

**Outcome Evaluation of the  
Women Offender Case Management  
Model in Connecticut Probation**

**January 23, 2009**

---

**Submitted to**

National Institute of Corrections

*by*



1143 Clapp Lane, Ottawa, Ontario K4M 1A5  
Tel 613 236 0773 ■ Fax 613 236 3433 ■ [info@orbispartners.com](mailto:info@orbispartners.com)

# Table of Contents

<b>Introduction</b>	
Women Offender Case Management Model	1
WOCMM Evaluation Framework	1
First Outcome Report	2
<b>Methodology</b>	2
WOCMM and Comparison Samples	2
<i>Table 1: WOCMM Sample</i>	3
<i>Table 2: WOCMM and Random Assignment Comparison Samples</i>	4
Matching Process	5
<i>Table 3: Retrospective Comparison Sample</i>	6
<i>Table 4: WOCMM and Retrospective Comparison Matched Samples</i>	7
Outcome Recidivism Variables	8
<b>Results</b>	8
<i>Table 5: Recidivism Rates of WOCMM and Retrospective Comparison Matched Samples</i>	8
<i>Table 6: Recidivism Rates of WOCMM and Retrospective Comparison Matched Samples</i>	9
– Drop-Outs Excluded	
<i>Table 7: Recidivism Rates of WOCMM and Retrospective Comparison Matched Samples</i>	10
– Top Third of LSI-R Scores	
<i>Table 8: Recidivism Rates of WOCMM and Retrospective Comparison Matched Samples</i>	11
– Top 50% of ASUS-R Mood Adjustment Scale	
<b>Conclusion</b>	11
<b>Appendix A</b>	13
<i>Table A-1: Total and Matched WOCMM Samples</i>	14
<i>Table A-2: Total and Matched Retrospective Comparison Samples</i>	15

## Introduction

This outcome report on the Women Offender Case Management Model (WOCMM) implemented in Connecticut probation represents the first formal examination of outcomes. The reporting period for this outcome report includes data collected from the introduction of WOCMM in July 2007 until November 2008.

The outcome evaluation focuses on determining whether participation in the project reduces future involvement in the criminal justice system as measured by recidivism over a fixed length follow-up period. The outcome evaluation employs a comparison group to determine if participants have more positive outcomes than a group of women with similar characteristics who were not exposed to the model.

## Women Offender Case Management Model

WOCMM was developed to focus on issues that are unique to serving women. It involves an enriched case management approach to address the risk, need and responsivity issues that are critical for success with women. The theory on which WOCMM is based is best described by eight principles that guided the development of the model. These principles are reviewed briefly below.

- WOCMM is a gender-responsive approach developed exclusively for women.
- WOCMM is a dynamic process.
- WOCMM requires the active and collaborative involvement of women.
- WOCMM is delivered by a multi-disciplinary team that recognizes the importance of open communication and the on-going transfer of information, knowledge and skills that can be shared with all members of the team.
- WOCMM promotes the development, implementation and monitoring of individualized service plans.
- WOCMM provides a range of services and opportunities.
- WOCMM was designed to help women mobilize existing strengths and resources.
- WOCMM was designed to monitor progress and report outcomes.

## WOCMM Evaluation Framework

In July 2007, a detailed framework report for the WOCMM evaluation was finalized. The framework describes the goals of the evaluation and the various questions that are being posed from the perspectives of process and outcomes. The framework was developed by Orbis Partners after extensive consultations with the Connecticut Judicial Branch, Court Support Services Division (CSSD) and National Institute of Corrections (NIC). Participation in the evaluation of WOCMM was included in the funding agreement established between

CSSD and NIC for piloting the model in Connecticut. A complete copy of the framework report is available from NIC upon request.

### **First Outcome Report**

In this report we provide a first examination of outcomes for women who participated in WOCMM. This is the first report and focuses on a sample with a relatively short follow-up period (fixed six month follow-up). While a comparison group has been established to help assess the impact of WOCMM, the number of women is often times too small to be helpful for detecting significant differences. However, this report does provide a first opportunity to examine outcomes of the WOCMM participants in relation to an integral comparison group and identify some of the issues that should be explored in subsequent reports.

We turn now to an examination of the characteristics of the samples and an overview of the comparative methods that will be used to assess the impact of this model.

## **Methodology**

### **WOCMM and Comparison Samples**

Implementation of WOCMM in Connecticut probation began in July 2007. Working with the Connecticut Judicial Branch, eligibility criteria for entry into WOCMM was identified as follows:

- Female
- 18 years of age or older at probation start
- Probation term of one year or more
- Not a sex offender
- LSI-R assessment score above 21
- Originally from Bridgeport, Hartford, New Britain or New Haven supervising offices
- Availability of a caseload ‘spot’ (maximum caseload size is 35 women per officer)

A total of 371 women had enrolled as of November 2008; 311 are currently active<sup>1</sup>. **Table 1** shows the demographics, supervising regions, probation sentence length, and LSI-R and ASUS-R scale scores for this group of women. Analyses show an average age of 34 years, the majority 25-34 years of age (33.7%) with a slightly lower percentage (31.0%) aged 35-44 years. About 42% were African-American, 31.3% Caucasian and 26.9% Hispanic. Slightly more than half (50.4%) were from the North Central supervising region and about one-quarter (23.2%) each from the South Central and South West supervising regions. Average probation

---

<sup>1</sup> Of the 60 women no longer active, 29 (48.3%) were removed due to unsatisfactory participation, 17 (28.3%) were transferred to a non-participating office and 12 (20.0%) were removed for other reasons. Only two (3.3%) have successfully completed to date.

supervision length was 850 days (about 2 years, 4 months). Average LSI-R score was 29.1 and ASUS-R scales showed elevated levels on alcohol/drug involvement and life disruption, social and legal non-conforming and mood adjustment.

<i><b>WOCMM SAMPLE</b></i>	<i><b>Table 1</b></i>
	<b>WOCMM Sample</b> (n=371)
<b>Age (years)</b>	
18-24	18.1%
25-34	33.7%
35-44	31.0%
45+	17.3%
<b>Average Age (years)</b>	34.2 (SD=9.3)
<b>Ethnicity</b>	
African-American	41.8%
Caucasian	31.3%
Hispanic	26.9%
Other	0.0%
<b>Supervising Region</b>	
Eastern	1.6%
North Central	50.4%
North West	1.6%
South Central	23.2%
South West	23.2%
<b>Average Probation (Days)</b>	850.0 (SD=365.0)
<b>Average LSI-R Score</b>	(n=356) 29.1 (SD=5.7)
<b>Average ASUS-R Scales</b>	(n=337)
Involvement	8.5 (SD=7.1)
Disruptive	16.5 (SD=19.3)
Social Non-Conforming	9.3 (SD=4.9)
Legal Non-Conforming	11.5 (SD=6.7)
Mood Adjustment	9.7 (SD=6.5)

The evaluation framework report described the experimental design for the outcome evaluation of WOCMM in Connecticut probation. The design involved random assignment of women probationers to either the WOCMM or a comparison group. Assignment is based on the availability of a caseload ‘spot’ at the time of probation intake. If caseloads are at their maximum and a spot is unavailable, women are then assigned to a Random Assignment Comparison sample and receive regular probation services. Given the first priority was to fill all caseload spots for the WOCMM, assignment of women to the comparison sample did not begin until November 2007. To date, a total of 226 women have been assigned to this group.

**Table 2** shows the profile of these women and compares the results to the WOCMM group in order to assess the integrity of the random assignment process – an important first step of establishing equivalencies between the two groups before proceeding with outcome analyses.

Results show that there are no significant differences between the WOCMM and Random Assignment Comparison samples on age, ethnicity, probation supervision length, and LSI-R and ASUS-R scale scores. The only statistically significant difference was supervising region – a higher percentage of the WOCMM sample is being supervised in the North Central region (50.4% vs. 31.6%) while more of the Random Assignment Comparison sample is being supervised in the South West (34.2% vs. 23.2%) and South Central (32.0% vs. 23.2%) regions.

<i>WOCMM AND RANDOM ASSIGNMENT COMPARISON SAMPLES</i>			<i>Table 2</i>
	Samples		Statistical Tests
	WOCMM (n=371)	Random Assignment Comparison (n=226)	
<b>Age (years)</b>			
18-24	18.1%	14.6%	$\chi^2=1.49, p=0.68$
25-34	33.7%	33.2%	
35-44	31.0%	34.1%	
45+	17.3%	18.1%	
<b>Average Age (years)</b>	34.2 (SD=9.3)	35.4 (SD=9.4)	$t=1.02, p=0.89$
<b>Ethnicity</b>			
African-American	41.8%	49.3%	$\chi^2=7.24, p=0.06$
Caucasian	31.3%	28.4%	
Hispanic	26.9%	21.3%	
Other	0.0%	0.9%	
<b>Supervising Region</b>			
Eastern	1.6%	1.3%	$\chi^2=22.5, p<.01$
North Central	50.4%	31.6%	
North West	1.6%	0.9%	
South Central	23.2%	32.0%	
South West	23.2%	34.2%	
<b>Average Probation (Days)</b>	850.0 (SD=365.0)	861.6 (SD=325.6)	$t=1.26, p=0.06$
<b>Average LSI-R Score</b>	(n=356) 29.1 (SD=5.7)	(n=210) 29.7 (SD=5.7)	$t=1.01, p=0.95$
<b>Average ASUS-R Scales</b>	(n=337)	(n=199)	
Involvement	8.5 (SD=7.1)	8.2 (SD=6.5)	$t=1.16, p=0.25$
Disruptive	16.5 (SD=19.3)	15.1 (SD=17.8)	$t=1.18, p=0.20$
Social Non-Conforming	9.3 (SD=4.9)	9.4 (SD=4.3)	$t=1.08, p=0.55$
Legal Non-Conforming	11.5 (SD=6.7)	11.1 (SD=6.0)	$t=1.25, p=0.09$
Mood Adjustment	9.7 (SD=6.5)	9.9 (SD=6.5)	$t=1.02, p=0.87$

The next step for this first outcome report was to determine the proportion of women in each group that had a minimum follow-up time of six months – a length of time considered appropriate for detecting the initial impact of WOCMM on recidivism. For the WOCMM sample, this meant at least six months of follow-up time since project start – 315 of the 371 women met this follow-up criterion. For the Random Assignment Comparison sample, at least six months from assignment to regular probation services was required. As explained earlier, the priority was to fill probation caseloads with WOCMM eligible clients. Therefore it's not surprising that only 43 of the 226 women in this group met the six month follow-up requirement. This represents less than 20% of the Random Assignment Comparison sample and unfortunately, it was determined the number is simply too low for conducting meaningful analyses.

While the low number that met the required follow-up period was unfortunate, the possibility of this occurring [at least for the first outcome report] was discussed in the evaluation framework report. An alternative strategy was proposed describing a quasi-experimental Retrospective Comparison sample that would include a large pool of women who received regular probation services in Connecticut during the two years prior to implementation of WOCMM. This pool would first be identified according to the same eligibility criteria (i.e., age 18 or older, one year or longer probation term, not a sex offender, LSI-R score of 21 or higher and supervised at one of four participating offices). Once identified, matching procedures could then be employed to 'match' a subset of these women to those in the WOCMM group.

The Retrospective Comparison group was comprised of an initial pool of 603 women. **Table 3** shows the characteristics of this sample. Average age was slightly lower than 34, the majority (33.5%) aged 35-44 years. About 43% were African-American, 31.2% Caucasian and 24.7% Hispanic. Just under half (45.8%) were from the North Central supervising region, 29.2% from South Central and 24.0% from the South West supervising region. Average probation supervision length was 866.6 days (about 2 years, 4 months). Average LSI-R score was 28.7 and ASUS scales<sup>2</sup> showed elevated levels on alcohol/drug involvement and life disruption, social non-conforming and mood adjustment.

### **Matching Process**

Before proceeding with development of the matching algorithms, it was necessary to reconsider the sample of 315 WOCMM participants that met the six month follow-up timeframe. To briefly explain, although staff were trained in the WOCMM model in the summer of 2007, they did not fully implement the model until October. Challenges in learning to use the assessment, develop functioning teams, and establish community resources

---

<sup>2</sup> The ASUS-R was not implemented in Connecticut probation until 2007. As a result, the Legal Non-Conforming scale was not available for this sample.

contributed to delays in fully implementing the model. As a result of these issues, it was determined that women accepted from July to September 2007 (89 in total) did not fully participate in WOCMM<sup>3</sup>. Given that the model was not fully implemented, it was decided to exclude this first group of WOCMM participants from the outcome analyses. This decision left a total of 226 WOCMM participants with at least six months of follow-up time.

<i>RETROSPECTIVE COMPARISON SAMPLE</i>	<i>Table 3</i>
	<b>Retrospective Comparison Sample (n=603)</b>
<b>Age (years)</b>	
18-24	23.1%
25-34	28.9%
35-44	33.5%
45+	14.6%
<b>Average Age (years)</b>	33.5 (SD=9.7)
<b>Ethnicity</b>	
African-American	43.3%
Caucasian	31.2%
Hispanic	24.7%
Other	0.8%
<b>Supervising Region</b>	
Eastern	0.2%
North Central	45.8%
North West	0.8%
South Central	29.2%
South West	24.0%
<b>Average Probation (Days)</b>	866.6 (SD=355.6)
<b>Average LSI-R Score</b>	28.7 (SD=5.6)
<b>Average ASUS Scales</b>	
Involvement	8.9 (SD=7.1)
Disruptive	15.7 (SD=17.7)
Social Non-Conforming	9.4 (SD=5.2)
Mood Adjustment	10.4 (SD=6.8)

A series of matching algorithms were carried-out between the two samples with the goal of matching as many women as possible on a number of key variables. The many iterations resulted in an optimal five variable matching solution with 156 women matched between the two groups. **Table 4** shows the variables included in the final matching algorithm as well as

<sup>3</sup> Subsequent analyses exemplified the early implementation challenges. For instance, 23.6% of these 89 women have since been discharged for negative reasons compared to only 14.6% that were accepted after September 2007. Further, recidivism analyses showed an arrest rate of 29.2% and an overall negative outcome rate of 32.6% for these early program participants (versus an arrest rate of 24.3% and an overall negative outcome rate of 27.9% for the later entry participants).



the additional variables used to profile earlier samples. Results demonstrate the integrity of the matching process – no significant differences were found between the two groups on any of the additional variables. A comparison of the initial samples and final matched samples for both the WOCMM participants and Retrospective Comparison groups is included in Appendix A.

<b>WOCMM AND RETROSPECTIVE COMPARISON MATCHED SAMPLES</b>			<b>Table 4</b>
	<b>Matched Samples</b>		<b>Statistical Tests</b>
	<b>WOCMM (n=156)</b>	<b>Retrospective Comparison (n=156)</b>	
<b>Age (years)*</b>			
18-24	13.5%	13.5%	$\chi^2=0.0, p=0.0$
25-34	35.3%	35.3%	
35-44	33.3%	33.3%	
45+	17.9%	17.9%	
<b>Average Age (years)</b>	34.8 (SD=8.7)	34.8 (SD=9.0)	$t=1.07, p=0.69$
<b>Ethnicity*</b>			
African-American	44.9%	44.9%	$\chi^2=0.0, p=0.0$
Caucasian	28.2%	28.2%	
Hispanic	26.9%	26.9%	
Other	0.0%	0.0%	
<b>Supervising Region*</b>			
Eastern	0.0%	0.0%	$\chi^2=0.0, p=0.0$
North Central	54.5%	54.5%	
North West	0.0%	0.0%	
South Central	19.9%	19.9%	
South West	25.6%	25.6%	
<b>Average Probation (Days)</b>	839.8 (SD=362.4)	829.4 (SD=378.7)	$t=1.09, p=0.58$
<b>LSI-R Scores*</b>			
Bottom 1/3	35.3%	35.3%	$\chi^2=0.0, p=0.0$
Middle 1/3	30.1%	30.1%	
Top 1/3	34.6%	34.6%	
<b>Average LSI-R Score</b>	29.2 (SD=5.6)	29.2 (SD=5.7)	$t=1.05, p=0.77$
<b>Average ASUS-R Scales</b>			
Involvement* <sup>+</sup>	8.4 (SD=7.7)	8.8 (SD=7.3)	$t=1.09, p=0.58$
Disruptive	15.9 (SD=18.3)	16.7 (SD=18.9)	$t=1.06, p=0.70$
Social Non-Conforming	8.5 (SD=4.7)	9.1 (SD=5.0)	$t=1.15, p=0.37$
Mood Adjustment	9.7 (SD=6.3)	10.7 (SD=7.3)	$t=1.31, p=0.09$

\* Denotes variables used in matching algorithm.

<sup>+</sup> ASUS-R Involvement scores dichotomized at the mean for matching purposes.

## Outcome Recidivism Variables

The following outcome recidivism variables were examined for this first report:

- Misdemeanor Arrests
- Misdemeanor Arrests resulting in Convictions
- Felony Arrests
- Felony Arrests resulting in Convictions
- Any Arrests
- Any Arrests resulting in Convictions
- Any Negative Outcome (include arrests as well as absconding and technical violations)

We now turn to an examination of the recidivism results between the WOCMM participants and Retrospective Comparison samples.

## Results

**Table 5** shows the recidivism rates of WOCMM participants and Retrospective Comparison matched samples. Results show that the WOCMM group had lower rates on the majority of the seven recidivism measures. For example, arrests within the six month follow-up period for the WOCMM group were 24.4% compared to 29.5% for the Retrospective Comparison group. For any negative outcomes the differences were more pronounced – 28.2% for the WOCMM sample compared to 35.9% for the comparison sample. The differences, however, failed to reach levels of statistical significance.

<i>RECIDIVISM RATES OF WOCMM AND RETROSPECTIVE COMPARISON MATCHED SAMPLES</i>			<i>Table 5</i>
	Matched Samples		Statistical Tests <sup>2</sup>
	WOCMM (n=156)	Retrospective Comparison (n=156)	
Misdemeanor Arrest	23.1%	26.9%	p=0.51
Misdemeanor Arrest - Convicted	5.1%	7.7%	p=0.49
Felony Arrest	12.2%	11.5%	p=1.0
Felony Arrest – Convicted	2.6%	2.6%	p=1.0
Any Arrest	24.4%	29.5%	p=0.37
Any Arrest – Convicted	7.7%	9.6%	p=0.69
Any Negative Outcome <sup>1</sup>	28.2%	35.9%	p=0.18

<sup>1</sup> Any Negative Outcomes include arrests as well as absconding and technical violations.

<sup>2</sup> Tests conducted using two-tailed Fisher's Exact Test.

The community supervision component of the WOCMM model acknowledges that some of the women may acquire new arrests or convictions but still are appropriate candidates to remain under supervision. Accordingly, it is important to examine the recidivism rates of women (and their matched comparisons) still active in the process. **Table 6** shows the results.

A total of 22 women in the matched WOCMM group had been discharged for negative reasons. Recidivism findings showed the still active WOCMM group had lower rates on all the outcomes examined. Compared to the matched Retrospective Comparison sample, arrest rates were lower for the participants (22.4% vs. 27.6%) as were the negative outcome rates (23.9% vs. 33.6%). Although the difference in negative outcomes between the two groups is sizeable, it failed to reach statistical significance.

<i><b>RECIDIVISM RATES OF WOCMM AND RETROSPECTIVE COMPARISON MATCHED SAMPLES – MROP-OUTS EXCLUDED</b></i>			<i><b>Table 6</b></i>
	<b>Matched Samples</b>		<b>Statistical Tests<sup>2</sup></b>
	<b>WOCMM (n=134)</b>	<b>Retrospective Comparison (n=134)</b>	
Misdemeanor Arrest	20.9%	24.6%	p=0.56
Misdemeanor Arrest - Convicted	6.0%	7.5%	p=0.81
Felony Arrest	10.5%	11.2%	p=1.0
Felony Arrest - Convicted	1.5%	3.0%	p=0.68
Any Arrest	22.4%	27.6%	p=0.40
Any Arrest – Convicted	7.5%	9.7%	p=0.66
Any Negative Outcome <sup>1</sup>	23.9%	33.6%	p=0.10

<sup>1</sup> Any Negative Outcomes include arrests as well as absconding and technical violations.

<sup>2</sup> Tests conducted using two-tailed Fisher’s Exact Test.

To examine the impact of the WOCMM initiative on higher risk women, the next set of analyses focused on those with LSI-R scores in the top third distribution of the sample. The results are shown in **Table 7**. Similar to earlier findings, the high risk WOCMM group had lower rates on all recidivism outcomes. Felony arrest and any arrest rates showed the greatest differences compared to the comparison sample (both lower by 7.4%). Any negative outcome rates were similarly positive - 37.0% in the high risk WOCMM group compared to

42.6% in the matched high risk Retrospective Comparison group. None of the differences however, attained the level of statistical significance.

The final set of outcome analyses examined the impact of WOCMM on women that scored in the top half of the ASUS-R Mood Adjustment scale. Elevated scores on this measure suggest psychological and emotional disruption that may be evidenced by depression, worry, anxiety, etc. **Table 8** shows the recidivism rates for this subgroup of WOCMM women and their matched comparisons. Results showed the WOCMM group had lower rates on all recidivism measures. The arrest rate for the WOCMM sample was 24.1% compared to 33.3% for the Retrospective Comparison sample. More pronounced was the difference in overall negative outcomes between the two groups – 28.9% for the WOCMM sample compared to 40.7% for the comparison sample. As with previous analyses, none of the differences were statistically significant.

**RECIDIVISM RATES OF WOCMM AND RETROSPECTIVE COMPARISON  
MATCHED SAMPLES – MOP THIRD OF LSI-R SCORES** **Table 7**

	Matched Samples		Statistical Tests <sup>2</sup>
	WOCMM (n=54)	Retrospective Comparison (n=54)	
Misdemeanor Arrest	29.6%	33.3%	p=0.84
Misdemeanor Arrest - Convicted	7.4%	11.1%	p=0.74
Felony Arrest	13.0%	20.4%	p=0.44
Felony Arrest - Convicted	1.9%	5.6%	p=0.62
Any Arrest	29.6%	37.0%	p=0.54
Any Arrest - Convicted	9.3%	16.7%	p=0.39
Any Negative Outcome <sup>1</sup>	37.0%	42.6%	p=0.69

<sup>1</sup> Any Negative Outcomes include arrests as well as absconding and technical violations.

<sup>2</sup> Tests conducted using two-tailed Fisher's Exact Test.

**RECIDIVISM RATES OF WOCMM AND RETROSPECTIVE COMPARISON  
MATCHED SAMPLES - MOP 50% OF ASUS-R MOOD ADJUSTMENT  
SCALE**

**Table 8**

	Matched Samples		Statistical Tests <sup>2</sup>
	WOCMM (n=83)	Retrospective Comparison (n=81)	
Misdemeanor Arrest	22.9%	28.4%	p=0.48
Misdemeanor Arrest - Convicted	3.6%	7.4%	p=0.33
Felony Arrest	14.5%	16.1%	p=0.83
Felony Arrest - Convicted	3.6%	3.7%	p=1.0
Any Arrest	24.1%	33.3%	p=0.23
Any Arrest - Convicted	7.2%	11.1%	p=0.43
Any Negative Outcome <sup>1</sup>	28.9%	40.7%	p=0.14

<sup>1</sup> Any Negative Outcomes include arrests as well as absconding and technical violations.

<sup>2</sup> Tests conducted using two-tailed Fisher's Exact Test.

## Conclusions

This first outcome report provided important information on the WOCMM initiative in Connecticut probation, including:

- A detailed profile of the 371 women accepted into WOCMM between the start –up in July 2007 and November 2008.
- A comparison of the Random Assignment Comparison sample that demonstrated similarities to the WOCMM group on a number of key comparison variables. (Unfortunately, this group was found to have too few cases with the required six months of follow-up time for conducting the outcome analyses.)
- The creation of an integral Retrospective Comparison sample where matching procedures were employed to examine a number of outcome recidivism measures for a representative sample of women in the WOCMM group.

The recidivism results showed a consistent trend of lower recidivism rates for the matched sample of WOCMM participants. These findings were observed for the entire group of 156 match participants as well as the subgroups of active cases and those with higher levels of

risk and psychological/emotional distress. The later findings were particularly important, demonstrating the positive impact of WOCMM on women with characteristics that place them at continued risk of future involvement in the criminal justice system.

Although the results are encouraging, it is acknowledged that no differences were found to be statistically significant. However, we believe the findings are nevertheless substantively meaningful, particularly given the consistency of results across the many recidivism analyses. For many of the analyses, the lack of significance can be attributed to the smaller sample sizes where the ‘power’ to detect the differences was deficient. As women continue to participate in WOCMM, sample sizes will become larger and follow-up times will be extended to longer periods (e.g., 12 to 18 months), both lending to more thorough analyses in a subsequent outcome report.

# Appendix A

---

## *Total and Matched Sample Comparisons*

<b>TOTAL AND MATCHED WOCMM SAMPLES</b>			<b>Table A-1</b>
	<b>Samples</b>		<b>Statistical Tests</b>
	<b>Total WOCMM (n=371)</b>	<b>Matched WOCMM (n=156)</b>	
<b>Age (years)</b>			
18-24	18.1%	13.5%	$\chi^2=1.69, p=0.64$
25-34	33.7%	35.3%	
35-44	31.0%	33.3%	
45+	17.3%	17.9%	
<b>Average Age (years)</b>	34.2 (SD=9.3)	34.8 (SD=8.7)	$t=1.14, p=0.34$
<b>Ethnicity</b>			
African-American	41.8%	44.9%	$\chi^2=0.59, p=0.75$
Caucasian	31.3%	28.2%	
Hispanic	26.9%	26.9%	
Other	0.0%	0.0%	
<b>Supervising Region</b>			
Eastern	1.6%	0.0%	$\chi^2=6.2, p<.18$
North Central	50.4%	54.5%	
North West	1.6%	0.0%	
South Central	23.2%	19.9%	
South West	23.2%	25.6%	
<b>Average Probation (Days)</b>	850.0 (SD=365.0)	839.8 (SD=362.4)	$t=1.01, p=0.93$
<b>Average LSI-R Score</b>	(n=356) 29.1 (SD=5.7)	29.2 (SD=5.6)	$t=1.03, p=0.82$
<b>Average ASUS-R Scales</b>	(n=337)		
Involvement	8.5 (SD=7.1)	8.4 (SD=7.7)	$t=1.0, p=0.96$
Disruptive	16.5 (SD=19.3)	15.9 (SD=18.3)	$t=1.11, p=0.45$
Social Non-Conforming	9.3 (SD=4.9)	8.5 (SD=4.7)	$t=1.11, p=0.44$
Legal Non-Conforming	11.5 (SD=6.7)	11.2 (6.5)	$t=1.06, p=0.70$
Mood Adjustment	9.7 (SD=6.5)	9.7 (SD=6.3)	$t=1.07, p=0.65$



**TOTAL AND MATCHED RETROSPECTIVE COMPARISON SAMPLES****Table A-2**

	Samples		Statistical Tests
	Total Retrospective Comparison (n=603)	Matched Retrospective Comparison (n=156)	
<b>Age (years)</b>			
18-24	23.1%	13.5%	$\chi^2=1.69, p=0.64$
25-34	28.9%	35.3%	
35-44	33.5%	33.3%	
45+	14.6%	17.9%	
<b>Average Age (years)</b>	33.5 (SD=9.7)	34.8 (SD=9.0)	$t=1.14, p=0.34$
<b>Ethnicity</b>			
African-American	43.3%	44.9%	$\chi^2=0.59, p=0.75$
Caucasian	31.2%	28.2%	
Hispanic	24.7%	26.9%	
Other	0.8%	0.0%	
<b>Supervising Region</b>			
Eastern	0.2%	0.0%	$\chi^2=6.2, p<.18$
North Central	45.8%	54.5%	
North West	0.8%	0.0%	
South Central	29.2%	19.9%	
South West	24.0%	25.6%	
<b>Average Probation (Days)</b>	866.6 (SD=355.6)	829.4 (SD=378.7)	$t=1.01, p=0.93$
<b>Average LSI-R Score</b>	28.7 (SD=5.6)	29.2 (SD=5.7)	$t=1.03, p=0.82$
<b>Average ASUS-R Scales</b>			
Involvement	8.9 (SD=7.1)	8.8 (SD=7.3)	$t=1.0, p=0.96$
Disruptive	15.7 (SD=17.7)	16.7 (SD=18.9)	$t=1.11, p=0.45$
Social Non-Conforming	9.4 (SD=5.2)	9.1 (SD=5.0)	$t=1.11, p=0.44$
Mood Adjustment	10.4 (SD=6.8)	10.7 (SD=7.3)	$t=1.07, p=0.65$