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Not “Does Treatment Work?” but “What Works?”

“Process Model” for Treatment

Strategic Issues for Treating Offenders
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Performance Indicators for Corrections (PIC)  
5 Participating Centers at 26 Sites

- TCU (9 Sites) 2106
- U Del (6 Sites) 428
- NDRI (5 Sites) 317
- U Ky (4 Sites) 282
- UCLA (2 Sites) 133

Total Clients: 3266

Sites Sampled:
1. Men/Women
2. ModTC/CTBT
3. Resid/OP

Assessments of Client Needs/ Progress

- **FORT CJ Settings**
  - Criminal Thinking:
    - Entitlement
    - Justification
    - Personal Incompetence
    - Cold Heartedness
    - Criminal Rationalization
    - Power Orientation

- **Social Functioning**:
  - Morality
  - Risk Taking
  - Social Consciousness

- **Treatment Engagement**
  - Participation
  - Therapeutic Relationship
  - Change
  - Thinking
  - Acting

- **Needs & Motivation**
  - Needs Index
  - Treatment Readiness
  - Treatment Participation
  - Therapeutic Relationship

- **Psychological Functioning**
  - Self-Esteem
  - Depression
  - Anxiety
  - Decision Making
  - Self-Efficacy

Offender Functioning Profiles
(Norms for 25th-75th Percentiles, N=3266)

- Motivation
- Psychological
- Social
- Engagement
- Criminal Thinking
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Criminal Thinking by Hostility
- % High Personal Irresponsibility
- % High Power Orientation

Low 23 8
Middle 31 27
High 54 72

Criminal Thinking by Counselor Rapport
- % High Personal Irresponsibility
- % High Cold Heartedness

Low 56 62
Middle 35 42
High 25 32

Client Response to Treatment
- % High Hostility
- % High Anxiety

Intake 0 5 10 15 20 25 30
Mid-Treatment
At Discharge

Hostility & Treatment Dropout Rates
- % High Hostility

Intake Month 1 Month 3 Month 6
Completers (n=290)
Dropouts (N=97/58)

Relationship between Hostility and Other Scales
- Higher Hostility: Red Flag
- Specialized Interventions?
- Higher Criminal Thinking
- Lower Treatment Readiness
- Lower Psychological Functioning
- Lower Treatment Engagement

Targeted Interventions for Corrections (TIC)
- Recovery Skills Training
- Cognitive Interventions
- Behavioural Interventions
- Social Skills & Support
- Drug use
- Crime
- Social Functions

Re-entry Services or Support Networks

Simpson, 2002, 2004 (J Substance Abuse Treatment)
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The table below presents data on Knowledge, Attitude, and Psychosocial/Motivation Ratings for the TIC HIV Module and TIC Anger Module. The data is divided into two groups: TIC (n=127) and Comparison (n=113), with mean values for each category.

### TIC HIV Module Knowledge, Attitude, and Psychosocial/Motivation Ratings (Controlling for Program Site Variance)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>TIC (n=127)</th>
<th>Comparison (n=113)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Scores (% Correct)</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude Ratings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risky</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Control</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosocial &amp; Motivation Ratings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire for Help</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>41.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment Readiness</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05

### TIC Anger Module Knowledge, Attitude, and Psychosocial Ratings (Controlling for Program Site Variance)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>TIC (n=87)</th>
<th>Comparison (n=73)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General facts about anger</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlling anger</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude Ratings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence in managing anger</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment Ratings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment Satisfaction</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
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