

PRELIMINARY EVALUATION REPORT

9/7/2009

Community Return: Cohort 1

Measurements of change in Community Return's Cohort 1 using the Texas Christian University Criminal Thinking Scales.

Preliminary Evaluation Report

COMMUNITY RETURN COHORT 1

The Instrument | TCU Criminal Thinking Scales

The Texas Christian University Criminal Thinking Scales are widely accepted in the state of Tennessee as an ideal instrument for measuring certain constructs associated with criminogenic factors. The test has been validated and nationally normed.

The Criminal Thinking Scales measure change in the following six areas: Entitlement, Justification, Power Orientation, Cold Heartedness, Criminal Rationalization, and Personal Irresponsibility.

Results | Individual Variables Compared Pre-Intervention versus Post-Intervention

Post-intervention, the average of our participants' scores were all lower except in the Cold Heartedness (CHA, CHB) category. Paired t-tests were conducted to analyze the change in scores among the program's participants. Significant differences were observed in Power Orientation (POB, POA) and Criminal Rationalization (CNA, CNB) scores. The difference in Personal Irresponsibility (PIB, PIA) scores approached significance.

Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	ENB	14.8250	8	4.57532	1.61762
	ENA	13.5750	8	4.25298	1.50366
Pair 2	JUB	17.7125	8	4.69937	1.66148
	JUA	16.2500	8	6.40134	2.26322
Pair 3	POB	25.3625	8	5.54280	1.95968
	POA	22.6625	8	5.57416	1.97076
Pair 4	CHB	16.2500	8	4.33425	1.53239
	CHA	17.0000	8	5.12696	1.81265
Pair 5	CNB	33.1125	8	5.59271	1.97732
	CNA	28.5500	8	4.13591	1.46226
Pair 6	PIB	17.7125	8	4.71455	1.66684
	PIA	15.6250	8	3.89533	1.37721

		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pair 1	ENB - ENA	1.800	7	.115
Pair 2	JUB - JUA	1.221	7	.262
Pair 3	POB - POA	2.629	7	.034
Pair 4	CHB - CHA	-1.000	7	.351
Pair 5	CNB - CNA	3.186	7	.015
Pair 6	PIB - PIA	2.022	7	.083

Results | Individual Variables Compared to National Norms and Means

All post-intervention means are lower than the national means in all six areas. With the exception of Power Orientation and Criminal Rationalization, our participants' scores were lower than the 25th percentile. However, pre-intervention, our participants' scores were already lower than national means in all areas except Criminal Rationalization.

Results | Comparing Means

Cohort One's overall average was significantly lower post-intervention. When comparing to national means, the cohort's pre-intervention average was significantly lower than the national average (p-value = 0.041); however, the post-intervention was more so (p-value = 0.000). The cohort's average pre- and post-intervention were so similar to the national lower 25th percentile average, there was no significant difference.

Comparison	Groups	Averages	Mean Difference	Significance
Cohort 1 Pre vs. Post	Pre	20.8	1.8	0.047
	Post	18.9		
Cohort 1 Pre vs. Nat'l Mean	Cohort1	20.8	-3.2	0.041
	National	24		
Cohort 1 Post vs. Nat'l Mean	Cohort1	18.9	-5	0.000
	National	24		
Cohort 1 Pre vs. Nat'l 25%tile	Cohort1	20.8	1.9	0.225
	National	19		
Cohort 1 Post vs. Nat'l 25%tile	Cohort1	18.9	-0.008	0.992
	National	19		

Conclusions |

This cohort entered the program with low Criminal Thinking Scale scores; however, some change was noted after the 16-week intervention. Significant changes were noted in Power Orientation and Criminal Rationalization.

The increase in Cold Heartedness may be explained by this program's emphasis that the ladies must care for themselves before attempting to care for others. This is indicated by hand-written comments found on the tests. They seem to be displaying an understanding that they will have to avoid certain loved ones, family members, and friends in order to ensure their own recovery; however, they may have also inadvertently picked up a more self-centered focus through certain program activities. All speakers and experts involved in the program should be educated on the particular nuances of incarcerated populations if they are not already involved with these populations.

For the future, program specialists may want to consider an additional focus on areas where significant change was not noted pre- and post-intervention. Additional assessments measuring change or progress in other areas, such as parenting, etc., may be desirable in order to provide a greater scope of the change that is taking place due to this intervention. An additional post-assessment using the TCU Criminal Thinking Scales should be administered after 6 months (February, 2010) to follow-up on the potential long-term impact of this program.