

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

**Stages of Change Profiles of Offenders:
Exploring Offenders' Motivation to Work on Their Offending Problems**

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Clinical Psychology

at Massey University, Albany,
New Zealand.

Abigail Dawn Yong

2017

Abstract

Research has highlighted the importance of the stages of change (SoC) model (Prochaska, DiClemente, & Norcross, 1992) in assessing offenders' motivation to work on their offending problems and as a guiding framework for selecting interventions. This thesis investigated the stages of change profiles in a group of general male offenders ($N = 481$) before and after a Short Motivational Programme (SMP), which is a combination of motivational interviewing and cognitive behavioural material. For the first aim, distinct homogenous stage profiles that reflected the stages of change were generated by subjecting offenders' responses on the University of Rhode Island Change Assessment Scale (URICA; McConaughy, DiClemente, Prochaska, & Velicer, 1989; McConaughy, Prochaska, & Velicer, 1983) to hierarchical agglomerative cluster analysis. At pre-SMP, the Ambivalent, Non-Reflective Action, Precontemplation, Preparticipation and Participation profiles were generated. At post-SMP, the same profiles were generated with the exception of the Non-Reflective Action profile. These stage profiles were consistent with profiles elicited in previous studies, and mapped well onto the SoC model. The majority of offenders were in the precontemplation stage (represented by the Ambivalent, Non-Reflective Action and Precontemplation profiles), whereas a smaller proportion were in the preparation (represented by the Preparticipation profile) and action stages (represented by the Participation profile). For the second aim, stage profiles obtained at pre- and post-SMP were then used to investigate stage movement following the SMP, by constructing a stage-transition matrix. There was evidence for offenders with different stage profiles showing different responses to the SMP, whereby a comparatively larger proportion of offenders with the Non-Reflective Action, Preparticipation and Participation profiles appeared to continue working on their offending problems or progressed to a more highly-motivated stage, compared to offenders with the Ambivalent and Precontemplation profiles. These findings indicated that there is a need for a

more flexible approach to motivational interviewing to more effectively facilitate offenders' motivation to work on their offending problems. Men with the Ambivalent and Precontemplation profiles may require further help to resolve their ambivalence towards changing, before cognitive behavioural content is introduced. For the third aim, stage profiles at pre- and post-SMP, and stage movements were examined as predictors of recidivism in three separate logistic regression analyses, controlling for salient demographic and risk variables. Men with profiles representing the precontemplation stage were less likely to reoffend compared to men with the Preparticipation profile. This study also found that men who remained in the precontemplation stage were less likely to reoffend than those who remained in the preparation and action stages. These results suggested that men with the Preparticipation profile (which represents the preparation stage) may still be experiencing some ambivalence towards changing their behaviour, thus, impacting on their readiness to change their offending behaviour. It also raised the question on whether men with the Participation profile (which represents the action stage) may be more externally motivated to change their behaviour resulting in less lasting change upon the completion of their sentences. These findings contributed to a more in-depth understanding of offenders' stages of change, and demonstrated that these stages have important clinical implications in guiding assessment of offenders' motivation to work on their offending problems, and tailoring rehabilitation programmes to increase treatment responsivity and improve outcomes.

Acknowledgements

Firstly, I would like to thank my fantastic supervisors, Dr Mei Wah Williams and Dr Dave Clarke. To Dr Mei Williams, thank you for sharing your expertise with me, and for always challenging me to achieve beyond what I deemed myself capable of doing and reminding me to let go of “getting things right”. To Dr Dave Clarke, thank you for extending your supervision of my thesis beyond your retirement, your encouragement during this process and your hard work in reviewing my work so quickly. My sincerest gratitude to the both of you for your generosity with your time, your patience with me and guidance through the years!

I would like to thank the Department of Corrections, especially Nikki Reynolds, for your approval of this research, and willingness to partner with Massey University. I would also like to extend my thanks to the men who participated in my study. A particular thanks to Aimee for your help in developing the database and the Massey University Seriousness of Offence Scale. To Dr Matt Williams, thank you for your generosity with your time and helping me demystify the complex (and rather perplexing) world of parametric statistics!

My thanks to Massey University for the financial support through the Doctoral scholarship.

There a few other special people I would like to thank. To my parents, Ben and Fiona, and my sister, Melody, for your unfailing support for me and for always encouraging me to wholeheartedly pursue my dreams. My thanks to my extended family, especially Mah Mah, Poh Poh, Uncle Ivor, Aunty Rosy, Aunty Julia, Uncle Ho Yoong, Aunty Mavis, Uncle Irvin, Aunty Joy, Jonathan, Azriel, Paul, Joshua and Daniel, thank you for your love for me, keeping me grounded on what matters most and praying faithfully for me.

To the girls in my cohort, Sarah, Toni, Zara, Verena, Marian and Nikki, thank you for sticking by me all these years, your friendship has surely been one of the highlights of my doctoral journey!

Thank you to a few very dear friends – to Kristine, Cerys, Gaby, Elena, Gloria and Esther, for journeying with me through the highs and lows of this doctorate. Like a cup of hot cocoa on a freezing winter’s night, your friendship has cheered and comforted me during the “wintery” seasons of my journey. To Ee Ling and Edmond, for generously opening up your home and hearts to me, some of the pages of this thesis were written in the comfort of your wonderful Northland home. To Jane, your mentorship from my undergraduate to postgraduate years has been so precious – thank you for sharing in my joy and my tears through the years.

A special thanks to my colleagues from the Northland Diabetes and Renal team. To Dr Craig Wiese, Lisa, Cheryle, Adrienne, Emma and Billy, Virjean, Ashleigh, Christine, Ned, Oringa, Tracey, Eve, Lynette, Trina, Amy, Odette, Liz, Joan and so many more of you, thank you for believing in me when I could not believe in myself. For your heartfelt support, camaraderie and constantly challenging me to achieve my full potential, I cannot thank you enough. I want to dedicate this thesis especially to all of you. To Dr Craig Wiese, much of the insights I have developed around the clinical applications of the stages of change model has been a result of observing and learning from your wealth of clinical expertise, and the great care and compassion you have for your clients.

Finally, to God, thank You for your faithfulness to me through all the years and years to come. You have truly been my source of strength, refuge and contentment, who has given me purpose and motivation to do what I do.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	ii
Acknowledgements.....	iv
Table of Contents.....	vi
List of Figures.....	x
List of Tables.....	x
Tables Appearing in the Appendices.....	xi
Chapter One: Introduction and Overview.....	13
Chapter Two: The Stages of Change Model.....	16
Motivation to Change.....	16
The Transtheoretical Model of Change.....	17
The Stages of Change Model.....	18
History of the Stages of Change Model.....	19
Stage Definitions.....	21
Stage Transitions.....	23
Evaluation of the Stages of Change Model.....	24
The Stages of Change Model and Motivational Interviewing with Offenders.....	26
Measurements of Stages of Change.....	30
Staging algorithms.....	30
Self-administered questionnaires.....	32
Stage Profiles.....	33

Stage Profiles of Offenders.....	38
Rationale for the current study	42
Chapter Three: Aims and Hypotheses	44
Chapter Four: Method.....	46
Participants.....	46
Intervention.....	47
Measures.....	49
The University of Rhode Island Change Assessment Questionnaire	49
Data.....	51
Massey University Seriousness of Offence Scale	52
Inter-rater Reliability	52
Inter-rater reliability for present study.....	54
Data Analysis.....	54
Aim 1: Examining the presence of stages of change profiles in a group of general male offenders.	54
Aim 2: Examining stage movement using stage profiles generated at pre- and post-SMP.....	56
Aim 3: Examining stage profiles and stage movement as predictors of recidivism.....	56
Chapter Five: Results	58
Preliminary Analyses	58
Testing of Aims.....	59
Testing the Presence of Stages of Change Profiles at Pre-SMP (Aim 1).....	59

The Presence of Stage of Change Profiles at Post-SMP	66
Characteristics of Stage Profiles.....	72
Testing the Presence of Stage Movements Following the SMP (Aim 2).....	74
Characteristics of Stage Movements	75
Examining stage profiles and stage movement as predictors of recidivism (Aim 3).....	76
Stage profiles at pre-SMP and recidivism.	79
Stage profiles at post-SMP and recidivism.....	80
Stage movement and recidivism.	81
Chapter Six: Discussion.....	82
Stage Profiles in a Group of General Male Offenders	82
Differences in demographic and risk variables across stage profiles.....	86
Stage profile findings in comparison to offending and non-offending populations.....	88
Movement across Stage Profiles following the SMP.....	91
Reoffending and the Stages of Change	95
Limitations of the Present Study	99
Suggestions for Future Research.....	102
Strengths of the Present Study and Potential Clinical Implications.....	103
Conclusion.....	107
References.....	109
Appendices.....	127
Appendix A: Summary of stage profiles selected for comparison to present study	127

Appendix B: Comparisons of demographic characteristics and URICA-21 scores between SMP completers and non-completers.....	133
Appendix C: Short Motivational Programme agreement form.....	136
Appendix D: SMP URICA Questionnaire (Community Offender Version)	138
Appendix E: SMP URICA Questionnaire (Prison Inmate Version)	141
Appendix F: Statement of contribution.....	144
Appendix G: SMP URICA-21 items.....	145
Appendix H: Low risk notification	147
Appendix I: Research agreement with the Department of Corrections	148
Appendix J: Development of the Massey University Seriousness of Offence Scale.....	152
Appendix K: Additional details for data screening.....	163
Appendix L: Characteristics of stage profiles at Pre-SMP and Post-SMP	164
Appendix M: Characteristics of stage movements.....	168
Appendix N: Additional details for logistic regression.....	170

List of Figures

Figure 1. Four figures demonstrating the stage movements described in Hypothesis 2.....	45
Figure 2. Mean-score distribution for five types of stage profiles at pre-SMP	65
Figure 3. Mean-score distribution for four types of stage profiles at post-SMP	71

List of Tables

Table 1. Tests of Normality for Demographic and Risk Variables	59
Table 2. Agglomeration Coefficient Analysis for Ward's Method for Pre-SMP URICA Scores	61
Table 3. Analysis of Variance for 3 and 5 Cluster Solutions for Pre-SMP URICA Scores	61
Table 4. Tukey HSD Comparisons for Pre-SMP Cluster Solutions	62
Table 5. Standardised <i>T</i> Scores and Proportion of Participants for the Pre-SMP 5 Cluster Solution.....	63
Table 6. Agglomeration Coefficient Analysis for Ward's Method for Post-SMP URICA scores.....	67
Table 7. Analysis of Variance for 3, 4 and 6 Cluster Solutions for Post-SMP URICA Scores	67
Table 8. Tukey HSD Comparisons for Post-SMP Cluster Solutions	68
Table 9. Standardised <i>T</i> Scores and Proportion of Participants for the Post-SMP 4 Cluster Solution.....	69
Table 10. Numbers of Participants Moving from Pre-SMP to Post-SMP.....	74
Table 11. Stage Movements from Pre-SMP to Post-SMP	75
Table 12. Intercorrelations Among Study Variables	78
Table 13. Logistic Regression for Pre-SMP Stage Profiles Predicting Recidivism	79
Table 14. Logistic Regression for Post-SMP Stage Profiles Predicting Recidivism.....	80
Table 15. Logistic Regression for Stae Movement Predicting Recidivism.....	81

Tables Appearing in the Appendices

Table A1. Summary of Stage Profiles	127
Table A2. Summary of Study Characteristics.....	132
Table A3. <i>T</i> Scores and Corresponding Categories	132
Table B1. Differences Between SMP Completers and Non-Completers	133
Table B2. Ethnicity, Recidivism, Risk and Setting of SMP Completers and Non-Completers	134
Table B3. Demographic Characteristics of Study Participants and the New Zealand Male Offending Population (New Zealand Department of Corrections, 2013).....	135
Table J1. Level of Offence Seriousness (Spier, 2001) and the Corresponding Offence Rankings on the Massey University Seriousness of Offence Scale.....	158
Table K1. Multicollinearity Assessment for URICA Subscale Scores at Pre-SMP and Post- SMP.....	163
Table L1. Means, Standard Deviations and One-Way Analyses of Variance for the Effects of Stage Profiles at Pre-SMP on Demographic, Risk and Outcome Variables	164
Table L2. Differences in Stage Profiles at Pre-SMP across Demographic and Outcome Variables	165
Table L3. Means, Standard Deviations and One-Way Analyses of Variance for the Effect of Stage Profiles at Post-SMP on Demographic, Risk and Outcome Variables	166
Table L4. Differences in Stage Profiles at Post-SMP across Demographic and Outcome Variables	167
Table M1. Means, Standard Deviations and One-Way Analyses of Variance for the Effects of Stage Movements on Demographic, Risk and Outcome Variables.....	168
Table M2. Differences in Stage Movements across Demographic and Outcome Variables.	169
Table N1. Intercorrelations for Ethnicity, Stage Profile and Stage Movement Variables.....	170

Table N2. Control Variables for Effects of Pre-SMP Stage Profiles on Recidivism 171

Table N3. Control Variables for Effects of Post-SMP Stage Profiles on Recidivism..... 172

Table N4. Control Variables for Effects of Stage Movement on Recidivism 172