

PRELIMINARY EVALUATION REPORT



Community Return: Cohort 3

Measurements of change in Community Return's Cohort 3 using the Texas Christian University Criminal Thinking Scales.

Preliminary Evaluation Report

COMMUNITY RETURN COHORT 3

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 lower than their pre-intervention scores in all six of the areas assessed. Paired t-tests were conducted to analyze the change in scores among the program's participants. Significant differences were observed in all but three of the areas assessed - Entitlement, Cold Heartedness, and Personal Irresponsibility. The means and p-values of the women's scores are provided in the tables below.

Paired Samples Statistics

	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1 ENC1B	17.1182	11	4.33539	1.30717
ENC1A	16.1636	11	5.71126	1.72201
Pair 2 JUC1B	19.5636	11	2.63145	.79341
JUC1A	15.0818	11	4.36573	1.31632
Pair 3 POC1B	24.9091	11	5.43479	1.63865
POC1A	20.0000	11	5.76871	1.73933
Pair 4 CHC1B	17.6000	10	3.97772	1.25786
CHC1A	15.6000	10	2.95146	.93333
Pair 5 CNC1B	26.5364	11	7.85662	2.36886
CNC1A	21.7000	11	6.80191	2.05085
Pair 6 PIC1B	18.0273	11	5.10315	1.53866
PIC1A	16.9727	11	4.14297	1.24915

	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pair 1 ENC1B - ENC1A	.549	10	.595
Pair 2 JUC1B - JUC1A	2.492	10	.032
Pair 3 POC1B - POC1A	3.394	10	.007
Pair 4 CHC1B - CHC1A	1.793	9	.107
Pair 5 CNC1B - CNC1A	3.279	10	.008
Pair 6 PIC1B - PIC1A	.877	10	.401

All post-intervention means indicate movement in the participants' responses toward healthy norms. Pre-intervention, the participants' scores were already lower than national means in all areas. However, a significant decrease in half the areas targeted was still achieved in this cohort.

Conclusions |

This cohort entered the program with average to low Criminal Thinking Scale scores; however, additional change in the correct direction was noted after the 16-week intervention. Significant decreases were noted in the average scores for Justification, Power Orientation, and Criminal Rationalization.

The pre-intervention scores for Cold Heartedness were already very low; a further decrease in these scores would be difficult considering the women already demonstrated normal responses in this area. Further research is needed to understand the lack of significant change in other areas that have previously shown significant change post-intervention. It is possible that this group of women may have been more “hardened” and require longer, more intensive treatment before showing change in those areas. Additional comparative analyses could be done in the future to see if this cohort of women demonstrated higher risk in their responses than the previous cohorts. A more complete understanding of the role of Community Return in the women’s change could also be achieved through a process evaluation of the program’s implementation.

An additional post-assessment using the TCU Criminal Thinking Scales should be administered after 6 months (November, 2010) to follow-up on the potential long-term impact of this program.