



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Targeting recidivism : an evaluation study into the functioning and effectiveness of a prison-based treatment program

Bosma, A.Q.

Citation

Bosma, A. Q. (2017, January 26). *Targeting recidivism : an evaluation study into the functioning and effectiveness of a prison-based treatment program*. Meijers-reeks. Meijers Research Institute and Graduate School of the Leiden Law School. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/45808>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/45808>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/45808> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation

Author: Bosma, A.Q.

Title: Targeting recidivism : an evaluation study into the functioning and effectiveness of a prison-based treatment program

Issue Date: 2017-01-26

Appendix A: Case Descriptions

Treatment group 1 (see Figure 1)

John, a homeless man aged 34, entered a Dutch remand center after he was caught shoplifting. When being arrested, he resisted which resulted in a minor injured policed officer. Because of his extensive criminal record, John was put in pre-trial detention until he was brought to court. The judge sentenced John to a prison-sentence equal to the time spent in pre-trial detention (which in this case was ten weeks). Because of this lack of sentence remainder John was **not assigned a candidate** for participation in the Prevention of Recidivism Program

Treatment group 2 (see Figure 1)

George, 19 years old, entered a Dutch remand center in the fall of 2010 after he was arrested for a very serious case of assault. After having spent eight weeks in pre-trial detention his court-day arrived, where the judge considered there was enough evidence to rule guilty and sentenced George to six months in prison. Based on the remaining prison sentence, which just exceeded four months, George qualified for participation in the Prevention of Recidivism Program. He was however staying in a penitentiary center where, at the time, one of two Prevention of Recidivism Program counselors was burned-out and was not able to attend work for several months. The prison sentence remaining was considered too short to transfer George to a prison in which program entry was possible. Therefore, George was **not able to participate** in the Prevention of Recidivism Program due to staff-shortages.

Treatment group 3 (see Figure 1)

After being put in pre-trial detention on charges of domestic violence, Pete (aged 24) was found guilty by a judge and was sentenced to a total prison sentence of eight months. He had spent a little over two months in pre-trial detention and based on his remaining prison sentence Pete was a candidate for participation in the Prevention of Recidivism Program. After being recognized by the Prevention of Recidivism Program registration system, a prison counselor contacted Pete in prison, explained the program to him, and asked him to participate. Pete however did not consider the program useful to him at all, and was not motivated to participate. He **declined participation** and spent the remainder of his prison sentence in a fully guarded prison, with no options to go on leave.

Treatment group 4 (see Figure 1)

After participating in an armed robbery, Kareem (aged 28) was brought to court and was sentenced to eighteen months in a Dutch penitentiary institution. Kareem had already spent three months in pre-trial detention and therefore, based on his remaining prison sentence at the moment of verdict, was considered a Prevention of Recidivism Program candidate. A prison employee asked Kareem to participate in the Program, which Kareem agreed to. Because a risk assessment instrument had already been administered in light of his court appearance, recent risk outcomes were available and the probation organization did not need to assess again. In line with risk outcomes, a re-integration plan was formed in which no specific behavioral modules were documented. Kareem did not score high on risk scales that indicate any of the four types of treatment administered in Dutch prisons. Therefore, he followed a **standard treatment program**, which entailed that he was prepared for re-entry by offering guidance regarding his work and income situation (shelter, health care, identity papers and debts were not a problem for Kareem) and spent the final months of his prison sentence in a half-open facility where he enjoyed more liberties and was able to spend weekends at home.

Treatment group 5 (see Figure 1)

Following being sentenced to prison for numerous charges relating to serious cases of assault, resulting in a prison-sentence of almost two years, Marc (aged 32) was considered a Prevention of Recidivism Program candidate and was asked to take part in the program. After agreeing to participate, a probation service employee administered a risk assessment instrument. The results showed that Marc had serious problems with both impulse control and taking perspective, indicated by the risk scales that show a need for cognitive-skill training. Consequently, Marc was referred to **standard treatment program, plus cognitive skill training**, in which he took part in the second year of his time in prison. Marc spent most of his time in prison in a fully guarded facility, but was transferred to a half open facility in the last few months, after which he was released (see Figure 1, group 5).

Treatment group 6 (see Figure 1)

Guillermo, 38 years old, entered a Dutch remand center in the spring of 2011 after he was arrested for stalking and harassing an ex-boyfriend. After having spent a few months in pre-trial detention, he was brought before a court. Guillermo was found guilty and, considering he already had multiple convictions in his name, was sentenced to 12 months in prison. Based on the remaining prison sentence, which surpassed four months, Guillermo qualified for participation in the Prevention of Recidivism Program and was asked by a prison staff-member to do so, to which he agreed. In light of previous incarcerations, risk assessment had already been conducted, which pointed to the fact that Guillermo had a drug-addiction, for which he needed treatment. Consequently, Guillermo participated in a **standard treatment**

program, plus lifestyle training, in which he was taught to cope with his drug-abuse problems. He successfully finished the Prevention of Recidivism Program, and was sent home to spend the final two months of his prison sentence at home under supervision of the Dutch probation organization.

Treatment group 7 (see Figure 1)

Nicholas, a 38-year old male with an extensive criminal record, was arrested and charged with Drug trafficking in January 2011. He spent three months in pre-trial detention after which he was sentenced to a prison sentence of two years. Because of his long prison sentence, Nicholas was a Prevention of Recidivism Program candidate. A recent risk assessment was not available so after Nicholas was asked and agreed to participate in the program a probation officer administered the instrument and made a risk assessment. Based on this assessment, it was shown that Nicholas had some problems with impulse control and substance abuse problems. He was therefore referred to a **standard treatment program, plus cognitive skill- and lifestyle training**. Nicholas successfully finished the Prevention of Recidivism Program (including both types of treatment), spent two-third of his sentence in a fully guarded facility and was, because of his participation in the Prevention of Recidivism Program, allowed to spend the final months of his prison sentence at home under supervision of the Dutch probation organization.

Treatment group 8 (see Figure 1)

Following an arrest for violence against a health practitioner in the night of January 1st of 2011, Ismael was transferred to a Remand center, where he spent six weeks in pre-trial detention. After he was found guilty, Ismael was sentenced to prison where he was ought to remain for eleven months, a decision to which he appealed. Awaiting the results of his appeal, Ismael was considered a great candidate for treatment, and was asked to participate in the Prevention of Recidivism Program. After Ismael decided to take part, a risk assessment instrument was administered, which revealed no criminogenic need problems so severe, that a specific treatment module was indicated. Ismael was therefore referred to a standard program. Two months after the initial start of his program however, a court that dealt with the appeal ruled that the prison-sentence of eleven months was too long, sentenced Ismael to five months in prison. Ismael was immediately released and was considered a **non-completer due to organizational circumstances** (standard program).

Treatment group 9 (see Figure 1)

After being arrested for a violent attack on an ex-girlfriend, which caused major physical injury, Stanley (aged 34) was transferred to a remand center, where he spent ten weeks in pre-trial detention. Stanley was found guilty of aggravated assault and was sentenced to 16 months in prison. Due to the fact that his prison sentence exceeded the four months necessary to qualify

for program entry, Stanley was asked to participate in the Prevention of Recidivism Program, which he agreed upon. Because Stanley had been in recent contact with the Dutch probation organization, a risk assessment instrument had already been administered. This assessment had indicated that there was no need to refer Stanley to a specific treatment module, such as cognitive skill training, and he therefore was given a re-integration plan in which he was assigned a standard program. Because Stanley was a program participant, he was allowed to go on leave during the final months of his prison sentence. Stanley did however not return from a weekend-furlough, and was re-arrested a week later. Because of this violation, Stanley was excluded from further participation in the Prevention of Recidivism Program and was considered a **non-completer due to refusal** (standard program).

Appendix B: Tables

Table B1. Un-weighted and weighted means treatment group (standard program, $n = 188$), vs. control group (standard program, $n = 99$)

	Treatment group	Un-weighted means		Weighted means	
	M (SD)	M (SD)	p	M (SD)	p
Covariate: Demographics					
Age (in years)	31.2 (11.0)	34.6 (10.9)	.015*	32.7 (10.3)	.296
Ethnicity					
Native	0.7 (0.5)	0.6 (0.5)	.056	0.5 (0.5)	.003**
Non-native	0.3 (0.5)	0.3 (0.4)	.419	0.3 (0.5)	.377
Unknown	0.0 (0.2)	0.2 (0.4)	.000***	0.2 (0.4)	.000***
Covariate: Criminal history					
Age of onset	18.5 (8.0)	19.0 (8.1)	.655	19.3 (7.4)	.433
Nr. prior violent conv. last 5 y	0.4 (1.0)	0.6 (1.0)	.207	0.5 (0.9)	.859
Nr. prior property conv. last 5 y	0.9 (2.6)	1.2 (2.2)	.274	0.9 (1.9)	.966
Nr. prior other conv. last 5 y	0.6 (1.2)	0.8 (1.1)	.147	0.7 (1.1)	.394
Nr. prior prison sentences last 5 y	0.9 (2.7)	1.1 (2.4)	.511	0.9 (2.2)	.993
Nr. prior violent conv. ever	0.9 (2.0)	1.2 (1.9)	.242	1.0 (1.7)	.904
Nr. prior property conv. ever	2.7 (6.7)	3.3 (4.9)	.429	2.5 (4.4)	.809
Nr. prior other conv. ever	1.7 (3.6)	2.6 (3.6)	.044*	2.1 (3.3)	.404
Nr. prior prison sentences ever	2.2 (6.3)	2.4 (4.4)	.734	2.0 (4.3)	.760
Covariate: Current offence					
Offence type					
Violent	0.6 (0.5)	0.5 (0.5)	.321	0.5 (0.5)	.100
Property	0.2 (0.4)	0.2 (0.4)	.964	0.1 (0.3)	.535
Damage	0.0 (0.2)	0.0 (0.2)	.351	0.0 (0.2)	.605
Drug-related	0.0 (0.1)	0.0 (0.2)	.895	0.0 (0.1)	.350
Other	0.0 (0.1)	0.0 (0.2)	.469	0.0 (0.0)	.469
Covariate: Risk assessment outcomes					
Off. hist. & current offence	15.6 (12.8)	17.7 (12.6)	.271	15.1 (12.0)	.785
Accommodation	4.0 (4.5)	3.9 (4.4)	.911	4.0 (4.6)	.966
Education, work & training	8.3 (6.8)	10.0 (7.4)	.070	8.3 (7.3)	.998
Financial management & income	4.5 (3.8)	4.7 (3.8)	.752	4.8 (3.7)	.526
Relationship with partner & relatives	2.5 (1.8)	3.4 (1.8)	.001**	2.5 (1.9)	.926
Relationship with friends & acquaintances	5.6 (4.4)	5.9 (4.8)	.609	5.4 (4.6)	.841
Drug misuse	5.1 (5.4)	6.0 (6.3)	.267	4.4 (6.2)	.438
Alcohol misuse	1.6 (1.8)	1.8 (2.1)	.492	1.5 (1.8)	.639
Emotional wellbeing	2.4 (1.8)	3.6 (2.1)	.000***	2.4 (2.0)	.919
Thinking and behavior	6.9 (3.5)	8.1 (3.5)	.018*	6.9 (3.8)	.974
Attitudes and orientation	5.3 (4.6)	6.3 (4.9)	.143	6.0 (5.2)	.335
Sentence length					
Total sentence imposed (in months)	18.4 (14.4)	11.6 (11.6)	.000***	–	–
Propensity score					
Predicted probability (tr. group membership)	0.78 (0.16)	0.55 (0.25)	.000***	0.78 (0.16)	.762

Table B2. Un-weighted and weighted means treatment group (standard program plus cognitive skill training, $n = 93$), vs. control group (standard program plus cognitive skill training, $n = 56$)

	Treatment group	Un-weighted means		Weighted means	
	M (SD)	Control group M (SD)	p	Control group M (SD)	p
Covariate: Demographics					
Age (in years)	27.1 (9.0)	26.3 (8.6)	.619	29.8 (11.2)	.096
Ethnicity					
Native	0.5 (0.5)	0.5 (0.5)	.752	0.5 (0.5)	.904
Non-native	0.5 (0.5)	0.4 (0.5)	.951	0.4 (0.5)	.858
Unknown	0.0 (0.1)	0.1 (0.2)	.296	0.0 (0.2)	.849
Covariate: Criminal history					
Age of onset	15.8 (3.6)	15.2 (3.6)	.393	15.5 (3.4)	.637
Nr. prior violent conv. last 5 y	0.5 (1.2)	0.5 (0.8)	.960	0.2 (0.6)	.158
Nr. prior property conv. last 5 y	0.8 (1.7)	0.8 (1.6)	.992	0.5 (1.4)	.286
Nr. prior other conv. last 5 y	0.5 (0.9)	0.5 (1.1)	.990	0.3 (0.7)	.180
Nr. prior prison sentences last 5 y	0.8 (2.2)	0.7 (1.6)	.648	0.4 (1.4)	.199
Nr. prior violent conv. ever	0.9 (2.2)	0.9 (1.8)	.885	0.7 (1.7)	.713
Nr. prior property conv. ever	2.5 (6.5)	2.7 (6.1)	.815	5.5 (7.7)	.010*
Nr. prior other conv. ever	1.2 (2.3)	1.1 (1.8)	.793	1.0 (1.4)	.603
Nr. prior prison sentences ever	1.9 (5.6)	1.8 (3.8)	.884	2.3 (3.3)	.607
Covariate: Current offence					
Offence type					
Violent	0.6 (0.5)	0.6 (0.5)	.945	0.6 (0.5)	.763
Property	0.2 (0.4)	0.3 (0.4)	.253	0.1 (0.3)	.183
Damage	0.0 (0.2)	0.0 (0.1)	.601	0.0 (0.1)	.337
Drug-related	0.0 (0.1)	0.0 (0.2)	.606	0.0 (0.2)	.582
Other	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	.409	0.0 (0.0)	–
Covariate: Risk assessment outcomes					
Off. hist. & current offence	18.9 (11.9)	17.1 (12.7)	.409	17.2 (15.9)	.455
Accommodation	3.5 (3.9)	3.7 (4.1)	.811	1.9 (3.1)	.007*
Education, work & training	8.9 (6.3)	9.6 (6.5)	.518	10.2 (5.3)	.172
Financial management & income	5.9 (3.6)	3.9 (3.5)	.001*	7.1 (4.1)	.074
Relationship with partner & relatives	2.3 (1.5)	2.6 (1.4)	.183	2.4 (1.4)	.597
Relationship with friends & acquaintances	7.3 (4.0)	7.3 (3.8)	.974	6.7 (3.9)	.313
Drug misuse	5.0 (5.0)	5.6 (4.9)	.491	3.9 (4.7)	.170
Alcohol misuse	1.4 (1.8)	1.4 (1.7)	.910	0.8 (1.4)	.061
Emotional wellbeing	1.8 (1.3)	2.4 (1.6)	.033*	1.8 (1.4)	.946
Thinking and behavior	8.2 (2.5)	8.3 (8.2)	.777	8.6 (1.9)	.240
Attitudes and orientation	6.1 (4.2)	7.3 (4.3)	.098	5.7 (4.4)	.570
Sentence length					
Total sentence imposed (in months)	21.0 (13.7)	11.9 (11.0)	.000***	–	–
Propensity score					
Predicted probability (tr. group membership)	0.72 (0.20)	0.45 (0.24)	.000***	0.74 (0.20)	.493

Table B3. Un-weighted and weighted means treatment group (standard program plus lifestyle training, $n = 61$), vs. control group (standard program plus lifestyle training, $n = 54$)

	Treatment group	Un-weighted means		Weighted means	
	M (SD)	Control group M (SD)	p	Control group M (SD)	p
Covariate: Demographics					
Age (in years)	27.8 (8.7)	30.4 (9.9)	.145	27.6 (9.3)	.864
Ethnicity					
Native	0.5 (0.5)	0.5 (0.5)	.931	0.4 (0.5)	.233
Non-native	0.4 (0.5)	0.4 (0.5)	.688	0.6 (0.5)	.156
Unknown	0.1 (0.2)	0.1 (0.3)	.392	0.0 (0.2)	.618
Covariate: Criminal history					
Age of onset	15.6 (3.4)	16.4 (5.2)	.297	15.2 (3.9)	.568
Nr. prior violent conv. last 5 y	0.5 (1.3)	0.6 (0.9)	.697	0.4 (0.7)	.629
Nr. prior property conv. last 5 y	1.1 (2.3)	1.3 (2.4)	.708	1.3 (2.7)	.691
Nr. prior other conv. last 5 y	0.8 (1.1)	0.5 (0.8)	.047*	0.6 (1.0)	.302
Nr. prior prison sentences last 5 y	1.1 (2.4)	1.4 (2.7)	.541	1.4 (3.0)	.551
Nr. prior violent conv. ever	1.1 (2.5)	1.4 (2.0)	.500	0.9 (2.0)	.676
Nr. prior property conv. ever	2.7 (5.1)	4.4 (7.3)	.153	2.7 (5.5)	.941
Nr. prior other conv. ever	1.9 (3.2)	1.5 (2.1)	.431	1.6 (2.4)	.610
Nr. prior prison sentences ever	2.2 (5.5)	3.2 (5.4)	.349	2.4 (4.8)	.895
Covariate: Current offence					
Offence type					
Violent	0.7 (0.5)	0.5 (0.5)	.041*	0.8 (0.4)	.729
Property	0.1 (0.4)	0.3 (0.5)	.088	0.2 (0.4)	.724
Damage	0.0 (0.2)	0.0 (0.2)	.902	0.0 (0.2)	.891
Drug-related	0.0 (0.1)	0.0 (0.0)	.349	0.0 (0.0)	.349
Other	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	–	0.0 (0.0)	–
Covariate: Risk assessment outcomes					
Off. hist. & current offence	19.9 (13.4)	17.8 (12.5)	.394	20.7 (14.1)	.772
Accommodation	3.9 (3.8)	4.3 (4.3)	.631	4.4 (4.4)	.556
Education, work & training	8.8 (6.5)	9.7 (6.2)	.478	9.8 (6.2)	.431
Financial management & income	5.7 (3.9)	5.1 (3.6)	.479	5.5 (3.7)	.848
Relationship with partner & relatives	2.8 (1.7)	2.7 (1.7)	.891	3.1 (1.9)	.388
Relationship with friends & acquaintances	7.0 (4.0)	6.6 (4.2)	.595	7.9 (4.0)	.226
Drug misuse	8.1 (4.6)	8.4 (4.8)	.727	8.1 (5.1)	.973
Alcohol misuse	2.3 (2.0)	1.8 (1.9)	.232	1.8 (1.9)	.161
Emotional wellbeing	2.2 (1.5)	2.1 (1.5)	.942	2.2 (1.4)	.997
Thinking and behavior	8.2 (2.9)	7.3 (3.2)	.138	8.6 (2.8)	.449
Attitudes and orientation	6.4 (4.5)	5.2 (4.4)	.164	7.0 (4.6)	.438
Sentence length					
Total sentence imposed (in months)	17.5 (15.2)	9.9 (11.8)	.004**	–	–
Propensity score					
Predicted probability (tr. group membership)	0.62 (0.21)	0.42 (0.20)	.000***	0.59 (0.18)	.752

Note: * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

Table B4. Estimated parameters of treatment group membership (standard program, $n = 188$) vs. control group membership (standard program, $n = 99$)

	Treatment vs. control group		
	OR	CI	Sig.
Covariate: Demographics			
Age (in years)	0.94	[0.88 – 0.99]	*
Ethnicity			
Native	<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Ref.</i>
Non-native	0.78	[0.34 – 1.77]	n.s.
Unknown	0.17	[0.02 – 1.25]	n.s.
Covariate: Criminal history			
Age of onset	1.01	[0.95 – 1.07]	n.s.
Nr. prior violent conv. last 5 y	0.72	[0.37– 1.41]	n.s.
Nr. prior property conv. last 5 y	0.69	[0.44 – 1.08]	n.s.
Nr. prior other conv. last 5 y	0.91	[0.61 – 1.34]	n.s.
Nr. prior prison sentences last 5 y	1.24	[0.75 – 2.07]	n.s.
Nr. prior violent conv. ever	0.94	[0.62 – 1.41]	n.s.
Nr. prior property conv. ever	1.02	[0.86 – 1.20]	n.s.
Nr. prior other conv. ever	0.93	[0.76 – 1.14]	n.s.
Nr. prior prison sentences ever	1.13	[0.89 – 1.43]	n.s.
Covariate: Current offence			
Offence type			
Violent	<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Ref.</i>
Property	0.65	[0.25 – 1.69]	n.s.
Damage	0.28	[0.29 – 2.66]	n.s.
Drug-related	0.83	[0.28 – 2.41]	n.s.
Other	3.44	[0.63 – 18.78]	n.s.
Covariate: Risk assessment outcomes			
Offending history and current offence	1.02	[0.97 – 1.04]	n.s.
Accommodation	1.25	[1.11 – 1.41]	***
Education, work and training	0.98	[0.91 – 1.05]	n.s.
Financial management and income	1.02	[0.92 – 1.14]	n.s.
Relationship with partner and relatives	0.81	[0.63 – 1.03]	n.s.
Relationship with friends and acquaintances	1.04	[0.94 – 1.16]	n.s.
Drug misuse	0.95	[0.87 – 1.04]	n.s.
Alcohol misuse	1.24	[0.99 – 1.55]	n.s.
Emotional wellbeing	0.61	[0.46 – 0.81]	**
Thinking and behavior	0.98	[0.82 – 1.17]	n.s.
Attitudes and orientation	0.97	[0.87 – 1.08]	n.s.

Note: * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

Table B5. Estimated parameters of treatment group membership (standard program plus cognitive skill training, $n = 93$) vs. control group membership (standard program plus cognitive skill training, $n = 56$)

	Treatment vs. control group		
	OR	CI	Sig.
Covariate: Demographics			
Age (in years)	1.03	[0.91 – 1.15]	n.s.
Ethnicity			
Native	<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Ref.</i>
Non-native	0.80	[0.30 – 2.17]	n.s.
Unknown	0.40	[0.04 – 4.26]	n.s.
Covariate: Criminal history			
Age of onset	0.98	[0.80 – 1.18]	n.s.
Nr. prior violent conv. last 5 y	1.01	[0.33 – 3.14]	n.s.
Nr. prior property conv. last 5 y	1.20	[0.58 – 2.47]	n.s.
Nr. prior other conv. last 5 y	1.00	[0.45 – 2.26]	n.s.
Nr. prior prison sentences last 5 y	1.06	[0.46 – 2.47]	n.s.
Nr. prior violent conv. ever	0.92	[0.53 – 1.61]	n.s.
Nr. prior property conv. ever	0.86	[0.60 – 1.24]	n.s.
Nr. prior other conv. ever	0.84	[0.49 – 1.43]	n.s.
Nr. prior prison sentences ever	1.11	[0.68 – 1.79]	n.s.
Covariate: Current offence			
Offence type			
Violent	<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Ref.</i>
Property	0.42	[0.12 – 1.47]	n.s.
Damage	1.83	[0.12 – 28.65]	n.s.
Drug-related	3.53	[0.63 – 19.66]	n.s.
Other	0.86	[0.09 – 8.47]	n.s.
Covariate: Risk assessment outcomes			
Offending history and current offence	1.06	[1.01 – 1.11]	*
Accommodation	0.97	[0.85 – 1.09]	n.s.
Education, work and training	0.97	[0.89 – 1.06]	n.s.
Financial management and income	1.40	[1.18 – 1.66]	***
Relationship with partner and relatives	0.83	[0.60 – 1.15]	n.s.
Relationship with friends and acquaintances	1.07	[0.94 – 1.22]	n.s.
Drug misuse	0.94	[0.85 – 1.03]	n.s.
Alcohol misuse	1.15	[0.86 – 1.53]	n.s.
Emotional wellbeing	0.88	[0.62 – 1.24]	n.s.
Thinking and behavior	1.10	[0.89 – 1.35]	n.s.
Attitudes and orientation	0.80	[0.70 – 0.92]	*

Note: * $p = <.05$; ** $p = <.01$; *** $p = <.001$

Table B6. Estimated parameters of treatment group membership (standard program plus lifestyle training, $n = 61$) vs. control group membership (standard program plus lifestyle training, $n = 54$)

	Treatment vs. control group		
	OR	CI	Sig.
Covariate: Demographics			
Age (in years)	0.98	[0.87 – 1.10]	n.s.
Ethnicity			
Native	<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Ref.</i>
Non-native	0.85	[0.30 – 2.41]	n.s.
Unknown	0.41	[0.07 – 2.53]	n.s.
Covariate: Criminal history			
Age of onset	0.90	[0.76 – 1.08]	n.s.
Nr. prior violent conv. last 5 y	1.45	[0.47– 4.48]	n.s.
Nr. prior property conv. last 5 y	1.23	[0.67 – 2.24]	n.s.
Nr. prior other conv. last 5 y	2.29	[0.90 – 5.87]	n.s.
Nr. prior prison sentences last 5 y	0.79	[0.36 – 1.71]	n.s.
Nr. prior violent conv. ever	0.74	[0.43 – 1.29]	n.s.
Nr. prior property conv. ever	0.89	[0.71 – 1.11]	n.s.
Nr. prior other conv. ever	0.98	[0.61 – 1.57]	n.s.
Nr. prior prison sentences ever	1.20	[0.82 – 1.76]	n.s.
Covariate: Current offence			
Offence type			
Violent	<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Ref.</i>
Property	0.28	[0.08 – 1.03]	n.s.
Damage	0.47	[0.04 – 5.00]	n.s.
Drug-related	0.96	[0.20 – 4.69]	n.s.
Other	0.94	[0.04 – 24.27]	n.s.
Covariate: Risk assessment outcomes			
Offending history and current offence	1.00	[0.96 – 1.04]	n.s.
Accommodation	0.98	[0.85 – 1.14]	n.s.
Education, work and training	0.95	[0.86 – 1.05]	n.s.
Financial management and income	1.06	[0.94 – 1.20]	n.s.
Relationship with partner and relatives	0.91	[0.65 – 1.27]	n.s.
Relationship with friends and acquaintances	0.97	[0.84 – 1.12]	n.s.
Drug misuse	0.99	[0.89 – 1.10]	n.s.
Alcohol misuse	1.18	[0.92 – 1.50]	n.s.
Emotional wellbeing	0.87	[0.59 – 0.26]	n.s.
Thinking and behavior	1.13	[0.90 – 1.42]	n.s.
Attitudes and orientation	1.05	[0.90 – 1.24]	n.s.

Note: * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

