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Summary

Offenders’ treatment motivation has been linked to improved treatment engagement (Sellen et al, 2009; Campbell et al., 2010) and in turn treatment completion is associated with better rehabilitation outcomes (McMurran & Theodosi, 2007). Custodial education has been suggested to reduce reoffending (e.g., Zgoba et al., 2008) and so it may be useful to develop ways of motivating offenders to participate in custodial workshops and education classes.

Firstly, the exploratory study investigated post-release employment issues in short-term offenders (STOs) sentenced to custody of less than 12 months. Secondly, the main study described a feasibility study examining STOs’ motivation to participate in education. The Personal Aspiration and Concerns Inventory for Offenders (PACIO) is a goal-based motivational interview aimed at enhancing treatment motivation and assessing its adaptive and maladaptive dimensions (Campbell et al., 2010). Firstly, the PACIO was used as a preparatory motivational intervention to investigate its effect on education participation compared with STOs who received the PACIO plus a motivational interview (PACIO plus) and a non-intervention. Secondly, the effect of education participation on reconviction rates was investigated. Thirdly, the influence of adaptive motivation (AM) and learned helplessness/powerlessness (LH/P) profiles were investigated in terms of education participation.

The PACIO and PACIO plus did not increase STOs’ motivation and education participation. However, education participation reduced reconviction. AM and LH/P did not predict education participation. Since these results did not confirm the hypothesised outcomes, it is not feasible to use the PACIO or the PACIO plus to improve and assess STOs’ motivation for and participation in custodial education. Future research should focus on developing an effective preparatory motivational intervention for STOs to participate in education.
Declaration

This work has not previously been accepted in substance for any degree and it is not being currently submitted in candidature for any degree.

Signed:………………………
Date:………………………..

Statement 1

This thesis is a result of my own investigations. Other sources are acknowledged by giving explicit references. A reference section is appended.

Signed:………………………
Date:………………………..

Statement 2

I hereby give consent for my thesis, if accepted, to be available for photocopying and for inter – library loan, and for the title and the summary to be available to outside organisations.

Signed:………………………
Date:………………………..
Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisors Dr Dan Heggs and Dr Jo Sellen, for their support and guidance they have given me for more than half a decade. Thank you to Dr Paul Hewlett for his help with the statistics. I would like to also thank Prof Mary McMurran for her expertise and kind and encouraging words she has given me in the final stage of my PhD. I will always be grateful.

I would like to thank my husband Laurence for his patience and love he has given me throughout my studies. Also, I would like give him my greatest appreciation for time he allowed me to talk on offenders’ motivation to change and other exciting topics with forensic themes.

I would like to thank my family, especially my mum whose help allowed me to write this thesis. Also, I would not be able to continue with my studies if it hadn’t been for the support of Laurence’s parents, Liz and Larry.

I would like to thank my friends who showed me support in times when I needed it the most.

I would like to thank prison staff for being helpful with assistance with my data collection. Especially, Ken Price, who allowed me to use Education Department classes for interviews and provided me with an office where I could store and analyse my data.

I would also like to thank participating offenders as they gave me time to interview them. My appreciation also goes to offenders’ openness about issues that seemed to be close to their hearts such as their families and painful experiences such as dealing with substance use. I would not have been able to conduct my study without their input.
List of Tables

Table 1. NOMS pathways to reoffending (Home Office, 2004) ................................................................. 30
Table 2 Primary human goods (Ward & Gannon, 2006) ........................................................................ 60
Table 3 The Personal Concerns Inventory (PCI) Identified life areas (Cox & Klinger, 2004) .......... 85
Table 4 The Personal Concerns Inventory (PCI-OA) Identified life areas (Sellen et al., 2006) ...... 90
Table 5 Indices on the PCI rating scales (Sellen et al., 2006) ................................................................. 91
Table 6 The Personal Aspiration and Concerns Inventory for Offenders – wider life areas (Campbell et al., 2010) ................................................................. 99
Table 7 PACIO rating scale .................................................................................................................... 101
Table 8 The PACIO prison and re-offending indices (Campbell et al., 2010) ........................................ 102
Table 9. The factor structure of the PACIO without the prison and offending scales (Campbell, Sellen & McMurran, in preparation) ................................................................. 106
Table 10 The PACIO factor structure, including the prison and offending scales (Campbell, Sellen & McMurran, in preparation)................................................................. 108
Table 11 Emerging subthemes used to re-establish the NOMS pathways ........................................... 132
Table 12. STOs evidence to support the eight themes ........................................................................ 134
Table 13 Number of STOs who participated in this study ................................................................. 149
Table 14. Reasons and the number of excluded and STOs unable to participate in this study. ..... 151
Table 15. Number of excluded participants from the study in each group ........................................ 152
Table 16. STOs’ mean age in experimental groups .............................................................................. 153
Table 17. Offenders’ self-reported achieved education and qualifications ......................................... 155
Table 18. Self-reported level of qualification within research groups .............................................. 156
Table 19. Types of offences and percentage of their incidence in the study sample .................... 157
Table 20. Types of offences and percentage of their incidence in the study sample .................... 158
Table 21. Dependent and independent variables and type of investigation ........................................ 161
Table 22. Examples of instructions and questions in the PACIO and PACIO plus MI interview. ... 165
Table 23. Breakdown of STOs’ education participation in this study .................................................. 190
Table 24. Number of learners (N=60) and non-learners (N=57) in NI, PG and PMI ....................... 191
Table 25 Learners (N=60) participated hours, mean and SD in education ........................................ 191
Table 26. Learners’ PEP and Mean and Standard deviations (SD) in NI and intervention groups. 192
Table 27. Number of STOs who reconvicted and the number of reconvictions in learners and non-learners 12 months after release ................................................................. 195
Table 28 Reconviction in four conditions combining the PACIO and education participation ...... 196
Table 29. Factor loadings on Adaptive motivation (AM), Learned Helplessness/Powerlessness (LH/P) and Lack of Direction (LoD) (Campbell, Sellen & McMurran et al., in preparation) ....... 214
Table 30. Group means of Adaptive motivation and Learned Helplessness/ Powerlessness (LH/P) in two experimental conditions ................................................................. 218
Table 31 Number of learners and non-learners in PG and PMI group .......................................... 219
Table 32 Overview of STOs’ goals in different life areas in PG and PMI .............................................. 223
Table 33 Suggestions for PACIO goal attainment through education. .................................................239
Table 34 The PACIO newly added education scale .................................................................241
List of Figures

Figure 1. Stages of Change Model (based on DiClemente, Prochaska, Fairhurst, Velicer, Valesquez, & Rossi, J. S. (1991).) ........................................................................................................................................................................... 66
Figure 2. Multifaceted Offenders’ Readiness Model (adopted from Ward et al., 2004). .................... 72
Figure 3. Drieschner’s Integral conceptualisation of treatment motivation and related concepts (Adopted from Drieschner, Lammers & van Staak, 2004). ........................................................................................................ 76
Figure 4. Qualification levels (Taken from Office of Qualification and Examinations Regulations, Ofqual, 2014). ........................................................................................................................................................................ 154
Figure 5. Scatterplot of correlating PEP and sentence length .................................................................. 193
Figure 6. Scatterplot of correlation between PEP and number of convictions ........................................ 194
Figure 7 Correlation between adaptive motivation (AM) and learned helplessness/powerlessness (LH/P). ...................................................................................................................................................... 219
Figure 8 Correlation between adaptive motivation (AM) and proportion of education participation (PEP). ...................................................................................................................................................... 220
Figure 9 Correlation between learned helplessness and powerlessness (LH/P) and proportion of education participation (PEP). ...................................................................................................................................................... 221
Figure 10 Shows spread of AM scores in non-learners and learners ...................................................... 221
Figure 11 Shows spread of LH/P scores in non-learners and learners .................................................... 222
INTRODUCTION TO THE THESIS ......................................................................................................................... 14

OVERVIEW OF THE CHAPTER CONTENT ........................................................................................................... 20

CHAPTER 1 – OFFENDERS: THE IMPORTANCE OF EDUCATION AND MOTIVATION TO CHANGE ........... 23

SUMMARY .......................................................................................................................................................... 23

1.1 DEFINING WHO OFFENDERS ARE .................................................................................................................. 24
   1.1.1 Short-term offenders .................................................................................................................................. 26
       1.1.1.1 Short-term offenders’ rehabilitative provision in custody and community ........................................ 28
1.2 THE NATIONAL OFFENDER MANAGEMENT SERVICE (NOMS) PATHWAYS OF REOFFENDING .......... 29
   1.2.1 Accommodation ...................................................................................................................................... 30
   1.2.2 Mental and Physical Health .................................................................................................................... 31
   1.2.3 Children and families of offenders ......................................................................................................... 31
   1.2.4 Attitudes and thinking behaviours .......................................................................................................... 32
   1.2.5 Education, Training and Employment ..................................................................................................... 33
   1.2.6 Drug and alcohol abuse ........................................................................................................................ 33
   1.2.7 Finance, benefit and debt ....................................................................................................................... 34
1.3 EDUCATION .................................................................................................................................................. 35
   1.3.1 Participation in custodial education ......................................................................................................... 36
1.4 EDUCATION AND RECONVICTION ................................................................................................................. 38
1.5 MOTIVATION TO CHANGE .......................................................................................................................... 45
   1.5.1 Approaches to motivating offenders to engage in education and the goal focused approach .................. 47
   1.5.2 The Personal Aspiration and Concerns Inventory (PACIO; Campbell et al., 2010) ................................. 50
1.6 AIMS OF THIS STUDY .................................................................................................................................. 52

CHAPTER 2 REHABILITATIVE FRAMEWORKS AND MODELS OF OFFENDERS’ READINESS AND
MOTIVATION TO ENGAGE IN TREATMENT ....................................................................................................... 53

2.1 INTRODUCTION TO OFFENDERS’ MOTIVATION TO TREATMENT .............................................................. 53
2.2 FRAMEWORKS OF OFFENDER REHABILITATION ........................................................................................ 54
   2.2.1 Risk-Need-Responsivity model (RNR model) .......................................................................................... 55
   2.2.2 The Good Lives Model (GLM). A positive, strength-based approach to offenders’ rehabilitation. .................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................. 59
2.3 MODELS OF OFFENDERS’ READINESS TO TREATMENT ................................................................................. 64
   2.3.1 Stages of Change Model (Prochaska, DiClemente, Velicer, Ginipil & Norcross, 1985) ......................... 65
   2.3.2 Multifactor Offender Readiness Model (MORM) ...................................................................................... 70
2.4 THEORIES OF OFFENDERS’ MOTIVATION TO TREATMENT ENGAGEMENT ................................................ 74
   2.4.1 Drieschner’s theory of motivation ........................................................................................................... 75
CHAPTER 3 SHORT-TERM OFFENDERS’ (STOS) ISSUES WITH EMPLOYMENT. AN EXPLORATORY STUDY

SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

EMPLOYMENT, TRAINING AND EDUCATION (ETE)

OFFENDER’S ATTITUDES, THINKING AND BEHAVIOUR

METHOD

Participants

Design

Materials

Procedure

Data Analysis

RESULTS

Employment

Education and Training

Attitudes and Thinking Behaviour

CONCLUSION

CHAPTER 4 - METHODOLOGY FOR A RANDOMISED CONTROLLED TRIAL (RCT) OF THE PACIO AS A MOTIVATOR TO EDUCATION WITH INCARCERATED SHORT-TERM OFFENDERS (STOS)
4.2.1 Baseline analyses .................................................................................................................. 152
  4.2.1.1 Age ................................................................................................................................. 152
  4.2.1.2 Levels of Education prior to custody ............................................................................. 153
  4.2.1.3 Offence types and history of reoffending ..................................................................... 156
  4.2.1.4 Employment prior to custody ....................................................................................... 159

4.3 DESIGN .................................................................................................................................. 159
  4.3.1 Randomised controlled trials (RCTs) in the prison setting ............................................. 159

4.4 OUTCOME VARIABLES .......................................................................................................... 160

4.5 INTERVENTIONS .................................................................................................................. 162
  4.5.1 The Personal Aspirations and Concerns Inventory for Offenders (PACIO) ...................... 162
  4.5.2 PACIO plus Motivational Interviewing (MI) .................................................................... 162
  4.5.3 Education ......................................................................................................................... 166

4.6 OUTCOME MEASURES ......................................................................................................... 167
  4.6.1 Primary outcome - STOs’ proportion of education participation (PEP). ......................... 167
  4.6.2 Secondary outcome – Reconviction rates ....................................................................... 168
  4.6.3 Tertiary outcome – Adaptive motivation (AM (PACIO) and Learned Helplessness/
             Powerlessness (LH/P) Scores. ......................................................................................... 169

4.7 PROCEDURE ......................................................................................................................... 170
  4.7.1 Ethical Approvals ............................................................................................................. 170
  4.7.2 Offenders’ initial recruitment from the Local Inmate Database System (LIDS) and Computer-
             National Offenders Management Information Service (C-NOMIS) ................................ 171
  4.7.3 Randomisation procedure ............................................................................................... 172
  4.7.4 Recruitment – offenders’ number estimation .................................................................. 173
  4.7.5 Recruitment – distributing information and seeking consent ....................................... 175
  4.7.6 Conducting Interviews (PACIO group; PG and the PACIO plus Motivational Interviewing;
             PMI) ................................................................................................................................. 176
    4.7.6.1 Examples of the PACIO interviews in PACIO group (PG) and PACIO plus Motivational Interviewing
             (PMI) .................................................................................................................................... 178
  4.7.7 Extracting reconviction data from the Police National Computer (PNC) ......................... 179
  4.7.8 Storing and handling data in the prison ......................................................................... 181

4.8 ANALYSIS PLAN .................................................................................................................. 182

CHAPTER 5 – STUDY 1: THE PACIO AS A PREPARATORY MOTIVATIONAL INTERVENTION FOR
PARTICIPATION IN EDUCATION FOR SHORT-TERM OFFENDERS (STOS) AND THE EFFECT OF
EDUCATION PARTICIPATION ON STOS’ RECONVICTION .......................................................... 184

SUMMARY ...................................................................................................................................... 184

5.1 INTRODUCTION .................................................................................................................... 185
  5.1.2 The current study ............................................................................................................. 185
5.1.3 Hypotheses ........................................................................................................ 186
5.2 METHOD .................................................................................................................. 187
5.3 METHOD OF ANALYSIS ...................................................................................... 189
5.4 RESULTS ................................................................................................................ 190
  5.4.1 Primary outcome – PACIO as a motivational preparatory intervention to improve STOs’
      education participation H1 – H3 ............................................................................. 190
  5.4.2 Secondary outcome – Reconviction H4 – H8...................................................... 193
  5.4.3 Exploratory post-hoc analysis ........................................................................... 197
  5.4.4 Feasibility of a Randomised Controlled Trial.................................................... 197
5.5 DISCUSSION .......................................................................................................... 198
  5.5.1 Summary .......................................................................................................... 198
  5.5.2 The PACIO, education participation and intervention groups ......................... 199
  5.5.3 STOs’ reconviction and the effect of education participation .......................... 203
  5.5.4 Feasibility of conducting a future RCT in this study ......................................... 204
     5.5.4.1 The recruitment rate .................................................................................. 204
     5.5.4.2 The PACIO uptake .................................................................................... 205
     5.5.4.3 Collection of education hours ..................................................................... 206
     5.5.4.4 PNC follow up ........................................................................................ 207
5.6 CONCLUSION ........................................................................................................ 207

CHAPTER 6 - STUDY 2: MOTIVATIONAL PROFILES AS ASSESSED ON THE PACIO AND EDUCATION

PARTICIPATION ............................................................................................................ 210

SUMMARY ................................................................................................................... 210

6.1 INTRODUCTION ....................................................................................................... 211
  6.1.1 The current study ............................................................................................. 211
  6.1.2 Hypotheses ...................................................................................................... 212
6.2 METHOD ................................................................................................................ 213
6.3 RESULTS ................................................................................................................ 217
  6.3.1 Primary outcome – Assess STOs’ Adaptive motivation (AM_PACIO Index) and Learned
      Helplessness/Powerlessness (LH/P Index) - H1-H2.............................................. 217
  6.3.2 Correlation between AM_PACIO Index and LH/P Index scores - H3 .................. 218
  6.3.3 Motivational profiles and STOs’ education status (ES) – H4.............................. 219
  6.3.4 Goals ............................................................................................................... 222
6.4 DISCUSSION .......................................................................................................... 224
  6.4.1 Summary .......................................................................................................... 224
  6.4.2 Adaptive motivation (AM) and learned helplessness/ powerlessness (LH/P) as assessed on
      the PACIO ............................................................................................................. 225
  6.4.3 The PACIO as an assessment of education participation .................................... 226
6.4.4 The PACIO and goals ........................................................................................................227
6.4.4.1 Exploring STOs’ goals .................................................................................................228
6.4.5 The PACIO and the Good Lives Model (GLM) ..............................................................229
6.4.6 Future research ..............................................................................................................230
6.4.7 Conclusion .....................................................................................................................231

CHAPTER 7 – DISCUSSION .....................................................................................................233

SUMMARY .............................................................................................................................233

7.1 SUMMARY OF RESULTS .................................................................................................234
7.1.1 Exploratory study ...........................................................................................................234
7.2 PACIO AS A PREPARATORY MOTIVATIONAL INTERVENTION TO MOTIVATE STOS TO PARTICIPATE IN EDUCATION ........................................................................238
7.2.1 The PACIO plus Motivational Interviewing ................................................................242
7.3 EDUCATION AS A MEANS TO REDUCE RECONVICTION ...........................................244
7.3.1 Learners and non-learners and reconviction .................................................................246
7.4 RANDOMISED CONTROLLED TRIAL METHODOLOGY .............................................247
7.5 PRACTICAL ISSUES ..........................................................................................................253
7.6 THE PACIO AS AN ASSESSMENT OF STOs’ MOTIVATION STRUCTURE ....................254
7.6.1 Goals and the PACIO .....................................................................................................256
7.6.2 Administering the PACIO in simpler language ............................................................257
7.7 LIMITATIONS AND STRENGTHS ....................................................................................258
7.8 FUTURE RESEARCH ........................................................................................................262
7.9 CONCLUSION ....................................................................................................................264
Introduction to the thesis

Offenders’ motivation to change behaviour and offenders’ motivation to engage in treatment has become an important issue since offenders’ treatment engagement has been suggested to influence the treatment outcomes related to offending (Campbell, Sellen & McMurran, 2010; Campbell, Sellen & McMurran, in preparation). Motivation to change behaviour has been defined as ‘commitment to the goal of change’ (McMurran, 2002). In order for an offender to change behaviour, he/she needs to be motivated to achieve a goal which leads to a desirable outcome. For instance, an offender needs to be committed to engage in treatment. Offenders’ engagement in treatment has been suggested to influence the treatment outcomes related to offending such as reduction in impulsivity (Campbell et al., 2010). Motivation of offenders to engage in treatment can be a proxy for offenders’ motivation to change behaviour (Campbell et al., 2010). This means that if an offender is motivated to engage in treatment and address his/her crime-related behaviours, it is likely that the offender is motivated to change and stop reoffending.

Offenders are likely to experience hardship and social discrimination such as health, finance and education and as a result they face complex needs regarding their rehabilitation. Offenders with short sentences under 12 months have the highest rate of reconviction which currently stands at 58.3% in comparison to 33.9% of offenders who were sentenced for more than 12 months in custody (Ministry of Justice, 2015). Custodial sentences aim to punish, incapacitate and rehabilitate offenders. The punishment includes diminished liberty, incapacitation includes protecting the public from risk of harm, and rehabilitation includes interventions aimed at the reduction of
crime (Sentencing Council, 2014). Many offenders can address their crime related attitudes and behaviours in accredited rehabilitative programmes in custody to addresses factors contributing to criminal behaviour directly and indirectly such as violent behaviour and improving education. However, the programmes are often not suitable for offenders who are sentenced to a short custodial sentence.

Short-term offenders (STOs) are sentenced to less than 12 months and typically serve only half of their sentence (Lewis, Maguire, Raynor, Vanstone, & Vennard, 2003a) which makes it challenging to engage in a meaningful pro-social activity. In addition to the short sentence, long waiting times and long duration of a programme makes it difficult for STOs to participate in such rehabilitation. Despite difficulties to access programmes, education and workshops in custody are open and suitable for offenders with short sentences. Classes in education include English and Mathematics, IT and employability skills. Workshops in custody include work for local companies and offenders can gain skills such as product packaging and bicycle repair. STOs were thought to have ‘significant educational’ needs (House of Commons, 2004a, p.77; Lewis, Maguire, Raynor, Vanstone, & Vennard, 2003b) and therefore, education may be more accessible for STOs but more importantly, STOs can improve their level of education and gain valuable skills. Improved education may indirectly lead to improved reoffending as offenders with adequate education can contribute to better prospects of gaining employment (Metcalf, Anderson, & Rolfe, 2001; Hopkins, 2012).

Employment has been proposed to be one of the most effective ways to reduce reoffending (Farrington, Gallagher, Morley, St Ledger, & West, 1986; Lipsey, 1992). Results from a national survey reported that 31% of STOs had a job in the period of 4
weeks prior their incarceration while 69% did not (Stewart, 2008). Those who were not in employment reported to be either unemployed, having a long term sickness or disability, looking after family or in education. Another study based on resettlement surveys has highlighted an issue between employment and reoffending. The results showed that reoffending rates of offenders with a prospect of a paid job to go to after release and those unwilling to work was 45% and 75% respectively. The offenders who reported that they do not want to work or train had the highest reoffending rate (May, Sharma, & Stewart 2008).

Complex interactions between individual pathways should be sought in order to understand underlying factors in identifying and applying appropriate treatment for successful rehabilitation. Psychological treatment in these areas has been shown to reduce reoffending and promotes desistance (Ward et al., 2007; Andrews, Zinger, Hoge, Bonta, Gendreau & Cullen, 1990; Walton & Chou, 2014). Stopping reoffending has been described in literature on desistance. Desistance is a complicated process, including relapses (Burnett, 2010). The process of desistance is comprised of three factors which are systemic provision (such as addressing offenders’ psychological characteristics), support to find employment and/or appropriate education and motivation to change behaviour (Maguire & Raynor, 2006). Thus, offenders’ motivation to participate in education has a potential to promote desistance and ending the cycle of reoffending.

One of the factors shown to reduce reoffending is custodial education (e.g., Steurer & Smith, 2006; Zgoba, Haugebrook, & Jenkins, 2008). For instance, reduction in reconviction was confirmed by US research including 33 studies in a meta-analysis (Wilson, Gallagher & MacKenzie, 2000). Offenders participating in educational,
vocational and correctional programmes in custody were less frequently reconvicted than the non-participants and the educational programmes were the most effective. Wilson et al’s analysis revealed a reduction in reoffending of offenders participating in post-secondary education (PSE) with the effect size of 26% and vocational training with the effect size of 22% of reduction. There is a lack of research conducted in the area of STOs’ motivation and education participation in terms of motivation assessment and improvement.

One preparatory motivational intervention that has been found to increase long-term offenders’ (LTOs) motivation for treatment is the Personal Aspiration and Concerns Inventory for Offenders (PACIO; Campbell et al., 2010). The aim of this thesis is firstly to investigate the PACIO’s effectiveness as a preparatory motivational intervention for STOs to improve motivation engagement in education. Secondly, both the PACIO and education will be tested as an intervention to reduce STOs’ reconviction. Education will also be investigated to determine whether it is an effective treatment in decreasing STOs reconviction. Furthermore, the PACIO has been suggested to assess offenders’ motivational structure (Campbell, 2009). Motivational profiles previously identified and assessed on the PACIO were adaptive motivation and maladaptive motivation (called learned helplessness/ powerlessness; LH/P) and lack of direction. Adaptive motivation was suggested to be worth investigating in other populations due to its predictive validity (Cox, Blount, Bair, & Hosier, 2000). Adaptive motivation has been characterised by perception of high likelihood and importance of goal achievement, high happiness on the goal achievement, goal commitment, knowing what to do to achieve the goal, control over goals and the view that the prison helps with goal attainment. LH/P has been characterised by feelings of goal importance and goal commitment and happiness and
the understanding that future reoffending will interfere with these. Nevertheless, the offenders lacked control over the goal achievement and believed that the prison will not help with the goal achievement (Campbell, 2009). The LH/P can impede on offenders’ motivation to change. If offenders do not feel that they can control their goals and make changes in their lives, they stop trying to make changes (Seligman, Rashid & Parks, 2006). Furthermore, LH/P is negatively correlated to adaptive motivation. The third factor identified on the PACIO’s structure was the lack of direction profile. The lack of direction profile displayed low internal reliability and therefore predictions based on this factor are not recommended. The lack of direction factor was not used in this study. Third, the ability of adaptive motivation and LH/P to predict participation in education will be investigated.

Moreover, an exploratory study was conducted with STOs to explore offenders’ thoughts and feelings about employment and employability after release. In particular, the exploratory study focused on the STOs’ views of the importance of education in relation to gaining employment after release.

In the main study, education is used as an intervention for STOs. Literature on offenders’ treatment often deals with offenders’ motivation to engage in treatment. However, education participation was investigated in this study since STOs’ attendance was one of the outcome measures. Classes in education and workshop sessions in custody require a degree of engagement with given work. This means that if an offender failed to work effectively during lessons or refused to follow an education contract, stating acceptable and unacceptable behaviour whilst in education, such an offender would be excluded from attending education. Therefore, the combination of the STOs’ attendance and a level of engagement required by the
Education Department established STOs’ education participation in education as one of the outcomes of this study. Moreover, STOs’ motivation to education participation was investigated using the PACIO as an assessment of STOs’ motivation to participate in education and the PACIO and the PACIO plus a motivational interview as intervention to improve STOs’ motivation and education participation which in turns reduces reconviction.
Overview of the chapter content

This thesis contains 7 chapters and details with regard to content in individual chapters are introduced below:

Chapter 1 is a descriptive chapter, introducing the concept of motivation and motivation to change. Also, the chapter introduces short-term offenders (STOs) and the importance of custodial education. The chapter sets out the aims of the thesis in detail.

Chapter 2 of this thesis examines the body of research with regards to current theories of offenders’ motivation and rehabilitative treatment for offenders. There is a need to explore existing rehabilitative frameworks since the most evidence for motivational effects relate to Offending Behaviour treatment rather than education (e.g., McMurran, 2009; Andrews, Bonta & Wormith, 2011; Chitty, 2005). Current rehabilitative frameworks in treatment, such as Good Lives Model (GLM), are introduced, together with goal-based models of motivation such as the Theory of Current Concerns (TCC). A measure that was developed to assess and enhance offenders’ motivation, based on the TCC, is the Personal Aspiration and Concerns Inventory for Offenders (PACIO). The PACIO was described and evaluated in this chapter and justified for the use of assessing and enhancing STOs motivation to participate in custodial education and workshops provided in prison.

Chapter 3 is an exploratory study to look at short-term offenders’ (STOs’) issues with employment. Six STOs were interviewed using semi-structured interviews to explore their concerns and factors which may influence searching and gaining employment after release. Originally, investigating STOs’ employment issues was the original idea of this PhD. However, due to possible impact of economic crisis in 2008
on employment in the offending population, the focus was shifted on one of the identified factor underlying STOs employment and also recidivism, which was education and workshops in custody.

The main study, which was a feasibility study, used a common sample. Chapter 4 provides methodology employed in two exploratory studies described in Chapter 5 and Chapter 6. This study is a randomised controlled trial (RCT) feasibility study. The design was a three-arm parallel RCT, comparing PACIO (PG) and PACIO plus MI (PMI) as a preparatory motivational intervention to a non-intervention group (NI) regarding STOs’ education participation and consequently, 12 months’ reconviction. The Police National Computer (PNC) was used to investigate reconviction rates (chapter 5). Further, the effectiveness of the PACIO plus MI was explored to determine whether it was an effective intervention in terms of improving STOs’ motivational profiles and education participation (chapter 6). Procedures during recruitment, randomisation and allocation of the offenders with sentences shorter than 12 months are described in this chapter also. Outcome measures which are Proportion Education Participation (PEP), reconviction and adaptive motivation index (AM(PACIO)) and learned helplessness and powerlessness index (LH/P(PACIO)) are introduced. Results of baseline analyses are included in this chapter.

The study in Chapter 5 was to investigate the Personal Aspiration and Concerns Inventory for Offenders group (PG) with the PACIO plus motivational interviewing (PMI) and non-intervention (NI) as a preparatory motivational intervention to increase STOs' motivation to participate in education in custody. STOs who participated in education were called learners and the STOs who did not participate in education in custody were called non-learners. Further, this exploratory
study was extended by collecting follow up data on reconviction rates measured by the Police National Computer (PNC) data at 12 month point after release. There were two groups of STOs established in terms of reconviction which were STOs who were reconvicted and the STOs who were not reconvicted.

Chapter 6 aimed to examine STOs’ motivational profiles derived from the PACIO rating scales and compare profile scores between PG and PMI. Adaptive motivation and LH/P was calculated and these motivational profiles were analysed as to how the AM and LH/P impact on the education participation. This means that learners and non-learners motivational profiles were investigated. Furthermore, STOs’ goals were described and evaluated between PG and PMI and also between learners and non-learners as well as STOs who were reconvicted and who were not reconvicted.

Chapter 7 is a Discussion chapter which presented and discussed the results of the RCT regarding the PACIO to be used as a tool to improve short-term offenders’ motivation for and participation in custodial education and reduce reconviction. This includes discussion on the strengths and limitations of the studies conducted in the research.

In this thesis, an investigation of feasibility for a randomised controlled trial was conducted and the PACIO was used to improve short-term offenders’ motivation for and participation in education in custody. Furthermore, custodial education was investigated whether it reduces STOs’ reconviction 12 months after release.
Chapter 1 – Offenders: The importance of education and motivation to change

Summary

Short-term offenders (STOs) have been suggested to have the most needs, such as a need to have secure accommodation after release, to address thinking skills and to improve education, which require effective rehabilitation. Despite their needs, STOs do not often have suitable custodial provision in place to support them. One of the pro-social activities which can be accessed by all offenders is education classes and workshops in custody. Education in custody has been suggested to improve offenders’ lives and reduce recidivism. Education offers short courses focusing on improving literacy, numeracy skills, IT and employability skills while workshops in custody include focus on more practical skills such as packaging products, such as headphones, and learning to repair push bikes. Education classes and workshops were monitored in this thesis and the two activities will be addressed as education. Education participation should be encouraged for STOs since it seems that education provides beneficial provision for individual STOs and for society in general. However, STOs’ motivation to participate in custodial education has not been well researched (both in terms of its assessment and motivation interventions to increase education participation). This chapter will provide an introduction into offenders’ characteristics and needs, the importance of education participation in STOs’ rehabilitation, and will define motivation to change behaviour.
1.1 Defining who offenders are

An offender is a person who has committed crime recognized by a court of law. As a consequence of the criminal actions and behaviours displayed in one’s lifetime, a person can be arrested, tried and found guilty by the country’s judiciary system (Ministry of Justice, 2011). Flood-Page, Campbell, Harrington & Miller (2000) published findings from the ‘Youth Lifestyles Survey’ targeting offenders from 12-30 years of age. Using the survey results, persistent offenders were typically ‘male from inner city and from lower social class’ (p.21). The offenders’ parents were likely to be single or step parents rather than two biological parents, with a history of crime, and who were poor supervising parents. They were likely to have delinquent friends, be bullies, drug users and regular drinkers, truants, excluded from school, and low school achievers. There is evidence to suggest that there is a link between school absence and offending (Vacca, 2004) since not attending school has a potential to lead to more opportunities for offending, increased time to spend with antisocial peers, family conflict and greater exposure to the police (Hayward, Stephenson & Blyth, 2004).

Academic problems such as underachievement and exclusion from school are often accompanied by behaviourial problems and criminal conduct. A youth survey explored young people’s experience of crime and found that 64% of young people who experienced long term exclusion offended in the past 12 months in comparison to those in mainstream education which was 18% (Phillips & Chamberlain, 2006). Offenders’ issues with academic underachievement and exclusion can be followed by lack of vocational skills and basic knowledge of literacy and numeracy and also a lack of employment and employability skills (Leone & Cutting, 2004). The resettlement
survey of more than 2,000 offenders showed that 55% of offenders were below level 1 in literacy and more than 75% were below level 1 in numeracy (Niven & Olagundoye, 2002). Furthermore, more than 57% had no qualifications (Niven & Olagundoye, 2002) which may have impact on gaining and keeping employment.

Socialisation and the influence of antisocial peers is one of the major factors in antisocial and criminal conduct (Andrews, Bonta & Wormith, 2006). Peer influence has been a predictor of delinquency in adolescence as those individuals without deviant peers are less likely to engage in antisocial activities and more likely to engage in pro-social behaviour such as school attendance (Farrington et al., 1986). As well as the peer pressure, an individual’s antisocial tendencies need to be attended to since some research suggested that the antisocial dispositions rather than affiliation with antisocial peers influences one’s criminal behaviour (Siegel & McCormick, 2006). This means that individuals with crime prone tendency seem to generate interest in joining peers with similar interests and values (Siegel & McCormick, 2006).

Moffitt (1993) divided offenders into two groups which are life-course persistent offenders and adolescence limited offenders. The life-course persistent offenders are characterised by an early onset of antisocial behaviour before reaching five years old and by engagement in violent and aggressive behaviour (Moffitt, 2006). The adolescence limited offenders start demonstrating antisocial behaviour in puberty (Barnes & Beaver, 2010) and usually grow out of crime in adolescence or early adulthood (Moffitt, 2006). Moffitt suggested that factors encouraging reoffending in life-course persistent offenders are, for instance, cognitive deficits, having criminal parents, disrupted families, poverty, and low socioeconomic status (Moffitt, 2005). It
is believed that most adolescents engage in some form of antisocial behaviour during teenage years but only 6% of those continue in to adulthood (Moffitt, Caspi, Harrington & Milne, 2002). However, the small proportion of offenders who persist with their offending to adulthood account for the majority of all committed offences. Becoming an offender is a process marked by crime-related conduct such as displays of antisocial behaviours (Andrews, Bonta & Wormith, 2011; Farrington et al., 2006). As a result of violation of the law, offenders face punishment ordered by the court such as a fine, community or custodial sentence. Custodial sentences vary in length and are considered short where sentences are less than 12 months.

1.1.1 Short-term offenders

Short-term offenders (STOs) are thought to have the most needs to be met in order to become rehabilitated (Lewis et al., 2003b) such as a lack of accommodation and/or low education. STOs have the highest reconviction rate of 58.3% while those offenders serving more than 1 year (but less than 4 years) have a 33.9% rate of reoffending within a year of release (Ministry of Justice, 2015). STOs constitute less than 10% of all prisoners. The Ministry of Justice (MoJ) statistics show that around 7,100 of offenders with sentences of less than 12 months are held in custody at any one time (MoJ; 2013a). However, 65% of all admissions are sentenced to less than 12 months in custody (Ministry of Justice, 2013a).

The STOs spend short periods of time of incarceration but the periods are the most frequent out of all the offenders in custody. The sentence length and the multiple underlying criminogenic factors make effective rehabilitation complicated. The
National Offender Management Service (NOMS, 2012) also acknowledged problematic rehabilitation access for STOs. Moreover, the National Audit Office (NAO; 2010) report claimed that over 50% of STOs do not engage in prison activities, such as education and despite making several applications, they are not successful.

*Short sentence prisoners (those sentenced to less than 12 months imprisonment) are harder to help because their time in prison is very brief. The most prevalent offending-related needs for short sentence prisoners are retaining or finding accommodation and employment, overcoming substance misuse, and thinking skills problems* (NOMS Commissioning Intentions, 2012, p.19).

The likelihood of offending increases with the number of risk factors which can be associated with social influences such as antisocial peers (Maguire & Raynor, 2006; Social Exclusion Unit, 2002) and psychological factors such as antisocial attitudes (Andrews et al., 2012). Other factors including lack of housing (Penfold, Day, Dixon, & Thomas, 2009), unemployment (Raynor, Kynch, Roberts & Merrington, 2000) and low educational achievement (Andrews & Bonta, 2010) were also thought to be contributory to crime. Regarding education, research has shown that children who start performing poorly in junior school are more likely to become involved in criminal activity in comparison to those who do well (Defoe, Farrington & Loeber, 2013). Those with lower education levels and no qualifications were more likely to become involved in property crime and which can lead to imprisonment (Machin, Marie & Vujić, 2011). Especially affected can be those sentenced to a short custodial sentence as they may not have time for any meaningful engagement in education in custody. Furthermore, employment also has been shown to be one of the criminogenic needs identified by the National Offender Management Service (NOMS;
see 1.2). Lack of employment and education has been shown to be related to increased reoffending post-release (Hopkins, 2012).

1.1.1 Short-term offenders’ rehabilitative provision in custody and community

There is a systemic provision for STOs within the prison service regarding their rehabilitative treatment. Despite the opportunities being sparse, all offenders, including offenders with sentences less than 12 months, have an opportunity to engage in educational classes and vocational workshops while in custody. Education participation can promote positive outcomes such as successful reintegration back in society and reduction in reconviction (e.g., Vacca, 2004; Aos, Miller & Drake, 2006).

Her Majesty’s Prison Service (HMPS) aim to assess offenders within 24 hours after being admitted into custody (Ministry of Justice, 2005). The initial assessments include mental and physical health, accommodation after release and educational needs. The assessments are likely to be repeated with each custodial admission. Offenders are asked to contact the housing office and job centre in custody if they have any issues with accommodation or job seeking. Immediate drug abuse and mental health needs are dealt with in a custodial health centre. All incarcerated offenders have an option to participate in gym programmes, library visits, workshops, including work for local companies in custody, gaining vocational qualifications and participating in custodial education. In order for offenders to participate in education, each offender needs to be assessed at the start of their custodial sentence on their literacy and numeracy skills. Classes in education include English and Mathematics, IT and employability skills. The courses vary in lengths ranging from 1 week to 10
week courses. Offenders are paid for participating in workshops and education classes (Bhatti, 2010).

Currently, STOs have no rehabilitative custodial plan which systematically addresses their needs and offers continuity of care. Furthermore, there is no intervention to increase STOs’ motivation to participate in custodial education. Therefore, it is the offenders’ decision how to spend their time in custody without any intervention to question their decision. Another added challenge was that the STOs typically served only a half of their sentence and, until recently, they were released back into their communities with no supervision. Therefore, offering and delivering an effective treatment for STOs in custody is extremely challenging.

New governmental proposals with regards to probation supervision for offenders sentenced to less than 12 months were suggested in ‘Transforming Rehabilitation: A Strategy for Reform’ (Ministry of Justice, 2013). This paper proposed compulsory statutory probation supervision order for those sentenced to less than 12 months commencing in 2015. The mandatory supervision in the community is thought to benefit 50,000 offenders with short sentences less than 12 months and provide rehabilitation in community (Ministry of Justice, 2013).

1.2 The National Offender Management Service (NOMS) pathways of reoffending

NOMS which is an executive agency of Ministry of Justice which manages offenders in custody and in the community established 7 pathways contributing to offending (see Table 1). The pathways were designed to capture common
characteristics of offenders’ life areas in which offenders can experience hardship. The outlined NOMS areas of offenders’ criminogenic needs are based on the Social Exclusion Unit’s report (2002) and aim to be in the centre of offenders’ rehabilitation to support offenders with needs in these areas. Each pathway is supported by evidence from research to suggest that concerns and issues identified in any one of the pathways may lead to offending (see 1.2.1). Details on Education, Training and Employment (ETE) and offenders’ attitudes, thinking and behaviour can be found in more details in 1.3 and chapter 3.

Table 1. NOMS pathways to reoffending (Home Office, 2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pathway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Accommodation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mental and physical health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Children and families of offenders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Attitudes, thinking and behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Education, Training and Employment (ETE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Drugs and alcohol abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Finance, benefit and debt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2.1 Accommodation

Stable accommodation upon release was suggested to increase the chances of offenders to secure employment, training and education (May et al., 2008; Williams, Poyser & Hopkins, 2012). Despite the importance of stable housing, offenders reported 8% of the sample as being homeless before custody (Stewart, 2008). Nevertheless, some research showed that unemployment itself did not suggest increased likelihood of criminal behaviour but when both unemployment and
accommodation were offenders’ needs to address then the likelihood of reoffending increased (May et al., 2008). When offenders had a problem with either accommodation or employment their reoffending rate within 1 year after release was 55% while when both problems were prevalent the reoffending rate increased to 74%.

1.2.2 Mental and Physical Health

Imprisoned offenders suffer from poorer mental and physical health in comparison to the general public (Fazel, Hope, O’ Donnell & Jacoby, 2001) as it has been suggested that over 90% of prisoners suffer from mental and physical health problems (Birmingham, 2003). The health problems include neurotic disorders, epilepsy, coronary heart disease and infectious diseases (Marshall, Simpsons & Stevens, 2000). Result from a national survey revealed that 82% of offenders reported one or more symptoms of anxiety and depression (Stewart, 2008). These problems may have been treated prior to their incarceration but there are also many living with undiagnosed health conditions.

1.2.3 Children and families of offenders

Some research has identified that having a good family relationship reduces re-offending as help and support provided by family and friends is important for offenders directly after release in order to ease resettlement (SEU, 2002). It has been suggested that families may help offenders manage to cope with distress during imprisonment and also function as a protective factors in committing more crime (Brown, 2001; Farrington, Coid & Murray, 2009). It may also be that families can be
dependent on an income of the offender to support family and by his/her arrest and custodial sentence, the offenders’ earnings are removed from the household (King & South, 2011) which may indicate considerable hardship for the family.

1.2.4 Attitudes and thinking behaviours

Offenders are thought to come from socially and financially deprived areas (SEU, 2002). There are certain predictors of offenders’ attitudes and behaviours such as family risk and socio-economic (Farrington et al., 2009). The family factors include for instance having a criminal parent, violence and poor parental care and low family income. Further, low school attendance and impulsive behaviour and issues with attention were highlighted as some of the behaviours and situations linked to offending. Hughes et al. (2016) conducted research in Wales investigating the Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs). The research suggested that physical and verbal abuse, substance abuse and parental separation contributed to increased harming behaviours. For instance, children from such households were 15 times more likely to commit violence against other people and were 11 times more likely to smoke cannabis. Moreover, individuals from the characterised environment were 20 times likely to become incarcerated. Therefore, it seems that there is a link between attitudes and behaviours and childhood experiences. As well as addressing immediate needs of the prison population such as helping with possible substance use and improving education and vocational skills, it is important to support and implement preventative measures to address childhood experiences.
1.2.5 Education, Training and Employment

NOMS (2007a) suggested a strong indirect link between unemployment and poor basic skills. Of all offenders leaving prison, 76% have no job to go to (SEU, 2002) and one in seven claim that that they have never had a job (Home Office, 2002). Unemployment in the prison population is almost 10 times higher than in the general population which in May, 2011 reached 7.7% (Office for National Statistics, 2011).

Improving education and gaining qualifications may make it more likely for an ex-offender to gain employment and thus reduce re-offending. Increasing employment and employability skills is a part of the rehabilitative process available for offenders while in prison. However, due to long waiting times for education and employment places many offenders are released before they are able to engage in any purposeful activity in prison. This is especially true for offenders sentenced to short-term sentences (SEU, 2002). Short-term prisoners are thought to have ‘significant educational’ needs (House of Commons, 2004a, p. 77), and they serve their sentences in prisons which are often overcrowded (Collins, 2010).

1.2.6 Drug and alcohol abuse

Surveying Prisoner Crime Reduction (MoJ, 2010) reported 81% of offenders self-reported to have abused illicit drugs in the previous year in comparison to a non-offending population which stood at 8.6% (British Crime Survey 2009/10). Moreover, 36% were classified as heavy drinkers (Stewart, 2008) and 22% drank alcohol every day in the four week period before custody (MoJ, 2010). Around two-thirds of imprisoned offenders used illegal drugs in the year before custody and three
fifths of prisoners reported that the use of illegal drugs generated problems in employment and personal life (Singleton et al., 1998). People, who have taken ‘hard’ drugs in the past, were significantly likely to stay unemployed (MacDonald et al., 2000).

In prison, drug and alcohol abuse is addressed in rehabilitative drug programmes which provide an intensive treatment for prisoners. All offenders sentenced to custodial sentences are entitled to receive a minimum standard of drug treatment while in prison. One of the initiatives outlined in the NOMS plan is more effective supervision for short term offenders in the community. The Police and the Health Service need to know offenders’ whereabouts after release in order to monitor or to continue medication or drug treatment respectively (Home Office, 2009).

1.2.7 Finance, benefit and debt

Criminal behaviour is likely to be accompanied by future financial instability (King & South, 2011). According to research, 48% of the questioned offenders had a history of debt (SEU, 2002). Lack of money has been proposed as a risk factor in re-offending as ex-offenders in financial difficulties are more likely to commit another crime within a few weeks after release. Research suggested that prolonged periods without work or learning can have negative life time consequences as it can lead to low earnings and low rate of future employment but also lack of pro-social engagement and ill health (Bell & Blanchflower, 2011).
1.3 Education

Improving offenders’ academic, vocational and social skills can contribute to offenders’ development of their abilities necessary to gain employment and live a crime free life but also to their personal growth (Gaes, 2008; Davis et al., 2013). Certain levels of education are required as a basis for development of moral thinking (Dewey, 1913) and pro-social attitudes which are thought to be promoted by education in custody (Harer, 1995). Therefore, education programmes do not only contribute to improving levels of literacy and numeracy skills but also empower offenders with vocational skills and behaviours necessary for successful integration back to society (Vacca, 2004; Gaes, 2008).

Education and workshops to gain new skills and qualifications in custody are open to all offenders. Offenders are informed during their initial induction on the support and facilities available in the establishment. Offenders in custody can participate up to 24 hours a week including educational courses and training programmes and employment based and resettlement focused activities. Findings based on self-report measures revealed that 41% of offenders required help with education (Hopkins, 2012) and there were perhaps also offenders who did not require basic help but may have been in need of improving their education and vocational skills. Custodial educational courses for offenders are classed as ‘work’ as offenders are paid for every session they attend. A full time learner can attend 8 sessions a week and earn a minimum of £10 (Bhatti, 2010). There is even a possibility to combine part time course in education and gain qualifications in custodial workshop as all prisoners
should be encouraged to participate in and benefit from education provision in custody (The Prison Rules, 1999).

Prison education provision is dependent on the prison establishment, its regime and the demographics of the offender population. These include people on remand, offenders with indeterminate sentences, sex-offenders and STOs. Courses suitable for STOs may include one day courses such as a Food and Hygiene Certificate or a week course in literacy or numeracy. Longer courses, for instance, include ‘Employability courses’ addressing ‘soft skills’ such as appropriate behaviours in the workplace and CV writing. Offenders sentenced to long sentences have an opportunity to complete a university course or a trade such as painter and decorator and bricklayer. Furthermore, prison work as part of daily prison regime is available for offenders, including work in the prison kitchens and wing cleaners. Fully recognised qualifications are available to be completed in such prison jobs providing that an offender is staying long enough to be offered involvement in the course.

1.3.1 Participation in custodial education

There are several reasons for offenders to participate in custodial activities. Some offenders’ decision may be based on a given instruction from the prison staff to participate as opposed to acting within offenders’ values and intention. This dichotomous view is called push-pull dimension (Gambetta, 1987; Manger, Eikeland, Diseth, Hetland & Asbjorsen, 2010). The ‘pushed from behind’ individuals often see learning and gaining knowledge as related to benefits within the prison context rather than their value beyond the prison gates. The ‘pushed from behind’ act on the basis of avoidance and involves more passive participation with no real interest in education.
For example, such offenders participate in education as they do not want to be punished if they did not go or they seek to avoid prison work (Manger et al., 2010). This behaviour is related to the sociological and psychological aspects which are not conducive to learning provoking change. However, some offenders are ‘pulled from the front’ which means that their decision to participate in education is based on the idea to improve their skills which have a potential to lead to future employment (Manger et al., 2010). Furthermore, since education is classified as work within prison and is paid for, earned money for attendance may also have a motivational function.

Gambetta (1987) argued that all reasons for participating in education may be beneficial. Some decisions to participate in education may be based on monetary benefits, fear of punishment, avoidance of unpleasant action or boredom. However, if intrinsic motivation to study is missing at the beginning, the view of reward or punishment avoidance may act as an initial motivator (Reeve, 2005). It is possible that offenders are beneficially motivated both intrinsically and extrinsically. For instance, an individual’s motivation may be based on a desire to learn new skills and also on viewing improving employment and employability skills as advantageous in job seeking after release (Manger et al., 2010).

Due to the long waiting times for an educational course and frequent lack of motivation to perceive education as beneficial by both the offenders and some prison staff, many offenders are released before they are able to engage in any purposeful activity in prison. This is especially applicable for offenders sentenced to short-term sentences as there is little time to be able to participate in meaningful activities (SEU, 2002; Adams et al., 1994). There seem to be many factors which play a role in STOs’ education participation such as the sentence length and prison provision which may in
turn affect offenders’ motivation to participate. The frustration was highlighted in House of Common (2004b) when it was stated that “the prisons ... are struggling to provide the basics of decency and safety, let alone purposeful activity and rehabilitation” (p.209). So, despite the importance of custodial education, it seems that there are offenders with complicated needs which need to be addressed in order for an offender to enter education.

1.4 Education and reconviction

There is evidence that education can be effective in reducing re-offending (e.g., Bouffard, Mackenzie & Hickman, 2000; Wilson et al., 2000; Aos et al. (2006); Kim & Clarke, 2013). A recent study was conducted with longer serving offenders in custodial education. Self-selection bias were controlled for and the results indicated that offenders who participated and completed an education course were 1.8 times less likely to be rearrested than those who did not participate in a custodial college programmes whose re-arrest rate was 17.1% (Kim & Clark, 2013).

Some researchers argued that custodial education reduces reoffending by improving employability skills and self-esteem needed for personal growth (Duguid, 1997; Batiuk, Lahm, McKeever, Wilcox & Wilcox, 2005; Wilson et al., 2000). Education also has other positive consequences other than improving skills needed for employment and increasing self-confidence. Therefore, education is seen as rehabilitative for offenders and may be considered as a type of an intervention (see Chapter 4 for more information). Furthermore, regarding rehabilitative activities and availability for STOs, educational classes and custodial workshops seemed to be accessible within the short time frame, unlike other offending behaviour interventions.
Rehabilitative educational programmes aim to target risk factors and have been suggested to be a means for reducing offending (Kim & Clark, 2013; Cho & Tyler, 2013).

The majority of knowledge regarding custodial education and reoffending has been generated in The United States. There are three meta-analyses that have focused on education programmes to adult offenders in custody. They were Wilson, Gallagher, and MacKenzie (2000), MacKenzie, 2006 and Aos, Miller, and Drake (2006). These meta-analyses apply meta-analytic methods such as taking offenders’ characteristics between groups and design of the studies into account.

Wilson et al., (2000) conducted a meta-analysis of 33 studies. The eligibility criteria of the studies included offenders in custody and in probation participating in educational, vocational and correctional programmes. Studies were included if a comparison group was included and recidivism was one of the outcome measures. Programmes based on a psychological model (containing cognitive and behavioural components) were not included. Adult Basic Education, post-secondary education, vocational training and correctional work/industries were included. It was concluded that offenders who participated in custodial education, vocational training or work programmes recidivated lower that those who did not participate. Moreover, the offenders were likely to be employed at higher rate than non-participants (Wilson, et al., 2000). Offenders who participated in the educational programmes had the lowest reoffending rate. Conclusions about the effect of vocational programmes were not possible to be drawn as there was no statistical difference between mean effect sizes.

A more methodological rigour was implemented by one of the co-author of previous meta-analysis, MacKenzie (2006). Her meta-analysis was an updated version
of the Wilson et al., (2000) since only studies which met Level 3 or higher ratings on the Maryland Scientific Methods Scale (SMS) were included. There are 5 levels on the Maryland SMS ranging from Level 1 (the poorest design as a comparison is not present), Level 2 (quasi-experimental design with limited controls for differences; Level 3 (also a quasi-experimental design but with reasonable controls for differences) and Level 4 (with similar control and treatment group) and Level 5 (experimental design with random assignment; Sherman et al., 1997). MacKenzie (2006) in the re-analysis confirmed that academic programmes were also beneficial as there was 16% higher recidivism amongst non-participants. Furthermore, the updated study revealed that vocational programmes were also associated with reduction in recidivism by 24% lower in those offenders who participated in vocational programmes. Results regarding offenders’ education participation and employment benefits were not updated. Aos, Miller and Drake (2006) conducted a meta-analysis of the effects of academic and vocational education. They included 21 studies with Level 3 rating and above on the Maryland SMS. The findings are similar to MacKenzies’ findings it that academic education was associated with 7% reduction in reconviction and vocational education was associated with a 9% reduction of recidivism.

The most recent meta-analysis conducted in the USA examined evidence of the effectiveness of vocational and academic education and recidivism (Davis, Bozick, Steele, Saunder & Miles (2013). Fifty studies, with 71 effect size estimates, were graded by the quality of design and estimates of the effect of education participation on recidivism were calculated. The Maryland SMS included Level 2 – Level 5 studies and odds ratio of recidivating was calculated for each level on the Maryland SMS. The results showed that education in custody decreased the odds of recidivism as on average, the odds recidivating of offenders who participated in
education was 64% lower than the odds of offenders who did not participated in custodial education. There were in total 7 studies with Level 4 and Level 5 methodological rating on the Maryland SMS. They included RCTs and quasi-experimental designs with match pairs, there was 61% lower odds of recidivating for offenders who participated in education in relation to the comparison group. However, the studies which employed a RCT design were drawn from the same experiment (Lattimore, Witte & Baker, 1988; 1990). For the Level 4 and Level 5, a range of programmes in education were included such as Adult Basic Education, General Education Diploma (achieved in secondary school in the USA), post-secondary education and vocational training.

However, despite the positive ‘findings’ in the effect of academic education and reconviction were questioned as low methodological quality of the studies involved was highlighted. For instance, it was argued that participants’ characteristics between education and comparison groups such as offenders’ motivation to change should have been controlled for more stringently (Wilson et al., 2000). This indicated that the results may have occurred due to the differential characteristics of the groups rather than as a result of the education programmes. Thus, it is important to implement rigorous methodology when evaluating education effectiveness and also making sure that different types of education are distinguished when evaluating effectiveness of custodial education to reduce recidivism. In addition, offenders’ sentence lengths should be considered since education may have different effect on offenders sentenced to short-term sentences or long-term sentences. This is because the time offenders’ serve may affect their chances to access and participate in custodial education and workshops. Also, it means that long-term offenders can engage in a wider selection of custodial programmes which may address offenders’
goals what they want to achieve. Participating in an educational programme which is considered to be meaningful can influence offenders’ motivation to participate in such programmes.

The most recent US meta-analysis revealed that four different types of education (adult basic education, high school general education diploma, post-secondary education (college) and vocational education) were examined. It seemed that all types of education, were associated with reduction of recidivism as all four odds ratios were less than 1 and were statistically significant (Davis et al., 2013). However, one of the difficulties with interpreting the odds ratios was that the education programmes were not clearly classified. Some studies focussed on custodial programmes which were broader. For instance, the vocational courses were taken in combination with academic courses. Therefore, it may have been difficult to distinguish between the academic and vocational elements. Due to the overlap, the effect of education can be challenging to measure and it cannot be determined with certainty that elements of other programme were not involved.

Since the USA have different penal and judiciary systems, results of the studies and application to the UK population needs to be taken with caution (Czerniawski, 2015). However, it seems that there is limited evidence of studies investigating effectiveness of education and vocational training in reconviction. Some studies, used data from the Surveying Prisoner Crime Reduction (SPCR) cohort provide some information on offenders’ education and one-year re-offending rates. For instance, over 40% of 1,435 offenders reported needing help with education (Hopkins, 2012). Majority the offenders were sentenced to less than 12 months and 23% attended education classes (Hopkins & Brunton-Smith, 2012). These surveys
provide information of a descriptive nature. May, Sharma & Stewart (2008) conducted an analysis of 4,898 offenders who participated in the Resettlement Surveys 2011-2004. The offenders were matched with criminal history and information on reoffending. Other factors, such as accommodation, education and employment were monitored. It was suggested that offenders who did not attend a prison job club were more likely to reoffend in comparison to offenders who participated. The reoffending rate was 58% and 49% respectively. However, the two groups differed in their size as there were only 305 offenders in comparison to 4,594 offenders who did not attend.

There is also some evidence to suggest that offenders who receive an Open University grant were less likely to reoffend. Matched pair analysis was used but some variables such as offender’ motivation to change and motivation to participate in education was not addressed. Moreover, the groups were not matched on the sample size. There were 805 offenders who were matched with over 135,000 offenders (MoJ, 2013f). Therefore, a true effect of education cannot be known. Furthermore, a type of education was not specified and the Open University courses are likely to be for offenders serving longer sentences over 12 month.

It seems that the studies available in the UK do not address the effect of custodial education on offenders’ recidivism. It is important that research in this area in the UK is established and rigorous methodology to investigate the impact of education on offenders’ reconviction is employed such as the use of randomly assigned offenders. The Methodologically rigorous studies such as Level 5 and Level 4 on the Maryland Scientific Methods Scale, provide the best estimate of causality between education in custody and reconviction. Further, education needs to be clearly
defined. It is vital to know whether education refers to academic classes such as English, Maths, IT or if it also includes vocational training with a potential to gain qualification or whether participation in vocational workshops where few qualification can be gained also qualify as education. It seems that offenders’ sentence lengths needs to be also taken into account and therefore, the effect of education on offenders’ reconviction needs to be investigated with short-term and long-term offenders.

Despite a number of US studies investigating the relationship between different types of education and offenders’ reconviction rates, it cannot be concluded with confidence that education reduces reoffending or reconviction. This is because there are many methodological issues when studies were conducted such as lack of control group or having a control group that may not be suitably matched. However, matching offenders in an intervention and control group will always be challenging and it may be argued that offenders’ circumstances and criminogenic needs are complex.

One of the ways how to overcome the problem with establishing equally matched groups may be by conducting RCT methodology when investigating effect of education on reconviction rates and having education clearly defined. Research in the UK needs to be developed and rigorous methodology employed to be able to draw conclusion of the effect of custodial education and relate the findings to the UK population.

Current research suggested that there is a link between unemployment and reoffending (Farrington et al., 1986; Aaltonen et al., 2013). The relationship between unemployment and criminal behaviour is based on different premises depending on
the hypothesised cause of the link. Unemployment in the prison population is more than 8 times higher than in the general population which in spring 2013 reached 6.6% (Office for National Statistics, ONS; 2013). Around 55% of offenders were unemployed prior to custody and 25% of those were not expected to return to their employment due to incarceration or stigma linked to incarceration (Hopkins, 2012). The most obvious indirect relationship is that unemployment causes financial difficulties which are compensated through the means of crime (Orsagh & Witte, 1981; Phillips & Land, 2012). Having stable employment can bring a stable income so that a person is able to be financially independent and able to support himself or herself and his or her family. Other theories suggest that some unemployed people have more time to engage in delinquency and crime as they do not have to attend employment (Sviridoff & Thompson, 1983) or participate in structured activities such as education (Weerman, Bernasco, Bruinsma, & Pauwels, 2013). However, it seems that no matter what a perceived need or a goal, offenders need to be motivated to change and achieve their goals which can be improving education as a means to increase possibility to find meaningful employment which in turn may contribute to a drop in reconviction rates.

1.5 Motivation to change

Motivation to change behaviour has been established as selecting a relevant goal which is accompanied by commitment to achieve the goal (McMurran, 2002). Motivation of offenders to engage in treatment is vital for offenders to change behaviour. Motivation of offenders to engage in treatment can be a proxy for offenders’ motivation to change behaviour (Campbell et al., 2010). This means that if
an offender is motivated to engage in treatment and address his/her crime-related behaviours, it is likely that the offender is motivated to change and desist from crime. Despite the fact that offenders’ motivation to change behaviour is vital in treatment, there is confusion as to what motivation constitutes (Raskin, 1961; Rosenbaum & Horowitz, 1983).

In a forensic setting, offenders’ motivation is of interest as previous research suggests that offenders who dropped out of treatment reoffended more than offenders who completed treatment and those who did not enter the treatment at all (Cann, Falshaw, Nugent & Friendship, 2003; Hanson & Harris, 2000; McMurrnan & Theodosi, 2007). Also, treatment motivation predicts treatment engagement (Dreischner et al., 2004) and treatment completion (Ward, Day, Howells & Birgden, 2004). Motivation for treatment includes offenders seeking personally meaningful, pro-social goals (Ward et al., 2004) rather than negative and avoidant goals (Ward & Brown, 2004). It is also important to take a view of the motivation of individual offenders rather than seeing treatment motivation and treatment outcomes as related to a particular treatment. For instance a therapist and an offender’s views can differ on what is relevant to his/her offending. Therefore, for an offender to be motivated for treatment, treatment goals and outcomes have to be agreed by both parties in order to achieve offenders’ personal goals (Ward et al., 2004). Inappropriate selection of offenders for treatment, and goals viewed by an offender as irrelevant, may lead to potential problems with treatment engagement, treatment completion and can reflect in treatment motivation.
1.5.1 Approaches to motivating offenders to engage in education and the goal focused approach

One of the existing models of offenders’ rehabilitation, the Good Lives Model (Ward et al., 2004), acknowledges the importance of life areas such as vocational skills and education in reoffending. Education has been shown to reduce reoffending (Gaes, 2008) and therefore offenders’ motivation to participate and engage in education in custody needs to be improved. Rehabilitation for STOs in custody is limited due to availability and the sentence length but education is one of the rehabilitative activities STOs can participate. Thus, STOs’ motivation needs to be assessed and improved to promote engagement in custodial education and to prevent reoffending.

Maruna (2001) suggested that, in his interviews with offenders, he dealt with two types of narratives which were desisting and offending. Those offenders who continued reoffending presented with little vision for their future and future goals. However, desisting offenders seemed to take control over their lives and had goals and optimism for their future. Similarly, alcoholic patient group when compared with non-alcoholic control group reported fewer goals than the comparison groups which were students, community adult group and non-alcoholic controls (Man, Stuchlikova, Klinger, 1998; Schroer, Fuhrmann & de Jong-Meyer, 2004).

Monitoring and assessing offenders’ motivation to treatment engagement are central in offenders’ rehabilitation. Offenders’ rehabilitative goals are seen as conducive to treatment readiness (Ward et al., 2004) and correctly identifying offenders’ goal structure may hold a key to offenders’ successful rehabilitation (Ward et al., 2004). Goals can function as predictors of motivation in therapy to change
behaviour and are thought to provide insight into human behaviour (Ward & Gannon, 2006). Goals can be selected and pursued by the attributed value of incentives and also by the expectancy of how well they will do in attaining the goal (Black & Cox, 1973; Bandura, 1977). Generally, goals have been used in therapy as they are defined directly by the individual who needs to make a change. This makes the goals effective targets in therapy as goals are personal and meaningful tools for change (Karoly, 1993; Ward & Marshall, 2004). For instance, if an offender’s goal is to improve education and it is accompanied by personal beliefs in achieving it, it is likely that an offender will attend school and achieve his/her academic goals.

Motivation to strive to attain goals, then, can be explained by the value and expectancy approach (Ajzen, 1988). Klinger & Cox (2004a) stated that value of each potential goal or an incentive depends on the affective change involved in selecting and attaining the goal. On the achievement of the goal with a positive value, people expect to be happier rather than unhappier. Should they fail, people expect to experience sorrow. Moreover, people may value a particular incentive but if they do not expect to succeed they will not be motivated to achieve it. For instance, if an offender would like to stop reoffending and feels that the incentive has a positive value as he expects then he will find peers who are not involved in criminal behaviour and gain respect in the community and to be a proud law-abiding citizen. However, although the value of the incentive is felt to be positive, it can be seen as being counterbalanced by the cost. An offender will have to stop seeing his peers with criminal history, become seen in a community as a law-abiding citizen and perhaps improve his education and skills. Therefore, offenders’ motivation to change such as stopping reoffending is a complex process involving achievement of numerous goals before leading a crime free life.
Goals are central to the Theory of Current Concerns (TCC) since it is believed that human behaviour is goal oriented. A ‘current concern’ is the state of an individual between becoming committed to pursuing a goal and until that goal is either attained or abandoned. The TCC is a motivational theory which provides a framework of motivation structure (Cox & Klinger, 1990). The TCC has been used with alcoholic patients in order to promote change, however, the TCC framework has been shown to be applicable to an offending population in terms of promoting behavioural change (Sellen, McMurran, Theodosi, Cox & Klinger, 2009).

Goal based assessments such as the Motivational Structure Questionnaire (MSQ), the Personal Concerns Inventory (PCI; Cox & Klinger, 2004b), the Personal Concerns Inventory-Offender Adaptation (PCI-OA; Sellen, McMurran, Cox, Theodosi, & Klinger, 2006) and the Personal Aspiration and concerns Inventory for Offenders (PACIO; Campbell et al., 2010) have been based on the Theory of Current Concerns (TCC; Cox & Klinger, 2004b) and administered to clients in health and forensic settings. Goal-based assessments have been proven to have utility with conceptualising offenders’ motivation to engage in treatment (McMurran & Ward, 2004). The MSQ, and the modified versions of the MSQ - the PCI were developed on the premise that people have a motivational structure in life which represents the individual’s goals and their way of relating to them. The PCI, the PCI-OA and its abridged version the PACIO were suggested to be used for assessment of offenders’ motivation structure. Offenders’ motivation structures in the PCI-OA and the PACIO are related to treatment engagement rather than assessing offenders’ general motivation to change (Sellen et al., 2009; Campbell, 2009). This is since offenders’ motivation structure has not correlated with reoffending (Sellen et al., 2009). Thus,
the PACIO is used in this study as a preparatory motivational intervention and also as an assessment of STOs’ motivation to participate in education (Campbell et al., 2010).

1.5.2 The Personal Aspiration and Concerns Inventory (PACIO; Campbell et al., 2010)

The PACIO is a guided intervention which allows offenders to think about and clarify valued goals. Previous research with long-term offenders showed promise in increasing offenders’ treatment motivation in custody (Campbell et al., 2010). The PACIO is a tool used to assess and improve offenders’ motivation to engage in therapy. This tool has been investigated in this study. Goals, which are self-identified in 7 life areas, are central to the PACIO. Goals are used to calculate two motivational profiles which are adaptive motivation (AM) and learned helplessness/powerlessness (LH/P). Adaptive motivation has been previously associated with positive outcomes such as improved treatment engagement while LH/P was negatively related to AM. Each goal on the PACIO can be scored on a scale from 0-10. For instance, each goal is scored on the goal’s importance and likelihood to happen since goal value is important. A past study showed that the PACIO as an intervention reduced offenders’ impulsivity and improved offenders’ treatment engagement (Campbell, 2009). In addition, another intervention that has been suggested to be effective with offenders is Motivational Interviewing (MI). Outcome from a systematic review of 13 published studies indicated that MI used in forensic population can lead to improved treatment retention and improve motivation to change (McMurran, 2009).

Some studies fail to report behavioural aspects such as treatment engagement (Drieschner, Lammers & van der Staak, 2004). Research showed that offenders with
higher AM were more likely to engage in therapy (Campbell et al., 2010). Individuals with more AM are characterised by more motivation to change (Cox & Klinger, 2004b) and higher engagement in treatment when compared to offenders with maladaptive structure. Generally, offenders with high AM are characterised by viewing that, for instance, it is important to improve education, it is likely that they participate, they are committed and know what to do and it will bring them happiness. They also feel in control of participating in education and as they feel that prison helps. Thus, STOs with higher AM may be likely to participate more in custodial education classes and workshops compared to those with lower AM both in terms of frequency and participated hours.

Offenders with high LH/P are characterised by viewing that, for instance, improving education is important, they are committed and achieving better academic knowledge and vocational skills which would bring them happiness. However, offenders with higher LH/P also display lack of knowledge which may demonstrate that they may not know where to go for education, which classes are available, whether they will be allowed to go, whether they are suitable for them and the offenders believe that they would not be able to achieve a new qualification or learn. Moreover, some offenders may view the prison as not helpful with improving their education since prison support is not viewed as helpful. This means in educational terms that such STOs with a high LH/P will probably participate less than STOs with lower LH/P both in terms of frequency and participated hours. Thus, behaviour such as education participation should be reflective in STOs’ scores on adaptive motivation and LH/P profile.
1.6 Aims of this study

This study aims to investigate motivation of STOs to engage in education in custody. Firstly, the PACIO will be investigated in terms of whether it is an effective preparatory motivational intervention before education. Secondly, the STOs motivational structure will be assessed using the PACIO and investigated as to whether it assesses motivation to engage in education. Thirdly, the PACIO will be investigated whether it reduces reconviction 12 months’ post-release since the PACIO was suggested to reduce reconviction (Campbell, 2009). Finally, due to extensive evidence of education effectiveness to reduce reconviction, STOs who participated in education (learners) and STOs who did not participate in education (non-learners) were investigated whether learners will have lower reconviction rates than non-learners.
Chapter 2 Rehabilitative frameworks and models of offenders’ readiness and motivation to engage in treatment

2.1 Introduction to offenders’ motivation to treatment

Offenders’ motivation to change behaviour has an important role in offenders’ treatment rehabilitation as changes in behaviour have a potential to stop offenders committing more crime (Maguire & Raynor, 2006; McMurran, Sellen & Campbell, 2011). Nevertheless, defining the concept of motivation appears to be a complicated issue. For instance, offenders’ motivation for treatment includes motivation to enter and engage in treatment and also motivation to change behaviour (Drieschner, 2005). Motivation to change behaviour may not be specified since it is not clear which behaviour an offender should be motivated to change. It may be reduction in impulsivity, reduced substance use and reduction in reoffending.

For the purpose of this study, motivation to change has been defined as ‘commitment to the goal of change’ (McMurran, 2002). If an offender has a goal to change offending and believes that a particular treatment helps him/her to achieve the goal, commitment to that goal is vital in the offenders’ motivation. This means, for instance, how important the goal is for them and what steps they make to engage and complete the treatment and achieve the goal.

Motivation can be challenging to define and also improve. This can be particularly relevant for a group of offenders sentenced to short sentences of less than 12 months. STOs have the highest number of needs and often live chaotic lifestyles (Lewis et al., 2003a.). The importance of increasing STOs motivation to engage in
treatment is vital in order to improve well-being, reduce the number of victims and reduce reoffending rates.

Incarcerated offenders are rehabilitated in custodial treatment programmes which typically target dynamic criminogenic needs. Criminogenic needs are crime-related factors such as offenders’ employment status and education level. Risk reduction according to Risk-Need-Responsivity (RNR) principles is addressed in cognitive-behavioural therapy (CBT) addressing criminogenic needs (Looman & Abracen, 2013). In contrast, the Good Lives Model (GLM) principles focus on risk reduction through the attainment of positive goals using offenders’ strengths to achieve goals such as in the Thinking Skills Programme (Gobbett & Sellen; 2014). Both rehabilitation frameworks, the RNR and the GLM have a potential to be more useful in term of rehabilitation if current models of offenders’ motivation offer an effective pre-treatment to increase motivation to engage in treatment.

This chapter aims to describe and evaluate frameworks, the RNR and the GLM, in offenders’ rehabilitation. Moreover, this chapter will provide details about theories and models which have been used in offenders’ readiness and offenders’ motivation to treatment engagement such as the Multifactor Offender Readiness Model (MORM; Ward et al., 2004) and the Personal Aspirations and Concerns Inventory for Offenders (PACIO; Campbell et al., 2010).

**2.2 Frameworks of offender rehabilitation**

Typically, a prison-based rehabilitation treatment for offenders is based on the Risk-Need-Responsivity model (RNR; Andrews et al., 1990). The RNR is concerned
with addressing offenders’ criminogenic needs and thereby reducing reoffending. The risk principle is based on evidence that intensive treatments delivered to high-risk offenders are most effective in reducing reoffending. The needs principle tells us that reoffending will be reduced where interventions target the offenders’ offence related behaviour such as addressing aggressive behaviour, and the responsivity principle argues that offenders’ abilities, capabilities and treatment readiness should match the treatment. The RNR principles are used in CBT which has been shown to be effective in reoffending reduction (Lipsey, Landenberger & Wilson, 2007; Ministry of Justice, 2013c; McMurray, 2009; Wormith, Gendreau & Bonta, 2012).

The Good Lives Model (GLM; Ward, 2002) is based on the notion that offenders seek valid goals by unacceptable means and so the task is to help offenders to use pro-social goal strategies. GLM is a strength-based ‘well-being’ model used in offenders’ rehabilitation. The GLM encourages all human beings to make changes in different life areas such as healthy living and functioning and mastery experiences to live ‘better lives’ without offending. The GLM was designed to be a comprehensive model of rehabilitation aiming to improve offenders’ lives by tapping into their core values and making a fulfilling life plan. Recently, the GLM of offenders’ rehabilitation is used in clinical forensic setting (Sellen & Gobbett, 2014; Willis, Prescott & Yates, 2013; Yates, 2013) providing some evidence of its effectiveness.

**2.2.1 Risk-Need-Responsivity model (RNR model)**

There is an increasing body of empirical evidence for the effectiveness of treatment following RNR theory (Andrews & Bonta, 2003; Ward, 2007; Wormith et al., 2012). The main idea of this theory is to reduce or eliminate risk factors such as addressing drug abuse and lack of education rather than reducing crime through
increasing wellbeing such as physical exercising and meditation to reduce stress (Ward & Gannon, 2006). The model assumes that offenders do have rights to be assisted with their non-criminogenic needs, however, rehabilitative programmes should only address those needs leading to crime reduction (Andrews & Bonta, 2006; Blanchette & Brown, 2006).

There are three main factors of the theory to be followed in order to achieve a positive outcome resulting in reducing reoffending (Andrews et al., 1990). These factors are:

1. Risk principle (match programme intensity and the level of offender’s risk to reoffend)
2. Need principle (need to highlight and target offender’s offence related criminogenic needs)
3. Responsivity principle (match the intervention delivery style to the offender’s personal abilities learning style).

Firstly, the principles of RNR have been shown to reduce reoffending (eg Andrews & Bonta, 1994; Andrews & Bonta, 2003; 2010; Blud, Travers, Nugent, & Thornton, 2003) which benefits offenders and surrounding communities (Andrews et al., 2011). The Risk Principle urges treatment facilitators to engage and promote treatment to high risk offenders as more crime can be prevented. Rehabilitative programmes for offenders should be intensive as brief or limited in scope programmes are not effective in offending reduction (Andrews et al., 2006). The level of risk should be known before entering intervention and the low-risk offenders should be ‘out of intensive correctional services’ (Andrews et al., 2011; p738). Secondly, the
Need Principle includes criminogenic needs, which are dynamic risk factors related to the offenders’ criminal activity. RNR concentrates and targets eight need/risk factors which are: 1. History of antisocial behaviour (a static risk factor); 2. Antisocial personality pattern; 3. Antisocial cognition; 4. Antisocial associates; 5. Family/marital circumstances; 6. School/work; 7. Leisure and recreation; and 8. Substance use. For example, in order to reduce reoffending, an offender with low levels of education and skills should improve his education as having relevant qualifications may help securing employment. Thirdly, the Responsivity Principle looks at the offender’s ability to learn and the design of the treatment, also known as the ‘how’ of intervention (Andrews & Bonta, 2010). For instance, the offender’s learning style, circumstances, personality, mental state, motivation and readiness to change should be taken into account (Andrews et al., 2011). The Responsivity principle includes the construct of motivation as offenders need to be motivated to complete the therapy and importantly to be generally ready for change. Specific Responsivity, or tailoring, refers to the type of offenders for instance physically active young men may benefit more from shorter more interactive interventions and those offenders lacking motivation may benefit when they understand how they can benefit from the treatment (Andrews & Bonta, 2006, 2010a). Furthermore, Systemic Responsivity refers to the variety of treatment available in the Criminal Justice System for offenders in a particular area that match the risk-need profile of individual offenders. For instance, a geographic area with a high number of prolific offenders should have systemic, multi-agency support available for offenders with specific needs such as substance use disorders and economic related needs, such as employment and education (Andrews & Bonta, 2010).
The focus of RNR on predominantly addressing offenders’ criminogenic needs may be a weak point of the theory (Ward, 2002). The model assumes that the only way to achieve reduction in reoffending is by targeting offenders’ crime related dynamic risk (Polaschek, 2012). As a result, the lack of acknowledgement of the need for attainment of positive ‘human goods’, such as autonomy, relatedness, and happiness - which are thought to be associated with living a fulfilling and satisfactory life (Emmons, 1996) - can result in lack of goal coherence in treatment (Ward, 2002).

Evidence from cognitive-behavioural therapy (CBT) contributed to RNR principles since CBT has been shown to be more effective than other programmes to reduce reoffending (Porporino, 2010). CBT is based on the premise that offenders’ cognition and its deficits are learned and therefore teaching offenders to understand their thinking and decisions can reduce reoffending (Lipsey et al., 2007). All CBTs use a structured approach, aiming to improve cognitive skills in areas of offenders’ deficits and distorted thinking through improving cognitive skills and social skills training in treatment. It is assumed that if an offender is willing to enter and engage in treatment designed to change offending related behaviours, the offender is also motivated to complete treatment and change the actual offending behaviours, such as reducing impulsivity and consequently stop reoffending (McMurran, 2004).

McMurran & Theodosi (2007) conducted a meta-analysis of CBTs with offenders, investigating offenders’ reoffending rates with regards to their programme completion. They found that offenders who started but did not complete therapy were more likely to reoffend than those who completed therapy and those who were not offered therapy. Therefore, it is important to motivate offenders to rehabilitative
outcomes such as reducing impulsivity, stopping reoffending and increasing education but also to motivate them to participate and finish treatment.

2.2.2 The Good Lives Model (GLM). A positive, strength-based approach to offenders’ rehabilitation.

Ward & Stewart (2003) introduced a theoretical strength-based model for offenders which used ‘primary human goods’ called ‘The Good Lives Model’. The GLM is based on desistance theory (Maruna, 2001; Sampson & Laub, 2003) and positive psychology (Ward & Laws, 2010). This model has been further developed by Ward and colleagues (for instance Ward & Brown, 2004; Ward & Marshall, 2004; Ward & Gannon, 2006) and more recently a new approach based on the GLM was presented called a Good Live-Desistance approach (Laws & Ward, 2011).

The GLM represents a theoretical normative model of offenders’ rehabilitation by promoting universal human needs, called ‘goods’, and seeing offenders in their social, cultural, personal and physical context. The model is thought to be normative as in therapy individuals’ values and core beliefs are central to rehabilitation and to achieve a fulfilling lifestyle.

As offenders’ lives often lack valued outcomes, such as improving education, and can perceive crime as rewarding, it is important to equip offenders with skills and knowledge allowing them to live different kinds of lives (Ward, 2002). Other concerns and issues such as criminogenic needs will consequently arise. The GLM’s identified 11 groups of Primary Human Goods can be seen in Table 2.
The primary goods promote adaptive ways of living such as focusing on gaining necessary skills, values and social support (Ward & Stewart, 2003). Primary goods were described as ‘states of affairs, states of mind, personal characteristics,’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2 Primary human goods (Ward &amp; Gannon, 2006)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Life (how to live and function healthily)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Knowledge (how well a person is about what he/she considers to be important)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Excellence in play (hobbies and recreation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Excellence in work (including mastery experiences)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Excellence in agency (autonomy and self-directedness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Inner peace (freedom from emotional turmoil and stress)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
activities or experiences sought for their own sake and which are likely to increase psychological well-being if achieved’ (Ward et al., 2006, p. 382). The primary goods are achieved by ‘secondary goods’ which are instrumental goods such as having relevant education level, vocational and employability skills in order to secure employment. These instrumental goods are means to achieve one or more of the primary goods, for example having ‘Mastery experiences’ and also ‘Excellence in agency’ which promotes individuals’ autonomy and self-directedness (Ward, 2002).

Both primary goods and secondary goods should be appropriate and socially acceptable (Ward et al., 2012).

In order for an offender to change, an offender has to seek psychological and social values in life which are the same for all human beings if they want to live happy lives. However, there is no one ‘good life’ as each individual will seek different level of values in order to achieve ‘good life’. The ‘cocktail’ of offender’s values, capabilities, personality and skills vary and therefore represent possible different ‘good lives’. In therapy, the offenders’ personal characteristics, set of values, capabilities and skills should be taken into account to achieve ‘good lives’ state which is understood in context and a realistic way of living (Ward, 2002).

The GLM models assumes that people naturally seek certain goals called ‘primary goods’ and takes into account offenders’ characteristics, environment he/she will be released to and offenders’ personal preferences and strengths (Ward & Gannon, 2006). Rehabilitation is seen as a ‘value laden process’ (Ward & Gannon, 2006; p.83) and views offenders’ well-being as a pinnacle which determines the content of any rehabilitative intervention. The model presumes that the basis of each rehabilitation programme is a concept of good lives for offenders and therefore
offenders are guided by primary goods. This should also be reflected in offenders’ assessment to treatment programs (Ward, 2002; Ward, Mann & Gannon, 2007).

Ward (2002) claimed that offenders’ rehabilitative programmes containing human goods support offenders’ behavioural shift from antisocial world to a prosocial one. Ward et al. (2012) stated “a fundamental objective is to motivate offenders to change criminal behaviour as a result of what is important in their lives” (p.106). However, the GLM is not clear on offenders’ motivation to change with respect to the underlying processes shaping the offenders’ motivation to change their current way of living. Also, the model lacks empirical evidence of its effectiveness in promoting offenders’ change and stopping reoffending (Andrews et al., 2011; Netto et al., 2014).

Currently, there is no assessment of the GLM which could be useful in order to shed light on offenders’ motivation to live good lives. Importantly, the concept of promoting ‘good lives’ or ‘fulfilling lives’ for offenders is ambiguous and vague. There is no definition and measure of ‘good lives’. As a result, someone has to judge what it means and when a person has reached a ‘fulfilling life’. For instance in therapy, which is time bound and money bound the aim of the model may struggle to meet the outcome.

Previously, the GLM has been criticised for not targeting crime related needs, such as drug abuse and antisocial behaviour but build on offenders’ strength to promote change through achieving ‘primary goods’. This means that an offender’s life circumstances are considered holistically, not just circumstances which are crime-related (Ward et al., 2012). Recently, the GLM included a self-regulation module which includes the importance of addressing offenders’ criminogenic needs as well as promoting offenders’ well-being by achieving primary goods (Ward, Yates, & Willis,
Some rehabilitative programmes for sex-offenders use elements from the GLM in order to promote human goods and to reduce risk (Willis & Ward, 2011). Ward and Stewart (2003) argued that by living, for instance, in loving relationships, having friends, being sexually satisfied and being intellectually challenged will rehabilitate offenders and as a consequence, criminogenic needs connected to criminal conduct will be reduced (Ward & Steward, 2003). However, it is possible to live a personally fulfilling life as a criminal but be harmful to society. For instance financial autonomy can be pursued through illegal means and sexual satisfaction via child exploitation.

There are some rehabilitative programmes, such as the Thinking Skills Programme, that uses elements of the GLM with forensic population (Willis et al., 2014). The programmes are targeting mainly sex-offenders in treatment (Gobbett & Sellen, 2014; Willis et al., 2014) and despite claims of GLM advantages in management of short-term sentences (Purvis, Ward & Willis, 2011) no known GLM treatment involves STOs. The STOs have the highest reoffending rates and their lives are disrupted by frequent prison stays. This unsettled and chaotic way of living has impact on offenders’ lives in areas such as family relationships, accommodation and education and employment.

The GLM has little empirical support for its effectiveness to address change, promote better lives and reduce reoffending (Purvis et al., 2011; Wormith et al., 2012). However, the GLM is a model gaining popularity in offenders’ rehabilitation since offenders are able to seek life satisfaction in many areas that are thought to contribute to people’s well-being. This model aims to attain satisfaction in life rather than targeting reduction in reoffending (Maruna & LeBel, 2003).
Both, the RNR and the GLM, suggest that offenders’ motivation to treatment is important since it can improve treatment outcomes (McMurran & Theodosi, 2007). Ward et al. (2007) suggested that there should be a balance between addressing risk to reoffend and promoting offenders’ primary and secondary goods and that placing emphasis disproportionately may result in serious social and personal difficulties. The GLM is beneficial as it allows offenders to express their current concerns and establish their pro-social goals contributing to positive change (McMurran et al., 2010; see 2.4.3.4). So, in order to allow change, offenders’ goal structure needs to be investigated and motivation and readiness to achieve the goals need to be explored.

2.3 Models of offenders’ readiness to treatment

It was argued that greater readiness to rehabilitation results in greater reduction in recidivism (Ward, Vess, Collie & Gannon, 2006). Low readiness to treatment has been defined as ‘the presence of characteristics (states or dispositions) within either the client or the therapeutic situation, which are likely to impede engagement in therapy and which, thereby, are likely to diminish therapeutic change’ (Howells & Day, 2003). This means that if an individual is ready for treatment, an individual is likely to engage in treatment which in turn promotes change.

Offenders’ readiness to treatment was argued to be related but broader in scope in comparison to responsivity and motivation to engage in treatment (Serin, 1998). In terms of treatment, readiness places the individual in centre of offenders’ rehabilitation while responsivity addresses more adaptation of the treatment to offenders’ needs (Howells & Day, 2003). Motivation, or motivation to change, is a much narrower element of readiness and refers to ‘an intention to pursue a certain
goal and the development and subsequent implementation of a plan to achieve the goal in question’ (Ward et al., 2004; p 657)

A model that has been used in addiction treatment and also in forensic fields to conceptualise treatment readiness and behavioural change is the Stages of Change model (SoC). Each stage represents a modification of offender’s behaviour and higher motivation to achieve behavioural change (Tierney & McCabe, 2001). Prochaska and DiClemente (1983) suggested that an individual’s intrinsic motivation is the driving force to participate in treatment which contributes to behaviour change. Further, a specifically designed model for offenders’ readiness to treatment is described in the Multifactor Offender Readiness Model (MORM; Ward et al., 2004). This model recognises that there are differences between offenders’ treatment motivation, offenders’ responsivity and readiness. Offenders, who are motivated, have capabilities to enter the treatment, responsive to treatment and find the treatment meaningful, are thought to be ready to engage in treatment.

2.3.1 Stages of Change Model (Prochaska, DiClemente, Velicer, Ginpil & Norcross, 1985)

The Stages of Change (SoC) model was originally used in smoking cessation and alcohol abuse but it has been widely used in forensic population as a model of behaviour change (Tierney & McCabe, 2004).

The SoC is a part of a wider theoretical model called the Transtheoretical Model of Change (TTM). The TTM is a learning perspective including elements from different therapy theories and different theories of behaviour change (DiClemente,
This interactive model is used to describe an intentional process of change, aiming to acquire a positive change. The TTM contains 3 parts which are: 1. The Stages of Change (SoC); 2. The processes underlying change; and 3. The levels of change (Prochaska & DiClemente, 1983; Prochaska & Velicer, 1997).

![Stages of Change Model](image)

In the SoC model, ‘change’ is seen as a process which develops through different stages. The SoC may be applied to STOs and participation in custodial education. The process of change is divided into five stages – pre-contemplation stage during which an individual has no intention to change; contemplation stage where an individual is seriously considering changing behaviour but is not committed to it; preparation stage where an individual is committed to making a change in his/her life.
in the near future. These stages are followed by the action stage where an individual takes active steps toward his/her desired behaviour; and the maintenance stage in which an individual maintaining the desired behaviour and prevents relapse. Relapse back into undesired behaviour is referred to as regression to an earlier stage of change such as from Action or Maintenance to an earlier stage. In order for an individual to achieve change, an individual is thought to relapse several times (Prochaska, DiClemente & Norcross, 1992; see Figure 1 above). In terms of education participation, an offender in pre-contemplation stage has no intention to participate in education while an individual in contemplation stage is thinking about applying and participating in education. An offender in preparation stage is committed to participating in the near future while an offender who found out information about courses, applied to participate and started attending education is in an action stage. An offender in a maintenance stages keeps attending education until the goal, such as improved literacy, is achieved. It can be expected that STOs in a higher stage of change might be more engaged in education as a means of affecting change.

Despite the fact that the SoC was not designed to be a model of motivation and readiness, it has been used as a starting point in order to work on offenders’ readiness and suggest treatment towards current state of readiness (Burrowes & Needs, 2009). Offenders’ motivation and readiness to change in the SoC seems to be generated through the activities that accompany progress through one stage to another. As Prochaska & Norcross (2001) said ‘each stage represents a period of time as well as a set of tasks needed for movement to the next stage’ (p 443). It appears that the more an individual progresses through the stages the more likely it is for him/her to achieve the change which may suggest that motivation to change also increases. The model suggests the process of change to start with ‘pre-contemplation’ stage and ideally,
finishing in ‘maintenance stage’. It may appear that the motivation to change increases in parallel with the achieved stages, from the lowest to the highest. The level of motivation in each stage necessary for the progress is unclear and so are the suggested activities which need to be achieved in order to reach another stage.

Relationship between individual stages and motivation to change should be explained as it is believed that motivation varies due to occurring external and internal factors such as fear of imprisonment and problem recognition respectively (Drieschner et al., 2004). Furthermore, individual stages lack details needed for clinical judgements. For instance, individuals’ goals in each stage are not clear and therefore finding out what a client is willing or not willing to do is neglected. The model has also been criticised in relation to offenders’ behaviour change (McMurran et al., 2009; Burrowes & Needs, 2009) due to a lack of empirical evidence in the forensic settings (McMurran, 2004; Howells & Day, 2007).

The most frequently used psychometric tool for assessing change based on the Stages of Change is called the University of Rhode Island Change Assessment (URICA; McConnaughy, Prochaska & Velicer, 1983, 1989). The URICA is a 32-item scale with four 8-item subscales. It is a self-report questionnaire to identify stages of change and the change index can be calculated to assess offenders’ willingness to change (McMurran et al., 2011). The four scales map onto pre-contemplation, contemplation, action and maintenance stages. However, some of the items on the scales can be seen as ambiguous and confusing (Littell & Girvin, 2002).

Another assessment tool based on SoC is The Stages of Change and Treatment Eagerness Scales (SOCRATES; Miller & Tonigan, 1996). SOCRATES is a 19-item scale where items are scored in 3 areas. The areas are; Ambivalence (7 items),
Recognition (4 items) and Taking Steps (8 items). These areas represent motivational processes (Norcross, Crebs & Prochaska, 2011). SOCRATES has been used in smoking cessation (Di Clemente et al., 1991) alcohol use (Zhang, Harmon, Werkner, & McCormick, 2004) and drug use (Henderson, Saules & Galen, 2004). Similarly as with URICA, the results are categorized and in clinical practice the SoC are added. The SoC stages are created according to the timeline, so a client who is considering changing within 6 months is a contemplator; if not, such client is a pre-contemplator. Those clients who are considering taking action within a month are in a preparation stage while currently changing clients are in an action stage (Norcross et al., 2011).

The SoC views motivation as changeable rather than a trait (McMurran, 2009) which indicates that motivation can fluctuate and can also be increased. Some steps toward ‘action’ stage can be done while in custody. For instance if an offender would like to improve his/her education, it is possible to participate in education even if sentenced to a short custodial sentence. Motivation of those STOs who are in pre-contemplation and contemplation stages can be argued to be increased in order to move to higher stage which has been associated with higher readiness to change. SoC may be relevant in STOs’ representation of education participation as a means of improved readiness to change reoffending. However, the SoC is based on problem recognitions rather than taking into account offenders’ goals they would like to achieve and their strength they can use to goal attainment.

Offenders’ behaviour change and motivation has been recently addressed in research of ‘readiness to change’ and ‘offenders’ treatment’ where change and motivation is seen as non-linear, multifactorial continuum rather than a process which is divided into stages. The Multifactor Offender Readiness Model (MORM; Ward et
recogznises the importance of offenders’ characteristics and also the
environment in order to change behaviour.

2.3.2 Multifactor Offender Readiness Model (MORM)

The MORM is a model of readiness for treatment used in forensic settings. In
the MORM, the factors affecting the level of offenders’ readiness, such as the person
factors and contextual factors are taken into account so each offender is able to gain
greater understanding of treatment engagement and its implications. The MORM
describes issues that may enhance or impede treatment readiness. The MORM
represents a model which incorporates offenders’ motivation and also a range of
offenders’ psychological and contextual features (Ward et al., 2004).

The central principle of the MORM is to address offenders’ readiness which
takes into account offenders’ abilities, treatment programme and the context. It is
suggested that by adhering to the principle of readiness, greater than usual reduction
in recidivism will follow (Ward et al., 2004). The underlying MORM concept of
readiness is defined as having the appropriate cognitive tools (personal
characteristics) or situations that are supportive to therapy engagement and thus likely
to change behaviour (Ward et al., 2004). In other words, there are specific conditions
necessary for successful engagement in therapy. The concept of readiness is a broad
term including motivation and responsivity. Motivation for treatment is a predictor of
the offenders’ treatment engagement and completion. Responsivity principle refers as
to what degree an offender is able to gain and learn from a programme and
subsequently make behavioural changes. In order to be treatment ready if is helpful if
an offender is motivated to change, is able to respond appropriately during therapy,
finds the treatment meaningful and has the capacity to engage in treatment (Ward et al., 2004). Furthermore, therapeutic alliance (TA), which refers to the working relationship between an offender and an intervention facilitator, was identified as one of the needs that may increase offenders’ readiness for treatment. The TA help offenders engage in and benefit from treatment. There are three aspects of therapeutic alliance which are collaboration and affection between the offender and facilitator; and the ability to agree on treatment requirements (Bordin, 1994; Ward et al., 2004).

According to MORM, both internal and external characteristics are required for an offender to change offending. The degree to which the offender will be able to change depends on the ability to be ready for treatment (Ward et al., 2004). In order for an offender to be ready for treatment, an offender’s needs to be equipped with personal factors such as cognitive beliefs and strategies; affective factors such as emotions; volitional factors such as goals and desires; behavioural factors such as skills and competencies; and identity factors such as personal and social. The contextual factors include circumstances either compulsory and voluntary treatment, type of offender; location such as prison and community; opportunities such as what treatment is available; resources such as quality of treatment delivery, support such as positive interpersonal support and treatment characteristics such as type and timing of treatment (see Figure 2).
The MORM has an assessment tool which aims to assess readiness to change, the Corrections Victoria Treatment Readiness Model (CVTRQ; Casey, Day, Howells & Ward, 2007). This is a 40-item self-report questionnaire measuring offenders’ attitudes, emotions, beliefs and self-efficacy (Casey et al., 2007). Scoring is on a 5-point Likert scale and can range from 40-200. Higher scores indicate higher degree of readiness to participate an engage in treatment. The CVTRQ includes person factors, external circumstances and also target factors such as time and type of intervention and volition.

The volitional factor is in particular significant in terms of offenders’ motivation and readiness to treatment. Volition refers to the development of intent to pursue and achieve a goal. For instance, if an offender would like to enter and engage in treatment, intentions or the will to engage and behave pro-socially needs to be developed. Moreover, volition into treatment requires considering a treatment cost-benefit, making a non-coercive decision on treatment entry and also ability to consent to treatment (Ward et al., 2004).

Volitional factors have often been conceptualised as motivation to change which is related to treatment engagement (Campbell et al., 2010). Motivation has been
linked to personal goals which need to be accompanied by the directedness towards a goal, emotions and goal attainment expectancies. The absence of any of the three conditions towards a goal such as motivation to treatment engagement may result in lack of motivation (Ward et al., 2004). This means that an offender may lack motivation since the aim of therapy is perceived as unimportant, or a presence of uncontrollable feelings of hostility, or perceiving a goal as unlikely to be achieved (Ward et al., 2004). These factors need to be addressed in pre-treatment to boost offenders’ motivation to engage in therapy.

Nevertheless, offenders’ motivation for treatment can be compromised by the offender responding to the demands of the situation (McMurran, 2009). For instance, an offender may appear motivated and ready to enter treatment due to external pressures such as sanctions against him if he did not comply (Drieschner et al., 2004). MORM acknowledges that high perceived readiness to treatment, including motivation to engage, does not guarantee a good outcome (Ward et al., 2004). Therefore, offenders’ personal goals need to be attended to in order to understand the context of their goals.

Furthermore, MORM and its concept of motivation has been questioned. It is not clear whether an offender can be ready and motivated to participate in treatment, and at the same time, be ready and motivated to change behaviour which may potentially lead to stopping reoffending. Motivation and readiness to treatment and motivation to stop reoffending are thought to be two different concepts (Campbell et al., 2010). Thus, if the offenders’ reasons for participating were not genuine or changed during the course of a treatment, then the treatment engagement and behavioural change may also be in jeopardy. It may be the external pressure or it may
be a reflection of the erroneous linear logic behind motivation and readiness to
treatment, motivation and readiness to change behaviour and motivation and readiness
to stop reoffending.

Ward et al. (2004) claimed that MORM purports that if an individual is ready
for treatment, such individuals will have higher participation rates, treatment
attendance and treatment engagement and subsequently their risk of reoffending and
criminogenic needs will decrease. Therefore, it is vital that offenders with long and
short sentences improve their treatment readiness, in particular motivation to engage
in rehabilitation such as education. This includes motivating offenders to treatment
engagement prior to treatment, for instance, by administering a motivational intervention
before education.

2.4 Theories of offenders’ motivation to treatment engagement

There is a need to motivate offenders to treatment since high levels of
motivation contribute to treatment engagement, treatment completion, preventing
drop-out and have positive consequences on reoffending rates. Models of motivation
are available to assess offenders’ motivation to engage in treatment. The models
conceptualise treatment engagement motivation and suggest underlying principles for
assessment (Ward et al., 2004). Drieschner’s model of treatment motivation provides
a complex framework including both internal and external factors in offenders’
motivation to engage in treatment.
2.4.1 Drieschner’s theory of motivation

Motivation in treatment is believed to be influenced by both internal and external factors such as personal circumstances and treatment itself (see Figure 3). External factors are translated into internal factors such as coercing offenders into treatment. Research showed that offenders’ motivation to treatment engagement can be influenced by the legal threat but this external factor is often mediated and moderated by an offender, taking into account the extent of sanction against him (Drieschner et al., 2004). As Heckhausen (1991) claimed ‘‘actions or their underlying intentions are always only ‘internally’ caused’’ (p407). Therefore, Dreischner et al.’s conceptualisation of motivation to engage in treatment is based on the premise that there are six influencing internal factors which are subjective to the offender and directly influence treatment motivation. Motivation to engage in treatment is a predictor of treatment engagement which in turn impacts on the treatment outcomes.
Figure 3. Drieschner's Integral conceptualisation of treatment motivation and related concepts diagram (Adopted from Drieschner, Lammers & van Staak, 2004).

Motivation to engage in treatment depends on six cognitive and emotional factors which are characterised in the internal determinants section. These are problem recognition including concepts such as denial (Miller, 1985) and acceptance of the problem behaviour (Jenkins Hall, 1994); Distress which is level of suffering in terms of social, physical and economic consequences (Tierney & McGabe, 2002); perceived external pressure; perceived cost of treatment such as financial cost and time but in case of incarcerated offenders it may be psychological cost such as exposure to unpleasant emotions and quitting a pleasurable behaviour (Meichenbaum & Turk, 1987); perceived suitability of treatment such as treatment rationale and treatment goals (Miller, 1991); and outcome expectancy described in Expectancy vs Value model (Atkinson, 1957; Ajzen, 1988) and its related concept of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977; Miller & Rollnick, 1991). In other words, offenders’ internal-level factors such as level of distress and whether they understand the need for change
together with personal circumstances and characteristics all contribute to treatment motivation.

Drieschner et al. (2005) distinguished between offenders’ motivation before treatment and during treatment. Simply, the terminology of motivation is divided into motivation to enter treatment and motivation to engage in treatment. Similarly, with the concept of motivation to change, Drieschner et al. (2005) distinguished between motivation to change and between wishes and desires which an individual wants to eradicate rather than change. It may be that the complexities related to offending behaviour leads to offenders’ wishing their offending simply disappeared rather than changing their behaviours and leading crime free lives. Implications of this are that offenders may not be sufficiently motivated to enter and engage in therapy which promotes behavioural changes. Furthermore, offenders need to recognise the adverse consequences of their behaviour before being motivated to change it.

This model was a basis for a construction of a tool measuring motivation to engage in treatment called Treatment Motivation Scales for Forensic Psychiatric Outpatients (TMS-F; Drieschner & Boomsma, 2008). The TMS-F is a 85 item self-report questionnaire containing six cognitive and affective determinants of motivation. The TMS-F is a validated and reliable tool tested with 754 forensic patients highlighting the importance of the internal determinants in treatment motivation (Drieschner & Boomsma, 2008). The TMS-F is a time-consuming questionnaire, thus the administration time may not be practical for clinical purposes. However, if the TMS-F was used, validation and its properties such as predictive validity need to be further examined, for instance, whether the scale can be used with offenders in the United Kingdom (Drieschner & Boomsma, 2008).
Another framework of motivation to change behaviour is the Theory of Current Concerns (TCC; Klinger & Cox, 2004a) which is organised around goals and the goals provide a map of motivational structure (Klinger & Cox, 2011a). A generation of assessment tools of offenders’ motivation has been developed and based on the TCC including the Personal Concerns Inventory- Offender Adaptation (PCI-OA) and the Personal Aspiration and Concerns Inventory for Offenders (PACIO). The PCI-OA and the PACIO have been previously used to assess and improve offenders’ motivation to change, in particular to assess and improve offenders’ motivation to treatment engagement.

### 2.4.2 The Theory of Current concerns (TCC) and the importance of goals

The TCC is organised around the notion of goal fulfilment in several life areas which have a potential to bring happiness in life (Klinger & Cox, 2004a). The theory is focused on processes ranging from goal selection and goal pursuit to goal attainment. It claims that by naming a ‘current concern’ such as a need to improve education, an individual is stimulated to visualise and act on the cues which are involved in the ‘journey’ to achieve a goal. This goal-striving process is an underlying force in motivation (Klinger & Cox, 2004a). Klinger and Cox (2011) defined motivation as “the internal states of the organism that lead to the instigation, persistence, energy, and direction of behaviour towards a goal” (p4). Here, motivation is an umbrella term for several processes which involve goal selection, commitment, pursuit and disengagement of a goal. This definition refers to motivation as internally driven and divided into sections which are activation of motivation such as making a decision on which goal to strive to, persistence which is
a continued effort toward a set goal and intensity or vigour that is generated in order to achieve the goal and also behavioural approach toward a chosen goal. These processes are influenced by emotional responses as they are crucial in determining how an individual will think and behave (Klinger & Cox, 2011). The goal selection depends on the value of the incentive and perceived likelihood of goal achievement (Klinger & Cox, 2004a). For instance, in terms of an offender’s motivation to participate in custodial activities such as educational classes, the definition may be explained that an offender identifies intrinsically valuable primary goals and goals with acquired value that are a means to attaining primary goals. In terms of education, offenders need to seek a primary good of Knowledge which seeks knowledge in specific subjects. This can be achieved through a secondary good, such as participating in education courses or vocational training in workshops. However, the secondary goods for short-term offenders are limited in custody to achieve the primary good since the provision in education only includes classes in English, Maths, Arts, IT and addressing employability skills. The important aspect of motivation is intrinsic commitment to goals (McMurran, 2002) since the activation, persistence, intensity and behaviour to the goal achievement affects person’s commitment and goal striving to goal attainment. For instance, if a goal is not initiated or abandoned, this may show low commitment to a goal. Also, if a person does not engage with activities needed to attain a goal and does not exhibit relevant behaviours to reach desirable outcomes, such as education improvement or stopping reoffending, it may be indicative of low commitment.
2.4.2.1 Offenders’ goals and motivation to change behaviour

Ward (2002) suggested that desisting offenders created new adaptive personal identities in order to stop reoffending. These new identities were clustered around relatedness such as offenders’ social environment; autonomy such as having a choice and self-control; and competence such as having mastery experience and fulfilling work. Ward (2002) argued that rather than concentrating on treating offenders’ crime-related factors offenders’ rehabilitation programmes must be supported by a concept of good lives, taking into account offenders’ personally meaningful goals.

Karoly (1993) stated that goals are not stable or static and that the effort put into goals is variable. This means that goals can be seen as fluid and changing and become more or less important and can change over time in the actual process of achieving a goal. Goals seem to be important to have if one is ready to make a change. Goals have been used in offenders’ motivation assessments with regards to motivation to change behaviour (McMurran, 2009; Sellen et al., 2006, 2009; Cox & Klinger, 2004b; Campbell et al., 2010). Moreover, goals need to be SMART, that is specific, measurable, achievable, rewarding and time limited (McMurran, 2010) and also taking into account offenders’ individual differences.

As offenders’ goals may differ from those of a therapist, Ward suggested that in such cases, addressing the offender’s crime related behaviour may be a mistake contributing to offenders’ antisocial behaviour. Therefore, when assessing and investigating motivation to change, offenders’ goals should have a central role in monitoring and evaluating motivation to change. Therefore, processes related to goal pursuits and goal attainment should be taken into account.
Goal pursuit may be difficult to manage with STOs as they often have multiple needs such as addressing low literacy, lack of vocational skills and unemployment and offenders’ time in custody is limited for therapy. The process of achieving a goal may vary on an individual basis and personal circumstances (Ward et al., 2004). Thus, there is a call for assessment tools for offenders addressing their general motivational structure in order to assess and explore offenders’ motivation to changing behaviour.

Goal-based theories are compatible with strength-based theories such as GLM which aim to work toward offenders’ satisfaction with life rather than just eliminate criminogenic needs (Ward & Brown, 2004). It is important that offenders’ goals are explored and assessed since personally meaningful goals give structure and purpose to one’s life and achieving goals can lead to improved well-being and personal satisfaction (Michalak, Grosse, & Holtforth, 2006). Offenders’ personal goals found in treatment are thought to fit the offenders’ ‘higher-order’ goals which include their core beliefs, values and needs (Michalak et al., 2006). Furthermore, the newest version of the goal-based assessment used with offenders, the Personal Aspiration and Concerns Inventory for Offenders (PACIO), has been suggested to be an assessment of person’s motivational structure and also an enhancer of motivation to change, particularly enhance of motivation to treatment engagement (Campbell et al., 2010).

Goal striving and goal attainment are linked with self-efficacy and adopting new behaviours. New behaviours are acquired to experience well-being and personal satisfaction (Bandura, 1977). Self-efficacy is important in deciding which new behaviours to adopt. Self-efficacy has been defined as the ‘beliefs in one's capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to manage prospective situations’ (Bandura, 1995; p.2). Personal factors such as cognition, behaviours and
environmental factors contribute to human functioning (Bandura, 1986) so in order for a person to be satisfied in life, people set goals which they would like to accomplish. People’s self-efficacy beliefs determine their individual level of effort invested in their actions, motivation to persevere and overcoming their barriers in order to achieve a goal (Bandura, 1988). For instance, an offender who aims to learn new skills in education needs to have high-self-efficacy beliefs in order to start an educational course and continue after release. Lack of self-efficacy in difficult situations may result in reducing their effort. Low self-efficacy may discourage offenders from finding a course in local colleges, secure funding and achieve their goals. It is therefore important that offenders select realistic goals and have coping mechanisms in place for their release.

Goals in the Theory of Current Concerns can be pursued with two motivational approaches, which are being internally motivated or externally motivated (Ryan, Sheldon, Kasser & Deci, 1996). The internal or intrinsic motivation and external or extrinsic motivation can have not only impact on the goal selection but also on other processes involved in the goal achievement such as commitment to the goal, its pursuit and attainment of a goal (Ryan & Deci, 2000). When a goal is seen to be a stepping stone onto another goal, the motivation for this goal is said to be extrinsically driven. For instance an illiterate offender who would like to improve his literacy skills will be extrinsically motivated as he would like to get a better job as a result of his improved reading and writing. However, if the offender participated in literacy classes only for the pleasure and interest in learning how to read then the motivation will be intrinsically driven (Klinger & Cox, 2004a). Offenders’ extrinsically and intrinsically driven goals are central to the motivation improvement and motivation assessment on the PCI generation tools.
The Theory of Current Concerns organises offenders’ goals into a meaningful personal map called motivational structure. Motivational structure has been defined as ‘an individual’s array of goals and ways of relating to them’ (Cox & Klinger, 2004a; p 4). This motivation structure is important for construction of assessment instruments of motivation. A psychometric tool for assessing motivation to change which was based on the Theory of Current Concerns is the Motivational Structure Questionnaire (MSQ, Cox & Klinger, 2000) and the Personal Concerns Inventory (PCI; Cox & Klinger, 2004a) which is a modified version of the MSQ. The PCI was originally used with clients with addictive behaviours and later adapted for use with offenders. The adapted version is called The Personal Concerns Inventory-Offender Adaptation (PCI-OA; Sellen et al., 2006; 2009).

2.4.3 The development of the generation of goal-based assessments

2.4.3.1 Motivational Structure Questionnaire (Cox & Klinger, 2004a)

Motivational structure is the way offenders organise their pattern of thinking and behaving toward goal achievement. The thinking patterns and offenders’ goals are reported and assessed using adaptations of Personal Concerns Inventory or the Motivational Structure Questionnaire. The Motivational Structure Questionnaire is based on the Theory of Current Concerns and was developed on the premise that people have a motivational structure in life which represents the individual’s goals and the way of relating to them (Cox & Klinger, 2004). The aim of the Motivational Structure Questionnaire is to assess individuals’ concerns and the way the concerns will be resolved. The test has an idiographic component and the nomothetic component. The idiographic component names the individual’s concerns and also
describes how the concerns may be resolved. The concerns are resolved by goals which are investigated on their importance and also on their valence. The valence of the goals can be either aversive or appetitive which are goals aimed at getting rid of negative incentive and acquiring positive incentive (Cox & Klinger, 2011). The second component of the test is predominantly nomothetic as it contains 10 different rating scales ranging from 0-9 in areas such as ‘Commitment to the goal’ and ‘Chances of success if no action taken’. Results are averaged within each area and also across all areas to calculate offenders’ motivational structure indexes. Assessing a dynamic construct such as motivational structure can be challenging due to the perceived fluidity of motivation. However, the Motivational Structure Questionnaire has shown acceptable reliability with substance abusers over time as their rating on some of the indices was stable across 10 months. Cronbach’s alpha for the MSQ scales was satisfactory as it ranged from the .81 to .97. The validity of the MSQ has been established by relating the MSQ indices to other measures of motivational structure such as physiological and cognitive processes various personality measures and treatment outcomes (Cox and Klinger, 2004b). For instance, participants who were listening to audiotaped stories related more to stories that reminded them of their own goals, recalled many more and were thinking about the passages in the stories more than in the control passages which were not related to their goals (Klinger, 1978). This effect in recall involves a variety of cognitive processes. Moreover, words related to the participants’ goals produced significantly more skin conductance responses in comparison to other participants’ goals (Nikula, Klinger & Larson-Gutman, 1993). Therefore, the cognitive and physiological testing provides assessments of validity of the MSQ.
2.4.3.2 The Personal Concerns Inventory (PCI)

The PCI is a modified version of the Motivational Structure Questionnaire (Cox & Klinger, 2004b; Klinger, Cox & Blount, 1995). The PCI is administered in a self-report measure. The PCI is a motivation assessment which was originally developed for use with clients with addictive behaviours such as alcohol and drug addiction and smoking but also used with patients suffering from anxiety disorders and brain injury (Klinger & Cox, 2004b).

There are 11 life areas (see Table 3) where individuals identify their concerns, decide what needs to be done in order to resolve the concerns and finally score their goals on a 10 point rating scale ranging from 0 to 10 on their Importance, Commitment, Happiness, Unhappiness, Chances of success, Goal distance, Control and also Knowing what to do. The PCI requires the problem behaviour such as alcohol dependency to be scored on whether alcohol helps or hinder goal attainment.

Table 3 The Personal Concerns Inventory (PCI) Identified life areas (Cox & Klinger, 2004).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Home and household</th>
<th>7. Education and training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Employment and Finance</td>
<td>8. Health and medical matters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Partner, family and relatives</td>
<td>9. Substance use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Friend and acquaintances</td>
<td>10. Spiritual matters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Love, intimacy and sexual matters</td>
<td>11. Hobbies and recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Self-changes</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The exploration of the PCI structure has been investigated and two motivational profiles were identified. The profiles were adaptive motivation and maladaptive motivation profiles. The adaptive and maladaptive motivation have been previously identified in other studies on motivation to change (e.g., Klinger & Cox, 2004b; Fardardi, 2006; Hosier, 2001).

The indices that loaded onto adaptive motivation profile were perceived likelihood of goal achievement, expected happiness when a goal is attained and commitment to pursue and achieve goals. Maladaptive motivation is characterised by scores indicating that the goal is not important, bringing little happiness and there is a lack of commitment to goal attainment.

Individuals with a higher adaptive motivation profile believe that their goal is likely to happen and were committed to it and also they expected to be happy when the goal was achieved. Adaptive motivation is positively related to determination to change with substance abusers in treatment as measured on the University of Rhode Island Change Assessment tool (Cox et al., 2000). However, maladaptive motivation profile is characterised by ratings of selected goals as unimportant, lack of commitment and lack of happiness at goal attainment. Adaptive motivation profile has been shown to be more consistent than maladaptive motivation index. Maladaptive motivation (MM) has been rather inconsistent across studies (Klinger & Cox, 2011; Sellen et al., 2009). People with maladaptive motivational profiles are likely to be positively motivated, lack hope to achieve goals, expect less happiness when goal achieved and less sorrow when a goal is not achieved when compared to people with higher adaptive motivation. They also predict a longer distance before a goal is achieved and feel less committed and lack control over their goal achievement (Cox &
Klinger, 2004; Fadardi & Cox, 2008). Furthermore, there is evidence to suggest that statistically, there is a negative relationship between adaptive motivation and motivation to change in undergraduate students solving problematic drinking (Cox et al., 2002). This was however true only for students who perceived their drinking as problematic. Adaptive motivation was negatively correlated to life quality at the entry of treatment and positively correlated with well-being at the end of treatment (Schroer et al., 2004).

One of the reasons for using this tool in a forensic setting was that the PCI was based on sound theoretical underpinnings and demonstrated adequate internal reliability and construct validity (Cox & Klinger, 2004b). The PCI covers similar areas as the GLM such as having relevant education and vocational skills. Moreover, the PCI is designed so that both idiographic and nomothetic data can be collected (Cox & Klinger, 2004). The idiographic data involves identification of concerns and generation of goals which are rated using nomothetic rating scales. The PCI had also a potential to be developed into counselling, using the framework of the PCI.

2.4.3.3 The Systematic Motivational Counselling (Cox, Klinger & Blount, 1991).

Systematic Motivational Counselling is a counselling technique based on the goals identified during the Personal Concerns Inventory interviews. The counselling concentrates on evaluating the client’s motivational structure as the focus is on the clients’ goals. The main aim is to assist the client to form, pursue and achieve pro-social and adaptive goals in order to change behaviour (Cox and Klinger, 2004c). SMC has been used with drug and alcohol users and also people with personality disorders on an individual and group basis and has shown beneficial effects (Cox,
Heinemann, Miranti, Schmidt, Klinger & Blount, 2003; Cox & Klinger, 2004c). In terms of substance and alcohol abuse sufferers lead lives with many socially undesirable and sometimes unrealistic goals, such as stealing to have money for drugs or/and believing to find employment easily after a lengthy jobless period (Schroer et al., 2004). Systematic Motivational Counselling aims to target and modify the clients’ motivational basis after first assessing it with the Motivational Structure Questionnaire (or the Personal Concerns Inventory). The Personal Concerns Inventory components are used according to the clients’ needs which means that only relevant goals will be used in order to promote change.

It was suggested that Systematic Motivational Counselling would be a beneficial approach with an offending population as it is important to motivate offenders to change their offending behaviour (McMurran, 2004). This approach may also have some utility for use with STOs since it identifies offenders’ goals and future plans and can help with the goals’ achievement in a suitable manner for offenders with short sentences.

2.4.3.4 The Personal Concerns Inventory-Offenders Adaptation (PCI-OA).

Motivation theories used in the area of substance abuse, such as the Theory of Current Concerns (Cox & Klinger, 2004b), are thought to apply to offending and there is potential that the measurement tools may also be used with offenders (McMurran et al., 2011). The PCI was adapted for use with offenders. The amended version of the PCI for use in forensic settings was called ‘The Personal Concerns Inventory - Offender Adaptation’ (PCI-OA; Sellen et al., 2006).
There are five reasons why the PCI can be relevant for the use in forensic setting. Addictive behaviours and offending behaviours can be characterised by making choices with short-term benefits but long-term negative consequences. The measurement tools of motivation to change based on the Theory of Current Concerns such as the Motivational Structure Questionnaire and the PCI have been tested and the validity and reliability was adequate to be used in psychometric testing (Klinger & Cox, 2004b). The PCI forms a basis for the Systematic Motivational Counselling which may be useful with forensic populations as a motivational booster prior or during treatment (Sellen et al., 2009). Counselling specific for offenders can be developed from idiographic data collected on the PCI-OA such as offenders’ concerns and goals in the PCI-OA identified life areas. Furthermore, the life areas found in the PCI were previously identified in the GLM as primary human goods which were suggested to be relevant to offender rehabilitation (Ward & Gannon, 2006; Table 2 and Table 3 above).

A number of changes were made to the PCI scales to be applicable with offenders. Firstly, two areas related to offending and current accommodation were added which were: my offending behaviour, identifying concerns and goals regarding offending; and current living arrangements, intending to gain information regarding prison stay. Secondly, the PCI was administered as a semi-structured interview as opposed to a self-report. This was done in order to prevent possible literacy problems and establish a relationship with an offender. There were in total 13 life areas on the PCI-OA (Table 4).
Table 4 The Personal Concerns Inventory (PCI-OA) Identified life areas (Sellen et al., 2006).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Home and household matters</th>
<th>8. Health and medical matters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Employment and Finance</td>
<td>9. Substance use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Partner, family and relatives</td>
<td>10. Spiritual matters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Friend and acquaintances</td>
<td>11. Hobbies, Pastimes and recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Love, intimacy and sexual matters</td>
<td>12. My offending behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Education and training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of the life areas has a rating scale. These rating scales are used to calculate motivational structure. Offenders rate their goals ranging from 0-10 where 0 is not at all and 10 the most. The PCI rating scale contains 12 indices and is shown in Table 5.
Table 5 Indices on the PCI rating scales (Sellen et al., 2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Importance How important is it to me for things to turn out the way you want?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Likelihood How likely is it that things will turn out the way I want?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Control How much control do I have in causing things to turn out the way you want?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Achievability Do I know what steps to take to make things turn out the way I want?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Happiness How much happiness would I get if things turn out the way I want?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Unhappiness How unhappy would I get if things turn out the way I want?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Commitment How committed do I feel to making things turn out the way I want?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>When will it happen? How long it will take for things to turn out the way I want?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Will offending help? Will my offending behaviour help things to turn out the way I want?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Will offending interfere? Will my offending behaviour interfere with things to turn out the way I want?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Will prison help? Will the experience of being in prison help things to turn out the way I want?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Will prison interfere? Will the experience of being in prison interfere with things to turn out the way I want?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sellen et al. (2009) conducted two studies with a sample of 129 offenders from a UK prison to examine the factor structure in order to establish validity and reliability of the PCI-OA. Offenders were either in treatment or in an untreated group. The aim was to replicate motivational profiles, which were adaptive motivation and maladaptive motivation, with offenders in custody. Thus, the original items from the PCI were used for the first analysis omitting items whether offending and being in prison helped or interfered. Also, ‘When will it happen’ item was excluded as this question was difficult to answer for the offenders (7 items in total). The results revealed two factors which resembled the motivation structure of the PCI used with non-offending samples.

The second analysis which included prison-specific items which were whether offending helps/interferes and whether prison helps/interferes. There were three factors identified which were adaptive motivation (AM PCI-OA), maladaptive motivation (MM PCI-OA), and lack of direction (LoD PCI-OA). There were nine items used and they all loaded on Adaptive Motivation: Commitment, Likelihood, Happiness, Importance, Control, Achievability and also Prison helps and Offending helps loaded positively and Unhappiness loaded negatively.

It was suggested that a person is committed to his/her goals and feels happiness if goals are achieved, and sorrow if goals are failed and is likely to have an adaptive motivational structure and also more likely to achieve goals. For instance, if an offender feels he/she wants to stop reoffending and is committed to the appetitive goal, the achievement of living a free crime life brings joy and feels that it is realistic for him/her to stop reoffending. For instance, an offender has an adaptive motivational structure and is likely to stop reoffending. Moreover, Cox et al., (2000) concluded that
the adaptive motivational profile (as measured by the MSQ) is predictive of readiness to change (as measured by the URICA; McConnaughy et al., 1983) and reduction of undesired behaviours (as measured by the Short Michigan Alcoholism Screening Test; Cox, Schippers, Klinger, Stuchlíková, Man & Inderhaug, 2002).

In maladaptive motivation, Control, Likelihood and Unhappiness loaded positively while Importance and Happiness loaded negatively. If a person is not committed to goals and makes no effort in pursuing them, he/she will have a maladaptive motivational structure and therefore will be unlikely to attain goals. No or very little commitment, unhappiness on being a law abiding citizen and not knowing when he/ she will stop reoffending are characteristics of a maladaptive motivational structure.

The AM (PCI-OA) and MM (PCI-OA) were similar to those identified in the original PCI. However, there was an additional factor identified which was called Lack of Direction (PCI-OA). Prison helps, Offending helps and Unhappiness loaded positively in this factor, while Achievability of goals loaded negatively.
2.4.3.5 Calculation of the PCI-OA indices

Motivational indices were calculated including, and also excluding prison and offending scales. Adaptive motivation (AM \text{PCI-OA}) index, as calculated on a scale including prison and offending scales, was calculated by subtracting the score on the negatively loaded items, which was Unhappiness, from the sum of positive loadings on adaptive motivation, which were Likelihood, Control, Commitment, Happiness, Importance, Achievability, Offending helps and Prison helps. This provided a possible range from -10 to +60, yielding a range of 70 which was divided by 7 to achieve scores from 0 – 10.

Maladaptive motivation (MM \text{PCI-OA}) index was calculated by subtracting the sum of positively loaded scales which was Likelihood, Control and Unhappiness from negatively loaded scales which were Happiness and Importance. The possible range was from -30 to +20, yielding range of 50. The range (50) was divided by 5 to give the range of scores from 0-10.

Lack of Direction (LoD \text{PCI-OA}) index was calculated by subtracting the sum of the scales that loaded positively which was Offending helps, Prison helps and Unhappiness, from the sum of items that loaded negatively, which was Achievability. The scores ranges from -30 to +10, yielding a range of 40. In order to achieve a score from 0-10, the range (40) was divided by 4. The higher the score on the Lack of Direction factor, the greater the lack of direction was.

The internal consistency of adaptive motivation assessed on the PCI-OA (including rating scales relating to whether prison and offending help or interfere with
goal achievement) was similar to the PCI-OA (without prison and offending scales) which was Cronbach’s alpha .71 and .70 respectively. However, internal consistency of maladaptive motivation as measured on the PCI-OA including scales was Cronbach’s alpha .55 and PCI-OA without scales was Cronbach’s alpha .64. The new factor, Lack of Direction, did not have acceptable internal consistency which was .36. This indicated that the most robust was adaptive motivation factor when tested without additional prison and offending scales. Cronbach’s alpha for maladaptive motivation was marginally acceptable, and Lack of Direction was too low to be accepted. Therefore, this factor was not used and further investigation of this factor was recommended.

When establishing the PCI-OA psychometric properties, a battery of testing was conducted informing on the PCI-OA’s internal reliability (above) and also validity. There were 64 offenders in treatment and 65 offenders not in treatment. They were tested using the URICA (McConnaughy et al., 1989) to measure stages of change. Also, the 64 offenders completed the Treatment Motivation Questionnaire (Ryan et al., 1995) which is a 26-item self-report tool to measure motivation to treatment which the respondents indicate on a 7 point scale. This scale has four subscales which are a) Internal motivation, b) External motivation, c) Interpersonal Help Seeking, d) Confidence in treatment. Furthermore, offenders were ask to indicate a URICA stage of change which reflected the stage they thought they were in and rated the treatment motivation accordingly; internal and external motivation and motivation to stop reoffending on a scale from 0-100%. The analyses revealed that adaptive motivation scores were positively related to internal motivation to treatment ($r_s = .28$, $p = .05$) and maladaptive motivation was negatively related with staff rating
of motivation to treatment ($r_s = -.28, p < .05$), positively correlated with pre-contemplation stage scores and treatment compliance ($r = -.31, p < .05$).

Predictive validity was tested in order to investigate whether if the intervention works there would be change in the scores of AM$_{_{(PCI-OA)}}$ and MM$_{_{(PCI-OA)}}$. There were 34 offenders ($N=34$) in the treatment group and 20 offenders ($N=20$) in the control group, for whom pre- and post-treatment data was available, predictive validity testing revealed that during the treatment the AMI$_{_{(PCI-OA)}}$ increased since there was a significant difference between scores in treatment group in comparison to the control group in Time 2 ($AMI_{_{(PCI-OA)}}$ was 7.04 and 6.65 respectively; $p = .04$). Moreover, only offenders in treatment group showed a significant difference between pre-treatment testing (Time 1) and post-treatment testing (Time 2) which was AMI$_{_{(PCI-OA)}}$ = 6.81 and 7.04 respectively; $p = .04$. MM$_{_{(PCI-OA)}}$ in treatment group in Time 1 was significantly lower than in the control group (MM$_{_{(PCI-OA)}}$ = -.45 and -.99 respectively; $p = .0009$) and there was a significant difference between groups in Time 2. MM$_{_{(PCI-OA)}}$ in the comparison group was higher than in the treatment group (MM$_{_{(PCI-OA)}}$ = -.34 and -.89 respectively; $p = .004$). However, there were no significant differences between Time 1 and Time 2 for either treatment group or control group ($p = .38$ and $p = .66$; Sellen et al., 2009). This means that AM$_{_{(PCI-OA)}}$ was significantly higher post-treatment and also at Time 2 in treatment group in comparison to the control group. Offenders in comparison group had a higher MM$_{_{(PCI-OA)}}$ than a treatment group, however, MM$_{_{(PCI-OA)}}$ did not change over time (Sellen et al., 2009).

Treatment reduced reconviction 18 months after release, however, neither AM$_{_{(PCI-OA)}}$ nor MM$_{_{(PCI-OA)}}$ predicted reconviction. This was since offenders in the comparison group did not have significantly higher AM$_{_{(PCI-OA)}}$ than those in the
treatment group. However, AM \(_{\text{PCI-OA}}\) s at Time 1 between groups were not equal. MM \(_{\text{PCI-OA}}\) Indices were also significantly different at Time 1 and Time 2 and therefore, neither AM \(_{\text{PCI-OA}}\) Index nor MM \(_{\text{PCI-OA}}\) Index predicted reconviction (Sellen et al., 2009). Moreover, concurrent validity revealed that the AM \(_{\text{PCI-OA}}\) was positively correlated with one of the URICA scales which was Committed Action composite and MM \(_{\text{PCI-OA}}\) was negatively correlated with Maintenance stage as measured on the URICA. This was consistent with previous research on adaptive and maladaptive motivation and stages of change (Cox et al., 2000). However, the AM \(_{\text{PCI-OA}}\) and MM \(_{\text{PCI-OA}}\) scores did not correlate with Treatment Motivation Questionnaire (TMQ; Ryan et al., 1995). The lack of correlation with the URICA and also with the TMQ were thought to be due to lack of evidence accompanying stages of change rather than shortcomings on the PCI-OA (McMurran et al., 2006; Casey, Day & Howells, 2005).

The administration of the PCI-OA was estimated to be about 2 hours. This seems lengthy for the use in a prison setting, especially with offenders sentenced to short custodial sentences. Thus, a new abridged version, the Personal Aspiration and Concerns Inventory for Offenders (PACIO) was developed in order to address the limitations of the PCI-OA.

2.4.3.6 Development of the Personal Aspiration and Concerns Inventory for Offenders (PACIO; Campbell et al., 2010).

The PACIO is administered in a semi-structured interview and asks about offenders’ concerns and aspirations in six life areas plus ‘Other’ category (Sellen, Gobbett & Campbell, 2013; Table 6). In the original name the word ‘Aspirations’ was
added as offenders need to focus on their concerns but also emphasise their positive hopes and ambitions (Campbell et al., 2010). The PCI-OA areas were reduced to six wider PACIO life areas for the PACIO to be a more time-efficient tool.
Table 6 The Personal Aspiration and Concerns Inventory for Offenders – wider life areas (Campbell et al., 2010).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PACIO wider life areas</th>
<th>PCI-OA Life Areas Covered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Past, current and future living arrangements</td>
<td>Home and household matters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current living arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close personal relationships</td>
<td>Partner, family and relatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friends and acquaintances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Love, intimacy and sexual matters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical or mental health issues</td>
<td>Health and medical matters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Substance use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Hobbies and pastimes and recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spiritual matters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-changes and personal improvement, and problem with anger and violence</td>
<td>Self-changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My offending behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Problems with anger and violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment, training and financial situation</td>
<td>Employment and Finances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The design of the PACIO is conducive to goal conflict explorations since it provides an opportunity to discuss pros and cons of offenders’ offending. Therefore, the PACIO has a potential to be an intervention for offenders (McMurran et al., 2011). Furthermore, the PACIO’s indices have been adapted. For instance, changes were made to the prison and offending scales on the PACIO. On the PCI-OA, there are four indices regarding prison and offending (see Table 5) but the PACIO included only 2 continuous scales from 0-10. There have been quantitative element (Table 7) and qualitative element (Table 8) incorporated in the scales. This was done in order for an offender to make a list of potential gains and losses caused by being in prison and committing crimes in the future. It was suggested that these indices may have a potential to resolve any ambivalence of the offender may feel about treatment engagement and offending behaviour (Campbell, 2009).
Table 7 PACIO rating scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Importance: How important is it to you for things to turn out the way you want? Choose a number from 0 to 10, where 0 is not important at all, and 10 is very important.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood</td>
<td>How likely: How likely is it that things will turn out the way you want? Choose a number from 0 to 10, where 0 is not likely at all, and 10 is very likely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Control: How much control do you have in causing things to turn out the way you want? Choose a number from 0 to 10, where 0 is no control at all, and 10 is much control.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What to do</td>
<td>What to do: Do you know what steps to take to make things turn out the way you want? Choose a number from 0 to 10, where 0 is not knowing at all, and 10 is knowing exactly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>Happiness: How much happiness would you get if things turn out the way you want? Choose a number from 0 to 10, where 0 is no happiness at all, and 10 is a great deal happiness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>Commitment: How committed do you feel to making things turn out the way you want? Choose a number from 0 to 10, where 0 is no commitment at all, and 10 is strong commitment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When will it happen?</td>
<td>When will it happen? It will happen in the short-term (i.e. something you can achieve in the foreseeable future) or it will happen in the long-term (i.e. something that you won’t be able to achieve until far into the future)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8 shows the qualitative element of the PACIO which consists of four questions regarding the effects of the prison and the effects of reoffending on offender’s goals.

Table 8 The PACIO prison and re-offending indices (Campbell et al., 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item type</th>
<th>Item detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effects of prison:</td>
<td>Can you think about and list any ways (good or bad) in which being here in prison may affect things turning out the way you want with regard to this goal?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative question</td>
<td>So, overall how will the experience of being here in prison affect you being able to achieve this goal? Choose a number from 0 to 10, where 0 is ‘prison will (or has) completely interfere with me achieving my goal’, and 10 is ‘the prison will (or has completely interfered with me achieving my goal.‘</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects of re-offending:</td>
<td>Can you think about and list any ways (good or bad) in which re-offending in the future may affect things turning out the way you want with regard to this goal?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative question</td>
<td>So, overall if you were to re-offend in the future, how would this affect you achieving this goal? Choose a number from 0 to 10, where 0 is ‘future offending will (or has) completely interfere with me achieving my goal’, and 10 is ‘future offending will (or has completely interfered with me achieving my goal.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Further, the ‘when will it happen’ scale was changed since many offenders found it difficult to suggest when the goal is likely to be achieved. Often they stated that the goal will be achieved after release. Rather than scoring on 0-10 scale, offenders can rate whether the goal can be achieved ‘short-term’, ‘intermediate’ or ‘long-term’. However, this scale needs to be moderated in order to find more use in offenders’ motivation assessment.

In order to improve offenders’ experience during the PACIO interview and also effectiveness of the PACIO, the PACIO ‘Life Area Illustration Sheets’ were designed (Appendix 6). Illustration sheets were used at the start of the interview in a corresponding area. For instance, if the conversation was on education and employment, a sheet with education related pictures was included to make the instruction non-verbal and almost self-explanatory. The sheet contained clearly stated words in large writing. This was to enhance offenders’ understanding and encouragement to engage in the interview. Finally, ‘Unhappiness’ was excluded from the PACIO since offenders had difficulties here. This was since a score of 10 represented ‘the most unhappy’ and a score of 0 represented ‘the least unhappy’.

In brief, the PACIO is administered as a semi-structured interview and contains six broad life areas where offenders can score on eight rating scales from 0-10. Moreover, the PACIO included two idiographic questions regarding the offenders’ experience with being in prison and offending. These changes to the PACIO were tested to be applicable to an offending population and a pilot study with 22 offenders confirmed that the PACIO was applicable with a forensic population. The structure of the PACIO was suggested to keep with the more positive approach in rehabilitation. The PACIO was well received amongst offenders and the PACIO was claimed to
appear to be suitable for exploration of offenders’ treatment motivation (Campbell et al., 2010). In addition, it was concluded that the PACIO showed potential to be a motivation booster and a motivation assessment (Campbell, Sellen & McMurran, in preparation). However, further investigation needed to be conducted to establish the PACIO’s validity and reliability. For instance, more varied levels of offender motivation, rather than long-term offenders in ETS treatment, will be important to investigate.

2.4.3.7 The PACI-O as an STOs’ motivation to education assessment tool

Construct validity, internal reliability and predictive validity were investigated. Construct validity was conducted through the exploratory principal component analysis (PCA) with 113 offenders (N=113; Campbell, 2009). The aim of the PCA is to reduce dimensionality of a data set. This is since it was not clear how many factors would be identified on the PACIO structure. There were two analyses conducted, consistent with PCI-OA, analysing data with and without prison and offending indices. The first analysis without prison and offending scales revealed that there were two factors identified. Factor 1 contained six scales that positively loaded onto this factor. They were likelihood, knowledge, control, importance, happiness and commitment. This factor is similar to adaptive motivation as seen on the PCI (Hosier, 2002; Cox & Klinger, 2004) and the PCI-OA (Sellen et al., 2009). The adaptive motivation factor is stable in PACIO’s predecessors such as PCI-OA (Sellen et al., 2009) and it has been positively correlated with readiness to change (Cox, Blount, Blair & Hosier, 2000). Therefore, adaptive motivation has a potential to assess offenders’ motivation structure. AM had an internal consistency using Cronbach’s
alpha level of .67 which is just below an acceptable level of .70 as a cut-off point. Increasing alpha was suggested to .72 could have been reached by deleting prison rating scales. However, the prison rating scales were claimed to be a useful source of information regarding offenders’ motivation and therefore kept in the PACIO (Campbell, 2009).

Factor 2 had both positive and negative loadings. Importance, commitment and happiness loaded positively and control, knowledge and likelihood loaded negatively. Factor 2, maladaptive motivation, was not consistent with the PCI and the PCI-OA maladaptive motivation factor (Klinger & Cox, 2011; Sellen et al., 2009; see Table 9). Factor 2 was characterised by feelings of importance, commitment and happiness and offenders felt that offending interfered with their goals. In contrary, they also believed that the goals were unlikely to happen, and that there was lack of control over the goals and that prison would interfere with goal attainment. This factor resembles learned helplessness and therefore Factor 2 was renamed ‘learned helplessness/ powerlessness (LH/P)’. With regards to LH/P factor reliability statistic, the LH/P yielded an unacceptable alpha level of .56. If the re-offending scale were removed, this could have raised the alpha level to .61. Campbell (2009) believed that removal of the item may have interfered with the meaning of the scales. This is since it is important to report whether offenders feel that reoffending interferes with their goals. However, it terms of assessing motivation, the offending and prison specific indices were not recommended to be used in the PACIO and the PCI-OA. Only the original six indices which were importance, likelihood, control, knowledge, happiness and commitment were suggested to be used (Campbell, Palmer, Sellen & McMurrnan, in preparation).
Table 9. The factor structure of the PACIO without the prison and offending scales (Campbell, Sellen & McMurran, in preparation).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adaptive motivation</td>
<td>Learned Helplessness/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Powerlessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance</td>
<td>.596</td>
<td>.609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood</td>
<td>.777</td>
<td>-.317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>.676</td>
<td>-.563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What to do</td>
<td>.727</td>
<td>-.414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>.579</td>
<td>.481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>.564</td>
<td>.508</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A second factor analysis was conducted in ‘full’ including the prison and reoffending scales. There were three factors found which were: Factor 1 Adaptive motivation; Factor 2 Maladaptive motivation renamed to Learned Helplessness/Powerlessness LH/P and Factor 3, which was Lack of Direction (LoD). Seven factors loaded positively on Factor 1, adaptive motivation, which were likelihood, knowledge, control, happiness, importance, commitment and prison helps. ‘Offending helps’ did not load on Factor 1.

Four scales loaded positively on Factor 2 which were reoffending affects, commitment, importance and happiness. Three factors loaded negatively which were control, prison helps and likelihood. This factor is characterised by goal importance, commitment, happiness and also by feeling that offending interferes with future goals and also that the goals are unlikely to happen. Moreover, there is a lack of control and
a feeling of prison interference with goal achievement. Factor 2, including the prison and the offending scales on the PACIO, resembles maladaptive motivation with some of the item loadings but also a construct of learned helplessness or powerlessness which was already identified in the validity testing without the prison and the offending scales. The LH/P may have a potential to reveal particular motivational problems which can be addressed and dealt with in a relevant treatment. For instance, low LH/P may further be explored in an interview as to what barriers and obstacles there are for an offender to enter and engage in treatment or an education class. It is important that scores on both, adaptive motivation and LH/P, reflect a particular behaviour such as participation in custodial education (Drieschner, 2005).

Factor 3, Lack of Direction, had two scales that loaded positively onto this factor which were prison helps and importance. Two factors loaded negatively which were reoffending affects and knowledge (see Table 8). The third factor resembles the Lack of Directions on the PCI-OA in that there were positive loadings on prison helps and negative loadings with knowledge and reoffending helps with goal achievement. The third factor identified on the PACIO was Lack of Direction (LoD). This factor explains 13% of the variance. The factor structure of the PCI-OA also identified a Lack of Direction factor, however, ‘Importance’ was an additional positive loading in comparison to the PCI-OA. It was suggested that high scores on LoD as assessed on PCI-OA may indicate early stages of contemplating but there is lack of knowledge on how to achieve goals (Sellen et al., 2009). This factor was not explored in this study since previous studies (Campbell, 2009) suggested an unacceptable alpha level of .18. LoD was not used in this study for its lack of reliability.
Table 10 The PACIO factor structure, including the prison and offending scales (Campbell, Sellen & McMurran, in preparation).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td>Adaptive</td>
<td>Learned Helplessness/Powerlessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance</td>
<td>.631</td>
<td>.483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood</td>
<td>.745</td>
<td>-.353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>.633</td>
<td>-.546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What to do</td>
<td>.722</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>.633</td>
<td>.439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>.583</td>
<td>.480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison affects</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td>-.404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reoffending affects</td>
<td></td>
<td>.549</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4.3.8 Calculation of the PACIO indices

The negative and positive loadings were used to calculate offenders’ adaptive motivation index (AM\textsubscript{(PACIO)} Index), Learned Helplessness/Powerlessness Index (LH/P\textsubscript{(PACIO)} Index) and Lack of Direction Index (LoD\textsubscript{(PACIO)} Index). The AM\textsubscript{(PACIO)} Index is calculated by summing the means of the items that loaded positively which was Commitment, Likelihood, Happiness, Importance, Control, Knowing how, Prison helps and Offending helps. The scores can range from 0-70. In order to obtain a score from 0-10, the score was divided by 7 (a number of factors loading positively onto this factor). The LH/P\textsubscript{(PACIO)} Index is calculated by summing the item means loading
negatively, which were control, prison helps and likelihood and subtracting them from the sum of the means of items loading positively, which were reoffending affects, commitment, importance and happiness. The scores can range from -30 to 40. In order to obtain a score between 0-10, 30 is added and divided by 7 (the number of factors loading onto this factor).

Campbell, Palmer et al., (in preparation) conducted a study to test predictive validity of the PACIO and The Staff Treatment Engagement Questionnaire (STEQ) with 51 offenders (N=51), out of which 31 offenders (N=31) were drawn from general population and 20 sexual offenders (N=20), a week prior commencement of Enhanced Thinking Skills (ETS). The STEQ is a short, 5-item tool to measure the construct of treatment engagement. It was designed for treatment facilitators to indicate offenders’ dynamic risk factors which are aimed to bring about change, such as concentration during treatment, group work and assignment completion. The STEQ was completed by the facilitators post-ETS. The results revealed that adaptive motivation on the PACIO did not correlate with treatment engagement as measured on the STEQ. However, when tested by split population, there was a positive correlation between the AM\textsubscript{PACIO} and treatment engagement in general population (r=.302.; p<.05). However, there was no significant relationship in sexual offender population (r=.180; p>.05). Predictive validity of the LH/P and treatment engagement on the STEQ for all offenders (N=51) was negatively related (r=-.341, p<.05). This was also true for general population (r=-.401, p<.05) but participants in the sex offending population did not significantly correlated LH/P with the facilitators’ scores on their treatment engagement (r=-.330, p>.05). Adaptive motivation was negatively related to LH/P
2.4.3.9 The PACIO as a preparatory motivational intervention

Previous research on PACIO’s predecessor, adapted for use with treatment refusers (PCI-OA(TR)), suggested that sex-offenders refusing treatment who received the PCI-OA (TR) intervention were at least 0.6 times more likely to show ‘positive motivational shift’ towards their future treatment when compared to treatment refusers who did not receive the PCI-OA (TR) intervention (Theodosi & McMurran, 2006). However, the PCI-OA has not been explored as a potential motivation engagement enhancer. Predictive validity of the PACIO tested adaptive motivation and LH/P and how it related to treatment engagement (Campbell, Palmer et al., in preparation). Moreover, adaptive motivation and LH/P were also compared before and after ETS treatment. There were in total 46 offenders, but the number of offenders in each group, the general population and sexual offenders, is not known. The analysis revealed that AM_(PACIO) was significantly higher post-PACIO in comparison pre-PACIO (z =-2.80, p < .01). Further, there was a significant increase in AM_(PACIO) for general population but not with sexual offenders (z = 2.61, p < .05, d = .45 and z =1.16, p > .05, d = .28 respectively). LH/P was significantly lower after ETS for the mixed sample and general population (z =-3.38, p < .001, d = .55 and z =-3.43, p < .001, d = 1.50). However, there was not a significant reduction on LH/P in sexual offenders (z = -1.02, p>.05, d = .19; Campbell, Palmer et al., in preparation).

Campbell (2009) conducted randomised controlled trial to establish whether the PACIO is an effective enhancer of treatment motivation measured on the STEQ and the Prisoner Treatment Engagement Questionnaire (PTEQ) which in turn increases adaptive motivation and reduces criminogenic needs such as impulsivity.
The PTEQ is a self-report version of the STEQ for offenders to rate their own treatment engagement. The PTEQ and STEQ were amalgamated. Impulsivity was measure on the Eysenck’s Impulsivity Scale (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1978). It is self-report, a 22 item scale which was administered before and after ETS. One of the crime-related dynamic risk factors that ETS aims to reduce is impulsivity in order to reduce reoffending (Hollin, 2008; Andrew & Bonta, 2011). The study included 111 offenders out of which 72 were offenders from general population and 39 were sexual offenders. The total number of offenders differed in each analyses due to drop out. The number of offenders in each of the analysis will be reported with the findings. Firstly, adaptive motivation was assessed pre-ETS between the PACIO group and the control group. There were 93 offenders out of which 47 were in the PACIO group and 47 in the control condition. The analysis revealed that offenders in the PACIO group in the combined sample had significantly higher levels of AM\textsubscript{PACIO} (T=2.12, p<.05, d = .44). Secondly, analyses regarding treatment engagement measured by an amalgamated scores on STEQ and PTEQ (N=93) revealed that the PACIO group drawn from a combined sample scored significantly higher than offenders in the control group post ETS (z = -2.01, p < .05, d = .42). Finally, impulsivity scores with 80 participants (N=80) in the PACIO group measured post-ETS was significantly lower in comparison to the control group post-ETS (t =-1.93, p < .05, d = 43; Campbell, 2009).

2.5 Motivational Interviewing (MI)

The MI is a conversational approach which focuses on exploration and resolution of ambivalence. It is a client-centred approach encouraging motivational
processes connected with the individual’s behavioural change (Rollnick & Miller, 1995). This approach does not impose how and what an individual should change but rather supports change which is congruent with the individuals own values, beliefs and wishes.

MI was originally developed and used with substance abusers to increase motivation to change behaviour (Miller 1985; Miller & Rollnick, 1991; 2002). However, MI has been used in forensic settings as substance abuse is prevalent amongst offenders and it can be argued that uncontrolled drinking and offending have certain behaviours in common such as prioritising short-term rewards over long term adverse effects (McMurran, 2009). A meta-analytic review revealed that a single therapy session using MI principles was effective in reducing excessive drinking. The effect of the MI appeared to increase over time with an effect size of .18 but a three month follow up period increased the effect size to .60 (Vasilaki, Hosier, & Cox, 2006). Thus it seems that there was a positive delayed effect of MI on the level of drinking. This may be useful in forensic settings as the effects of MI may be useful in increasing STOs’ education participation. It has been suggested that exploring offenders’ goals and establishing offenders’ motivational structure may be useful prior therapy (McMurran et al., 2011) and MI may be useful in improving STOs’ motivational profiles.

Rollnick & Miller (1995) defined motivational interviewing as ‘a directive, client-centred counselling style for eliciting behaviour change by helping clients explore and resolve ambivalence’ (p.325). MI and the more traditional counselling techniques involve respectful collaboration between a client and a facilitator, exploration of client’s values and beliefs and increasing motivation to change desired
behaviours. MI is non-confrontation, and aims to elicit change statements from the client rather than change being imposed by the facilitator (Miller & Rollnick, 2013). Moreover, MI uses some techniques from non-directional Rogerian counselling. Nevertheless, MI therapies are directional as a clear structure is needed during sessions (Miller & Rollnick, 2013).

There are four core principles of MI which guide a facilitator throughout treatment. These principles are 1. Expressing Empathy; 2. Supporting Self-efficacy; 3. Rolling with Resistance; and 4. Developing Discrepancy.

1. **Expressing Empathy** is an important element in order to see client’s problems or concerns from his/her perspective. This approach provides the basis for a client to be understood and he/she is more likely to share their experience. The level of expressing empathy is dependent on the facilitator’s understanding of client’s experiences without being judgemental.

2. **Supporting Self-Efficacy** is an approach where it is believed that clients are capable of successful change. This includes that the client himself/herself believes that they are able to change. It is important that the facilitator concentrates on the client’s strength and stresses past successes as previous difficulties in making changes may promote feelings of doubt and general failure.

3. **Rolling with Resistance.** In some, treatment resistance may occur as the counsellor’s problem solutions are not compatible with the client’s. This approach suggests avoiding arguing for change but rather de-escalating or avoiding negative interaction by ‘rolling with it’. Solutions to the client’s problems and concerns have to be suggested by the clients as such solutions are accompanied by no resistance.
4. Developing Discrepancy. Problems and concerns which are accompanied by negative interaction should stay unchallenged especially in the beginning of client-facilitator relationship. However, in order to promote motivation to change, the current situation (where I am now) and the future situation (where I would like to be) need to be evaluated. Thus, successful recognition of a discrepancy between the current state and the client’s future goals are important as these discrepancies are likely to motivate clients to make desired life changes.

These four principles - expressing empathy, supporting self-efficacy, rolling with resistance and developing discrepancy - are used during therapy but should be viewed and anchored within a sound theoretical framework. There are three central concepts which guided the methodological development of MI. These are: 1. Readiness; 2. Ambivalence; and 3. Resistance. The readiness aspect is concerned with the client’s readiness to change. It is believed that motivation is a state of readiness which fluctuates and can be influenced by others (Miller & Rollnick, 1991). The process of change can be viewed in the form of stages, such as DiClemente & Prochaska’s (1998) Stages of Change Model (SoC), or as a continuum (Miller & Rollnick, 2013). The SoC proposed that change happens in a sequence of individual stages but its empirical evidence is rather limited. However, Miller suggested that the SoC generally, provided counsellors with some inspiration to realise that different clients in different stages of motivation and readiness to change have different needs (Miller & Rollnick, 2013). If a change is not seen as a process happening in stages but it is seen as a continuum, it is important that the therapist keeps pace with the client. If
not, the application of the MI is endangered as it would result in client’s resistance and therefore failed to meet one of its core clinical application principles.

The next useful concept that was placed at the centre of MI was ambivalence. The concept allowed dealing with uncertainty about changing behaviour. For a person making the change, the process can be painful and effortful as there is a need to reconfigure current values and beliefs. Moreover, the time of ambivalence can be crucial in therapy as a client establishes new viewpoints and beliefs. There is a link between ambivalence and resistance. A client’s behaviour can be resistant when a facilitator does not work in harmony with the client. However, the client-facilitator relationship can be corrected providing that the counsellor selects a non-confrontational approach. Resistance can be seen in the facilitator’s eyes as denial or a lack of motivation to make a change (Miller & Rollnick, 2013). Importantly, in forensic settings it may be that the client complies with the facilitator in order not to be labelled as unmotivated or in denial which may influence his/her sentence status. Thus, in clinical practice attention has to be given to creating ambivalence and avoiding resistance.

2.5.1 Motivational Interviewing and PACIO for STOs

The majority of offenders are not entitled to any treatment due to their types and lengths of sentences. Offenders serving shorter sentences (under 12 months) constitute less than 10% of the total prison population but account for 65% of all admissions and releases (MoJ, 2013a). Therefore, assessing and increasing STOs’ motivation to change, namely to reduce reconviction, should be a priority. There is some evidence to suggest that MI can be effective with offenders (e.g., Ginsburg,
Mann, Rotgers, & Weekes, 2002; McMurren, 2009; Anstiss, Polaschek, & Wilson, 2011). Anstiss et al. (2011)’s study conducted in New Zealand, showed that MI can be effective for medium risk offenders in terms of increasing offenders’ motivation to change and also risk of recidivism. Another study from New Zealand revealed that an adaptation of MI, called the Short Motivational Programme (SMP), was effective with high risk offenders serving short sentences in terms of motivation to change (Austin, Williams & Kilgour, 2011). Thirty-eight offenders were measured by the adapted version of the URICA which was SMP URICA (Anstiss, Steyn & Devereux, 2007). It was concluded that there was a significant shift in the offenders’ motivation. However, the risk of reconviction, as measured by the Risk of Reincarceration scale (Bakker, O’Malley & Riley, 1999), showed a higher mean risk of recidivism. This means that perhaps, high-risk offenders require high intensity intervention (Andrews & Bonta, 2010). Given the importance of entering and engaging in rehabilitation, added MI to the PACIO as one of the interventions may be worth exploring in this study.

MI is a counselling technique with a clear structure (Rollnick & Miller, 1995). This counselling format seems to be compatible with the structure of PACIO and appropriate for use with STOs. It appears that it has the potential to add to the current format of the PACIO’s counselling aspect such as expressing empathy and making sure that ambivalence is encouraged and resolution is generated by the offender rather than being imposed by the professional. The development of discrepancy may be motivational for the offender as the current situation in comparison to his/her future plans may encourage offenders to strive towards their pro social goals. Furthermore, the PACIO structure also allows discussing the offender’s goals in relations to his/her offending.
Offenders’ motivation to treatment is often taken as an indicator of general motivation to change behaviour (Campbell et al., 2010). However, the STOs level of motivation to change and readiness to change should be separated from the treatment motivation and treatment engagement. Motivation of STOs to change behaviour and motivation to stop reoffending should be addressed in a motivation assessment in custody and putting in place a strategy to tackle the behavioural change and reoffending. Perhaps, offenders sentenced to short sentences in custody should be treated as ‘in preparatory time’ for interventions to change behaviour and stop reoffending after release to engage in treatment in supervision in community.

2.6 Conclusion

This chapter presented the current models of rehabilitation and motivation. The RNR and the GLM are overarching models of offenders’ rehabilitation and each of the models has a different focus. While the RNR model aims to eliminate criminogenic needs such as antisocial personality and education in order to reduce reoffending (Andrews et al., 1990), the GLM focuses on supporting offenders’ goals to live ‘better lives’. The model encourages offenders to attain primary goods, such as mastery knowledge through secondary goods, which can be achieved by improving education. The RNR and GLM claim that offenders’ motivation affects treatment engagement. Motivation in the RNR model is part of the responsivity principle (McMurran & Ward, 2010) and according to the GLM treatment readiness is important in successful rehabilitation (Ward & Brown, 2004).

While it seems that motivation and readiness are vital in treatment, there is lack of clarification of what the constructs are. The MORM (Ward, Day, Howells &
Birgden, 2004) may help to explain offenders’ readiness for treatment. Ward et al. (2004) claimed that factors that influence readiness to treatment include external and internal factors. The latter includes volition which is in other words motivation to change (Ward et al., 2004). Research suggested that there is a positive correlation between offenders’ treatment readiness and behavioural change (McMurran & Ward, 2010). Thus, offenders’ readiness must be addressed in order to reduce crime related behaviour and also to improve offenders’ lives by encouraging them to achieve their goals. Motivation as one of the factors of readiness to treatment is of specific interest as offenders will not enter and engage in treatment if they are not motivated to participate. Drieschner’s model of motivation acknowledges internal and external factors such as problem recognition, perceived external pressure and personal circumstances to play a role in clients’ motivation to engage in treatment. This model has not specifically been used in prison setting and it does not place offenders’ goals that they aspire to achieve in the centre of rehabilitation but rather, it aims to capture treatment motivation including internal motivation factors such as personal circumstances and problem recognition.

Despite the importance of motivation in treatment engagement, there remains a lack of interventions and tools available to assess and improve the level of motivation prior to treatment (Campbell, 2009). One of the tools that has shown potential to be used with offenders’ treatment as a motivation assessment and enhancer was the Personal Aspiration and Concerns Inventory for Offenders (Campbell et al., 2010). The PACIO has a strong theoretical background as it is based on the Theory of Current Concerns. The PACIO seems to be a time-efficient tool used to assess and enhance offenders’ motivation for treatment. The shortened format may make it more suitable for use with the prison population serving short sentences as it
taps into areas of offenders’ needs (Campbell et al., 2010; McMurran, 2009).

Furthermore, research suggested that Motivational Interviewing (MI; see section 1.5) is a useful tool promoting external/internal motivation shift, that is motivation which is externally driven to self-determined actions (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Therefore, combining the PACIO, to establish offenders’ concerns and aspirations, in combination with some principles on the MI may offer enhanced effect in terms of behavioural change such as improved participation in education which has been shown to reduce reconviction.

However, there is lack of qualitative research on short-term offenders (STOs), specifically in terms of their views and opinions about the role of education and relevant behaviours in employment. Therefore, an exploratory study into STOs’ concerns and issues surrounding their past experiences, current situation and future plans are explored in the following chapter 3.
Chapter 3 Short-term offenders’ (STOs) issues with employment. An exploratory study

Summary

One of the seven National Offender Management Service (NOMS, 2012) pathways to reoffending and rehabilitation is Employment, Training and Education (ETE; see 1.2). Offenders’ employment status prior to custody and also participation in prison activities have been linked to better prospects of employment and a drop in reoffending after release. However, short-term offenders (STOs) lives may be disrupted by the frequent stays in prison which may influence their ETE opportunities after release. Nevertheless, there are other factors that influence employment, education and offending which are, for instance, lack of accommodation, drug abuse, lack of family support and ‘soft skills’ such as effective communication.

Six STOs were recruited for this study to explore their concerns regarding longer-term employment. Semi-structured interviews (SSIs) were conducted in custody and thematic analysis was employed to analyse the SSIs using the NVivo 8 computer programme. The analysis focused on education and STOs’ thoughts and feelings on gaining employment. The findings described a plethora of factors which play an important role in gaining employment. The results indicated that the STOs did not make references to education and better prospects regarding employment after release. The lack of awareness of the benefits of education may result in STOs’ lack of motivation to participate in custodial education. The findings and implications of STOs’ employment concerns and issues are discussed.
3.1 Introduction

The NOMS offending/rehabilitative pathways appear to offer a useful structure in identifying offenders’ possible issues and problems to reduce re-offending (see 1.2). The pathways include offenders’ accommodation; mental and physical health; children and families of offenders; drugs and alcohol; finance, benefit, debt; attitudes, thinking and behaviour; and education, training and employment (ETE; Home Office, 2004; see section 1.2). The aim of the NOMS pathways is to identify criminogenic needs of offenders but also to suggest pathways where rehabilitation of offenders should be considered. For instance, there is evidence to suggest that employment can be an effective means in reducing recidivism (Farrington et al., 1986; Lipsey, 1995; Andrews et al., 2006). In understanding the relationship between lack of employment and crime, there is a need to acknowledge influences of other factors such as lack of education, accommodation and attitudes towards employment as well as personal values. Research with long-term offenders sentenced between 18 months and four years showed a direct relationship between participation in accredited programmes and vocational activities in prison and increased employment rates after release (Brunton-Smith & Hopkins, 2013). Moreover, Wilson et al. (2000) suggested in their meta-analysis of 33 studies a negative relationship between vocational programmes and recidivism. Vacca (2004) claimed that offenders participate in programmes which help with social, vocational and academic programmes because ‘they see clear opportunities to improve their capabilities for employment after being released’ (p. 297). However, there is lack of research regarding offenders’ views and stands on the issue of employment, especially for those sentenced to short custodial sentences. Since lack of employment has been associated with many criminogenic needs such as low education, this study aim to explore STOs’ employment issues and
concerns. Despite the wide range of criminogenic factors that may lead to reoffending (Chapter 1) education and attitudes, thinking and behaviour in relation to employment will be described and evaluated in more detail since both, level of education and offenders’ thinking, have been associated with likelihood of gaining employment (Brunton-Smith & Hopkins, 2013; Duwe, 2014). Further, this study is relevant to the main study using a Randomised Controlled trial methodology as it aims to help with understanding processes involved during recruitment and interviewing when conducting the RCT in the main study.

3.2 Employment, Training and Education (ETE)

Typically, offenders are characterised by frequent short jobless periods rather than long-term unemployment (Fagan, 1995; Sullivan, 1989) and increased unemployment rates in comparison to the general public. Hopkins (2012) analysed employment, training and education issues in a sample of 1,435 offenders from the Surveying Prisoner Crime Reduction (SPCR) study. The sample consisted of men and women from different ethnic backgrounds. Thirty-two percent of the researched offending cohort had paid employment in the four week period prior to incarceration. Out of those offenders who were employed prior to custody, 63% reported to be returning to the same job post-release (Hopkins, 2012). A follow up study based on interviews up to six months post-release showed that 28% of offenders have worked after release from prison. Moreover, 73% claimed benefits almost immediately after release (Hopkins & Brunton-Smith, 2014) which has been associated with increased reconviction rate 12 months after release which was 58% in comparison to those who did not receive benefits, which was 42% (Hopkins, 2012). Moreover, offenders who
did not have any problems with employment or accommodation and those offenders who had either a problem with employment or accommodation reported 43% and 55% reoffending rates 12 months post-release. However, if both employment and accommodation were perceived as problematic, there was 74% reoffending rate (May, Sharma & Stewart, 2008).

Employment 12 months prior to custody and having qualifications were associated with reduced reconviction 12 months post-release in comparison to offenders who were unemployed, which was 40% in comparison with 65%. Offenders who reported a qualification were less likely to be reconvicted 12 months after release in comparison to those who reported no qualification, which was 45% in comparison with 60% respectively (Hopkins, 2012). However, those offenders who repeatedly spend time in custody, such as short-term offenders (MoJ, 2013a; see 1.1.1), may have their lives more disrupted than longer sentenced offenders. Frequent instances of incarceration and adaptation to prison life include issues, for instance, around accommodation and employment prior to custody. Furthermore, offenders, as a result of their incarceration, may suffer life-long exclusion and stigma (Social Exclusion Unit, 2002).

Offenders’ with custodial sentences have the right and are encouraged to participate in prison based education activities. However, there is limited provision in custody with regards to educational and vocational courses for STOs despite some evidence that education is important in many aspects of social and personal life. Offenders with inadequate education and vocational skills can struggle with finding employment (Metcalf et al., 2001; Vacca, 2004; Nally, Lockwood & Ho, 2011;
Hopkins, 2012) and are more likely to recidivate (Lockwood Nally, Ho & Knutson,, 2012). Offenders’ low education may be strengthened by other criminogenic needs that many offenders are characterised with such as prevalence of drug abuse and antisocial attitudes (Metcalf, 2001; Farrington, 2006; Andrews et al., 2006). Moreover, other factors such as having a criminal record and limited interpersonal skills (Rossman & Roman, 2003) may be detrimental to gaining employment especially in the period of economic downturn due to heightened competition for available employment vacancies (Pager, 2003). Therefore, gaining employment for offenders can be a complex and complicated issue since offenders have been suggested to lack education, discrimination based on their criminal record and appropriate attitudes or ‘soft skills’, including effective communication and behaviours relevant for sustaining employment (Chartered Institute of Personel and Development; CIPD; 2007).

### 3.3 Offenders’ attitudes, thinking and behaviour

The SEU report (2002) stated that offenders often come from areas which are socially deprived and where crime is often viewed as acceptable. Farrington et al. (2009) suggested that individual predictors such as low school attainment, impulsivity and attention problems may play an important role in offending. These factors were suggested to be predictors for displaying certain attitudes and behaviours leading to antisocial behaviour and offending. These antisocial attitudes can also contribute to the inability or difficulty of finding and keeping employment.

A person with antisocial attitudes can be characterized by displaying socially disapproved behaviours, including difficulty to conform to social norms, impulsive behaviour, irresponsibility and aggressiveness which are prevalent in forensic settings
(Andrews & Bonta, 2003; Jones, Miller, & Lynam, 2011). It appears that there is lack of offenders’ insight into appropriate employment related attitudes and behaviour which can be a significant barrier for offenders to secure a job and also stop offending (Zhang, Roberts & Callanan, 2006).

However, attitudes and behaviours sought by employers are different. In order to gain employment employers willing to employ an ex-offender require relevant employment skills (Albright & Denq, 1996; Graffam, Shinkfield & Hardcastle, 2008), accompanied by appropriate employability skills or ‘soft skills’ (SEU, 2002). These according to the CIPD survey included honesty, reliability and personal behaviour. Thus, pro-social, employment-friendly attitudes in offenders’ conduct need to be acknowledged and encouraged, and also better understanding of offenders’ potential regarding employment needs to be promoted (CIPD, 2007).

The role of employment has been established in terms of reduction of reoffending (Farrington et al., 2006). Moreover, there is association between adequate education and better prospects of employment post-custody (Hopkins, 2012). This study aimed to explore STOs’ thoughts and concerns toward their situation with employment. The interviews focused on past and current experiences and future plans in search for employment. These included problems the STOs had experienced when searching and gaining employment in the past. Future plans regarding employment and life goals and the perception of the prison facilitating the plans were explored. Further, the STOs considered potential problems they may face upon their release from custody in the future (see SSI schedule in Appendix 1). The study focussed on three factors, namely employment, education and STOs’ attitudes and beliefs, which
were amongst other identified NOMS pathways and factors to reoffending (Home Office, 2004).

3.4 Method

3.4.1 Participants

There were six offenders involved in the study, aged between 21 and 54 years old. They were interviewed in one of the prison establishments in South Wales. Offenders with sentences shorter than 12 months were targetted. The offenders were selected from the Local Inmate Database System (LIDS) which is a prison computer system holding information on all the offenders in the establishment. The six STOs were sentenced on a Friday and all the STOs who were sentenced on that particular day agreed to participate in the study. The STOs’ sentences ranged from 1 month and 11 days up to 12 months in custody. The offenders were serving sentences for offences such as driving while disqualified, drug related offences and robbery. At the time of the initial contact and of the subsequent interviews, no participants were learners in the Learning and Skills Department, or engaged in any purposeful activities within the prison establishment. Five out of six offenders had served a prison sentence prior to the sentence they were serving at the time of the interview. The highest education achievement was Level 1 in English and Maths and two out of six had a vocational qualification through apprenticeship. No STOs were working in the time before coming to custody.
3.4.2 Design

This study used a qualitative design. Qualitative research aims ‘to understand and interpret more local meanings’ (Braun & Clarke, 2013; p.4). Therefore, the qualitative design was appropriate to use in the forensic setting to explore STOs’ employment issues as it enabled in depth exploration of STOs’ thoughts about life areas relating to employment and education. Braun and Clarke also suggested that qualitative methods can generate knowledge that may later be used as an underpinning for more general understanding. For instance, exploration of rich data from the accounts of the six STOs in this study widened understanding and knowledge on STOs’ employment, education and attitudes and in that how STOs discussed the relationship between experience with gaining employment and the need to improve skills and knowledge and attitudes and behaviours. The findings in this study informed the main study in terms of the importance of education in custody and changing behaviour.

Semi-structured interviews were employed to elicit views and opinions of STOs’ on searching for employment. Accounts of incarcerated offenders of their experience with searching for and gaining employment were explored by using a semi-structured interview schedule (SSI schedule; see Appendix 1).

3.4.3 Materials

A SSI schedule was developed that considered four sections: past experience (from school and childhood), present situation (prison experience, employability skills
and barriers to employment), future plans regarding work and finally individual experience (what strengths and weaknesses they can identify within themselves with regard to employment). Furthermore, an Information sheet (see Appendix 2) and a consent form (see Appendix 3) were developed and used during recruitment.

NVivo 8 is a computer software programme to help in the analysis of qualitative data and thus I used NVivo to organise and classify information as I was reading the interviews. NVivo 8 relies on the information from the semi-structured interviews that was transcribed into it. NVivo 8 did not analyse the data but allowed me to conduct the analysis in a structured way in a complete database instead of analysing and using paper or other separate computer programmes.

3.4.4 Procedure

A list of newly sentenced offenders were generated from the prison database (C-NOMIS) on Friday. This was since it was found out that the majority of newly sentenced offenders arrive on Fridays. There were in total six STOs and they were approached on the next working day after being sentenced, which was a Monday. All STOs were approached on their wing landings on the Monday and asked whether they would like to participate in the research. Participants were informed about the purpose of the study and what it involved. Each participant was given an Information sheet (see Appendix 2) and informed consent was obtained from each participant (see Appendix 3). The STOs were informed that they could withdraw from the study at any point. All the STOs who were approached, agreed to participate. Semi-structured interviews took place in prison interview rooms in the Resettlement Department in
custody within the week they had been initially approached. The interviews lasted 40 minutes and were recorded and names of the participants were changed to ensure confidentiality. The interviews were recorded on a recording device and later the interviews were transcribed, saved and analysed in NVivo.

3.4.5 Data Analysis

The qualitative method employed here used Thematic analysis (TA). TA provides a guideline in terms of data analysis. This study used Braun & Clarke (2013) six stages of coding and analysis. They include 1. Transcription, of interviews from an audio device onto a Word document; 2. Reading and familiarisation, of the transcribed interviews; 3.Coding of prominent topics; 4. Searching for themes; 5. Reviewing themes and establishing relationship between themes and subthemes in order to create a ‘thematic map’; and lastly, 6. Defining and naming themes.

In order to understand the meaning of the STOs interviews I immersed myself in the data and I identified themes, which were clustered into super-ordinate themes with similar theme pattern of meaning (Braun & Clarke, 2006). In this study a bottom up (or an inductive) approach was used to establish multiple sub-themes. The sub-themes were grouped to some more narrow themes and later a more theoretical, deductive approach was used to essentially re-define the themes and relate them onto the NOMS pathways. This was done as the NOMS pathways are supported by evidence from ‘What Works’ literature and thus it seemed to be appropriate to relate the results from this study onto established pathways. TA can be used to explore any research question and therefore appropriate to be used in forensic setting to explore
STOs’ concerns regarding employment. TA does not prescribe how the data should be collected (Braun & Clarke, 2013) so in this study, semi-structured interviews were used.

Firstly, the interviews were read repeatedly to familiarise myself with the interviews. During the last reading, I established and coded sub-themes which emerged from the data. For instance, the subthemes included themes regarding housing such as difficulties to find stable accommodation and difficulties to pay the rent; problems with mental and physical health such as depression and rheumatoid arthritis; support of STOs’ families in terms of trying to provided employment where possible and also providing financial and emotional support after release generally; drug abuse and how it may have hindered job prospects; finding a stable employment such as obstacles to secure and sustain employment and a prospect of having employment after release; and also provision in custody regarding employment and employability skills and having appropriate attitudes and behaviours to be able to gain employment after release. For instance, the sub-themes in the employment theme included perceived barriers to gain employment; job search; and motivation to work. The education theme included sub-themes which were STOs education experience in school; education experience in custody; and future plans regarding education and training after release. Finally, attitudes, thinking and behaviours included sub-themes which were passion for work; passive approach in job search; violent behaviour at school. The themes that emerged from the interview transcripts were similar to the themes that have been identified by the NOMS. Therefore, a deductive approach to data analysis was adopted to map the STOs themes onto a more theoretical framework.
of criminogenic factors which was the NOMS (2004) pathways. Employment and Education and training was separated into two individual pathways (see 3.5).

3.5 Results

The themes that emerged during thematic analysis were: Accommodation; Mental and physical health; Children and families of offenders; Attitudes, thinking and behaviour; Education, Training and Employment (ETE); Drugs and alcohol abuse; and Finance, benefit and debt (Table 11).
Table 11 Emerging subthemes used to re-establish the NOMS pathways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subthemes</th>
<th>NOMS pathways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finding a place to live</td>
<td>1. Accommodation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in a different area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My health problems and inability to work</td>
<td>2. Mental and physical health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little support with health problems in prison</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive family</td>
<td>3. Children and families of offenders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having children did not help change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans to support family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My benefits of working</td>
<td>4. Attitudes, thinking and behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who am I?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passion for work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not knowing what to do after release</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and training:</td>
<td>5. Education, Training and Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Negative school experience</td>
<td>(ETE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Behavioural problems at school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Education in prison is easy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Short sentences don’t help education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Barriers to gaining employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Prison not helpful to assist with jobs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Jobs through relatives after release</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Unemployment experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs are a barrier</td>
<td>6. Drugs and alcohol abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends take drugs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-compliance with a drug programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison helps with drugs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claiming benefits</td>
<td>7. Finance, benefit and debt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State benefits never claimed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better working than on benefits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ETE pathway was divided into two separate pathways which were Employment pathway and Education and training pathway (Table 12). The reason was that the STOs seemed to describe and discuss emerging issues related to education and employment separately. Within the eight themes, STOs’ issues and thoughts in a particular area were highlighted. Evidence is provided for the eight emerged themes when the STOs were discussing their employment and employability situations (Table 12).
Table 12. STOs evidence to support the eight themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pathway</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Employment</td>
<td>Yeah…There ain’t any (work).That’s the only thing that’s stoppin’ me (Tony) I do wanna work but being in the prison, having a criminal record, it’s hard to find a job, ain’t it? (Martin)</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Education and Training</td>
<td>I’m not here long enough to do any courses ... (George) Yeah, I’ve done all the courses...I’ve done ETS and then English and Maths ...I was a gym orderly ...(John)</td>
<td>350-351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Attitudes, thinking and behaviour</td>
<td>I don’t know. I have never come across that (criteria employers look for in an employee; George) I want to get back to work. I…I…I need to get a structure in my life ... (Tom)</td>
<td>571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Accommodation</td>
<td>(I’m) No Fixed Abode so ...housing is more important than employment ...(John)</td>
<td>484-485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mental and physical health</td>
<td>Nothin’ apart from my fingers (hurt) ... I want to claim… incapacity benefits (Jeff)</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Children and families of offenders</td>
<td>I’ve had loads of chances They’ve given up now, you know? …I’m just on my own two feet ... and that’s it!”</td>
<td>509-511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Drugs and alcohol</td>
<td>Just hanging about with my mates in the street corners smoking cannabis all day drinking...(George)</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Finance and Debt</td>
<td>Factory work these days they pay £50 or £60 more than you’d get on benefits…(Martin)</td>
<td>593-594</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ‘LOCATION’ refers to the line number of a particular quote within an interview transcript.

Offenders’s names had been changed and their pseudonyms were used throughout the thesis.
The STOs discussed issues relating directly to employment such as barriers to gaining employment. These included lack of employment opportunities and having a criminal record. Matters regarding Education and training pathway seemed to be separate to those of employment, as the STOs pointed out difficulties they may have had in terms of attending school, including behavioural problems and custodial education, including the length of the custodial sentence and what courses and activities they attended when they were in prison previously. The STOs referred to some importance of employment. For instance, some STOs seemed to be motivated to find employment as one STO claimed that he wanted to go back to work, and another STO said that being in employment was financially better than being on benefits. However, each STO had a set of reasons which they thought can have or could have had impact on their employment such as no accommodation after release, physical disability, lack of support from family, problems with drugs and financial benefits of employment. The STOs made no references to the need to improve education, requalify or changing attitudes to become more employable, despite, generally, having low levels of education and having qualifications for jobs they could no longer do due to health problems and drug abuse.

The following analysis focussed on STOs’ accounts in the three areas outlined by NOMS which were employment, education and attitudes. The focus is on the three themes because it seemed that STOs presented with little awareness of the importance of relevant education and appropriate attitudes in gaining employment which in turn could have impact on their motivation to change, both in terms of better prospects of finding employment and reduce their reoffending.
3.5.1 Employment

STOs constructed accounts around jobs and work that often highlighted resistance to their finding work or changing behaviour (sometimes while recognising the damage their behaviours had). However, the theme of employment shows an awareness of how their offending history also impacts on their prospects. Employment was seen as beneficial, something desired and needed yet not always a simple option for them.

Tom was asked whether he felt motivated to find employment. When thinking about his daily routine, Tom said:

Yeah, I want to get back to work. I…I…I need to get a structure in my life basically. That’s the main thing. There is no structure in my life at the moment ehm…(Lines 270-271).

Tom was aware that alcohol has had a great impact on his physical and mental health and believed that gaining employment would be advantageous for him in terms of stopping drinking as he said that:

Getting money would be one thing but just keeping busy…keep alcohol free. It’s been like I said almost 4 years. I’ve had couple of lapses in that 4 years, you know, but ‘cause ultimately it’s gonna kill me if I continue (Lines 273-276).

However, Jeff said that the only barrier that may stop him from getting a job is his criminal record as he said that:
Well in my mind I can’t get a job in security kind of job ‘cause I have a record from childhood, you know from… from like being a teenager (Lines 286-287).

Tony also believed that his criminal history may stop employers giving him a job. He said that ... maybe my record...could be a barrier to gain employment (Line 315).

Employment issues and concerns were at time discussed with some level of perceived frustration as some STOs, such as Tony, pointed out that the offending history can be used to distance the accounts of work and employment further from a need to change behaviours. Thus potentially, the criminal record can be both a barrier to employment and justification for unemployment. Despite the STOs’ making links with employment and other pathways such as accommodation and mental and physical health, little evidence was provided to connect employment with education.

3.5.2 Education and Training

Skills and knowledge for work are vital in finding employment, and these are often demonstrated through appropriate vocational and academic qualifications. Most STOs had low level of education and few qualifications. For instance this was the case for George who did not gain any qualifications and he did not seem to focus on the value of education:
Similarly to George, Tony did not have any qualifications when he left school
his education was widened when in custody as he claimed that:

Yeah, I’ve done all the courses...I’ve done ETS* and then English and Maths and
word production education for a few months and I was a gym orderly then so then I
was going to the gym like ... I’ve also done a computer course...I’ve done CLAIT* as
well (Lines 143-147;*ETS – Enhanced Thinking Skills; *CLAIT – Computer Literacy
and Information Technology).

The completion of the courses was during a prior custodial sentence.
However, Tony did not suggest the use of custodial education in helping to secure a
job after release. As he stated, he completed many courses in custody and was sent to
complete a forklift licence qualification by a job centre after release. However, he got
a job as a washer.

… So I went to a forklift driving course, passed my forklift driving license and they
offered me a job down there, washing holding tanks (Line 180-182)

Although Tony participated in education while he was previously in custody
and gained some qualifications, Tony did not seem to need the qualifications for
doing the unskilled job as a washer. So, it would be important to equip STOs with
knowledge and skills so they would be able to gain employment but at the same time, employers need to offer jobs to people with criminal records.

Another participant, Martin, engaged in educational courses while in custody. However, he did not feel they were relevant for him as he had achieved higher levels before going into custody. Martin attended the classes as he wanted to avoid trouble if he refused to attend classes in custody which he was allocated to due to vacant spaces:

_Ehm...I’ve just finished my level 1 Maths and English but I already got my GCSE and things. I’ve got Key skills so I didn’t find it relevant to me. I’ve done the exam ‘cause I would’ve got a written warning if I refused so I’ve done my Maths and English exams, passed them..._(Lines 412-416).

Moreover, he suggested that he was not able to do what he would have liked to do within the time frame of his sentence:

_I’m not here long enough to do any courses so I can’t put down for bricklaying or painting and decorating. I can’t cause I won’t be here so...basically I’m just waiting for workshops get back to me that they might have some odd thing for me to do, I don’t know..._(Lines 420-424).

It seems that the courses in custody were not beneficial for Martin and he finished them under pressure without being able to decide what he wanted to do. Appropriate provision of courses, and access to courses, is important in helping offenders find employment, and also to help widen access to other employment.
The educational opportunities offered in prison can be seen as problematic and inconsistent with individual needs, particularly for Tony and Martin. Tony was not clear that the courses already completed had helped him to gain a place on the forklift course, whilst Martin was under pressure to attend basic skills courses. The skills that Martin wanted to improve were not available for him to achieve as he was serving a short custodial sentence. However, education and training did not seem to be perceived as transformative. It does raise a question of ‘purposeful activities’ in prison and how it is tailored to offender needs. Moreover, the lack of awareness of education and training benefits and a prospect of gaining employment leads to STOs’ the need to increase motivation to engagement in the ‘purposeful activities’ such as educational classes and vocational training in custody.

3.5.3 Attitudes and Thinking Behaviour

In order to gain employment it is important to have the relevant education, and training, employability skills and also the appropriate attitudes. It may be that an offender has all the relevant training and vocational skills to apply for a job, however, it may be the case that his/her ‘soft skills’ and attitudes are poor. Therefore, it may be difficult to gain and sustain employment (CIPD, 2007).

Tony achieved qualifications while serving previous sentences in prison. Although he had qualifications which may have been beneficial to gaining employment, it seems to be that it was his behaviour that stopped him from gaining a job. Tony talked about his attitude to work in the past:
I heard that they were looking for me to work for them (for another company) as well but I never went over there that’s all I remember and then I got used to not working...I went lazy...so... (Line 215-216).

Nevertheless, during the interview he appeared to understand the importance of having work and he seemed to be motivated to find employment for himself. He also said:

_I don’t want to... come back... (to the prison)...When I came here last time I was... I was...only 20 or I was only 21 something like that 23...and I’m still young anyway, really...and I’m not coming back in here, not now” (Line 461-466).

A desire not to come back to prison was articulated by Tony. However, it seemed that he did not have a plan how to achieve his desire of not being placed in custody again. The lack of goals and the lack of motivation to change behaviour may however lead to unemployment and more reoffending.

Unlike Tony, George had little work experience and lack of formal qualifications. He suggested that he does not know what was expected from him in order to gain employment. When asked how he would ‘sell’ himself to an employer George answered:

_I don’t know. I have never come across that (Line 571).

Thus, training of STOs’ employability skills seems important in order to improve their interview techniques and CV writing. In turn, it may positively affect
searching and gaining employment. STOs pointed out their possible problems and why they thought they were not able to gain employment. However, the STOs did not seem to make connections, and expressed little motivation, to participate and improve the skills, knowledge and attitudes that may help them to have better prospects to gain employment after release. These include having new qualifications and acquire skills needed in the job application process such as CV writing and job interview skills.

STOs’ concerns and issues in the Employment pathway, Education and Training pathway and Attitudes, Thinking and Behaviour pathway were discussed during the interviews. Some STOs’ described their past situation with employment in custody. However, the STOs lacked future goals with regards to employment. The lack of goals in the life areas such as employment and education may have potential to impact on STOs motivation to engage in searching for, gaining and sustaining employment. Moreover, the STOs’ did not refer to education and training and also changing attitudes and behaviours as potentially transformative. Lack of motivation to improve education, to re-qualify and to change behaviour that is conducive to gain and sustain employment may lead, again, to a vicious circle of unemployment and reoffending.

3.6 Discussion

The STOs provided evidence that employment issues and concerns are interlinked with other life areas such as lack of accommodation and poor mental and physical health. Serious problems in the life areas which the STOs’ discussed have been previously suggested to be associated with offending (e.g., Farrington et al., 2006; Hopkins, 2012; Hopkins & Brunton-Smith, 2014). However, the STOs did not
make an explicit connection between employment and the need to improve education. This is not in line with some research suggesting that offenders felt that learning, education or training helps gaining employment (Hopkins, 2012).

Some STOs who referred to their aggressive and impulsive behaviour did not have any goals with regards to the change in their attitudes and behaviours. This resonated with the existing research suggesting that lack of insight into their behaviours which may be an obstacle to gaining employment (Zhang et al., 2006). Further, some researchers indicated that most offenders are fully aware of the importance of gaining employment in order to stop reoffending (Visher & Courtney, 2007). However, there is no evidence in this study to suggest that any of the six offenders viewed employment as a deterrent to future offending.

There was a sense of frustration from some STOs with wanting to gain employment but unable to participate in educational courses and training due to their short custodial sentences. There are some courses and programmes available for STOs designed to increase their employment and employability skills, however little is known about STOs’ motivation to participate in such activities. Support offered to offenders is limited by being incarcerated for a short period of time such as under 12 months in custody. In terms of employment, there is limited help for offenders to search for employment whilst in prison and STOs may be less likely to receive any assistance. Where help and support is available, it is important that STOs express motivation to search for employment while in custody and also to improve their education and qualifications such as gaining a Food and Hygiene Certificate.
Having employment and work was thought as important in terms of affording to pay for housing and contributing to having a structure in a day and in turn eliminating alcohol use. However, some STOs’ acknowledged barriers that may lead to difficulties to gain and sustain employment such as having a criminal record. This is consistent with past research suggesting that the effects of stigma and discrimination and the actual experience of incarceration on employment are prominent (Western, Kling & Weiman, 2001). Furthermore, the six STOs in this study had not been employed in the period before coming in to custody. This may have influenced their motivation to engage in education (Hopkins, 2012).

The overarching themes reflected the seven NOMS pathways to reduce re-offending (Home Office, 2004), and provided evidence of the complexity of the offenders’ employment issues and the need for a holistic approach. Initially, an inductive approach was used in order to explore the STOs’ accounts of their experience with employment. Sub-themes started to emerge which were similar to issues and concerns of identified in the seven NOMS pathways. Thus, the sub-themes were clustered onto the NOMS pathways using deductive approach. However, there was a need to separate the ETE pathway since connections between employment and education and training were not defined in this study. The potential barriers to employment described by the STOs were individual to each person and generally, the barriers were spread across the NOMS seven pathways of reducing re-offending (Home Office, 2004), including difficulties with accommodation and drug abuse.
3.7 Conclusion

This exploratory study focussed on the STOs discussion on issues of employment in terms of the barriers to employment; their past experience with searching for and gaining employment; current situation in custody with regards to beneficial activities that can be achieved in prison; and their future goals in terms of employment post-release. It was clear that offenders felt that factors such as physical disability and drug abuse may have some impact on their future employment, as well as a lack of job opportunities and a criminal record. These factors have been identified previously on the seven NOMS pathways to reoffending (Home Office, 2004). However, it seemed that the STOs did not link education and training and provision available in custody as conducive to finding employment after release, despite having lower levels of education and lack of training. The findings of this study do not seem to support Vacca’s (2004) claim that offenders join rehabilitative programmes in prison as they see the programmes as a means to improve capabilities to employment post-release. Furthermore, STOs made references to having anti-social behaviours in the past and difficulties to find employment, they did not have goals to indicate motivation to change their attitudes and behaviours and motivation to engage in education to broaden possibilities to find employment. Thus, effective and relevant provision in custody needs to be made available for STOs to improve their knowledge and skills to find meaningful employment. Furthermore, STOs need to be aware of the possible transformative effect of education which may in turn lead to increased motivation to participate in education which can have an effect on prospect of
education and reoffending post-release. Therefore, further investigation of STOs’ motivation to participate in custodial education was conducted.

The Personal Aspiration and Concerns Inventory for Offenders (PACIO), as described and evaluated in chapter 2, seems to be an appropriate tool to assess and improve short-term offenders’ motivation to education since it has a sound theoretical background and aims to focus on offenders’ strength to achieve their goals (see 2.4.3.6). Therefore, the PACIO and the PACIO plus Motivational interviewing will be investigated by an RCT feasibility study to explore whether they have potential to be used in motivation of short-term offenders and a motivational preparatory intervention for short-term offenders which could lead to an improved participation in education in custody and reduction of reconviction rates. Furthermore, the PACIO’s utility as a motivation assessment tool for STOs regarding education participation was investigated.

The following chapter, chapter 4, contains details of methodology for a feasibility study for a randomised controlled trial investigating STOs’ motivation to engage in custodial education, using the PACIO as a motivation enhancer and assessment of short-term offenders to participate in custodial education.
Chapter 4 - Methodology for a Randomised Controlled Trial (RCT) of the PACIO as a motivator to education with incarcerated short-term offenders (STOs).

4.1 Overall aim of the research

In this chapter, methodology for a randomised controlled feasibility study (RCT) will be reported. The RCT feasibility study was employed to investigate whether the Personal Aspiration and Concerns Inventory-for Offenders (PACIO) and PACIO plus Motivational Interviewing (MI) could be a motivational preparatory intervention for short-term offenders. This would lead to improved participation in education in custody which would then lead to reduction in reconviction rates in comparison to a non-intervention group. Furthermore, PACIO was investigated as an assessment tool of STOs motivation to participate in education in custody. Effectiveness of the RCT feasibility study refers to improved participation in education which refers to more hours spent in education in relation to sentence length. Furthermore, positive benefits of completing PACIO and/ or PACIO plus MI on participating in education in custody were investigated whether they can lead to an improved STOs’ motivational profile, and a decrease in reconviction rates.
4.1.1 Aims of individual studies

This chapter provides methodologies employed in two feasibility studies described in Chapter 5 and Chapter 6. The study in Chapter 4 was to investigate the PACIO group (PG) with the PACIO plus Motivational Interviewing (PMI) and Non-intervention (NI) as a preparatory motivational intervention to increase STOs' motivation to participate in education in custody. Further, this exploratory study was extended by collecting follow up data on reconviction rates measured by the Police National Computer (PNC) data at a 12 months point after release. Chapter 6 aimed to examine STOs' motivational profiles derived from the PACIO rating scales and compare profile scores between PG and PMI. These studies were conducted on a common sample. Therefore, the sampling procedures and the characteristics of the participants in these studies will be described here.

A randomised controlled trial will be considered to be feasible if: 1. The recruitment rate to the project is at least 80% of the study sample; 2. The uptake of the interview by at least 60% of STOs in the active arms of the trial (PG and PMI); 3. Collection of education hours during the STOs’ sentence lengths by at least 80%; 4. PNC follow up at 12 months by at least 80%. The results will be included in the following experimental chapters (Chapter 5 and Chapter 6).

4.2 Participants

There were 117 participants used for analyses in this study. See the number of participants in each experimental group (Table 13).
Table 13 Number of STOs who participated in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>NI</th>
<th>PG</th>
<th>PMI</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NI=Non-intervention; PG= PACIO group; PACIO plus Motivational Interviewing.

There was a total pool of 174 randomly allocated male STOs. Thirty STOs were excluded from the study at the first point of contact and there were 144 STOs who agreed to participate in the study. Moreover, out of the 144 STOs, 17 STOs were excluded at the second point of contact before or during the interview. Finally, there were 10 STOs who withdrew or were excluded after the interview. Out of the 10 STOs, one STO asked to be withdrawn from research and there was no data held on one participant on the Police National Computer and there was no data available on eight STOs regarding education participation as they were transferred to other prison establishments. Originally, there were 34 STOs transferred to other establishments in England and Wales but data on education participation of only eight offenders was missing. Thus the eight offenders were excluded from the study. The breakdown of the numbers for excluded offenders can be seen in Table 14 and a Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials (CONSORT) diagram with regards to progress through stages of randomisation, allocation and recruitment of the STOs in the RCT (Appendix 4).

The inclusion criteria were sentence length in duration of 12 months and under and current non-engagement in education. STOs sentences ranged from 7 days to 12 months. There was no minimum length of sentence set as an exclusion criterion. The STOs were 21 years and over as the prison where the research where the STOs were
recruited only housed adult males over the age of 21. The majority of offenders were White British, but other ethnic origins included Black Caribbean, Polish and French. The average age of the participants was 31.4 (SD 7.29) and their age ranged from 21 to 54 years old.

Low level of English was an exclusion criterion which was determined during the interview. Fifty-seven STOs were excluded from the study as they were unable to participate in the study for reasons such as difficulty expressing themselves in English, not being interested and missing data regarding reconviction and education participation (Table 14 and Appendix 4).
Table 14. Reasons and the number of excluded and STOs unable to participate in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Point of exclusion</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At recruitment (1st contact)</td>
<td>Not interested</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Segregation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Released</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ill</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluded before or during interview (2nd contact)</td>
<td>Walked out of the interview</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not interested</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor English</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ill</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interviewed previously</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluded post-interview</td>
<td>Withdrew 3 weeks after interview</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing data: No reconviction information held on PNC</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing data: No data held on education participation after transfer</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Furthermore, STOs who were asked to participate in treatment groups were more likely to be excluded or not to participate. STOs in the non-intervention group had the lowest drop out (Table 15).

Table 15. Number of excluded participants from the study in each group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>NI</th>
<th>PG</th>
<th>PMI</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drop out</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NI=Non-intervention; PG= PACIO group; PACIO plus Motivational Interviewing.

4.2.1 Baseline analyses

In order for the analysis to be conducted, comparisons of the research group homogeneity were made in areas of demographics such as age and information about sentencing to ensure that the outcomes were drawn from experimental groups with similar characteristics.

4.2.1.1 Age

Offenders’ age can be a confounding factor since it may effect offenders’ engagement in education. For instance, younger adults may want to continue with their studies but older adults may perceive education as not relevant since they may have achieved some qualifications already. Furthermore, motivational profiles were suggested to vary with age. This means that older adults identified fewer goals than
younger ones (Klinger & Cox, 2011). In this study, no significant difference in age amongst experimental groups and sentenced groups was found (p > .05; see Table 16).

Table 16. STOs’ mean age in experimental groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>NT</th>
<th>PG</th>
<th>PMI</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>F=.466; p=.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Age</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NT = Non-intervention; PG = PACIO group; PMI = PACIO plus Motivational Interviewing; SD = standard deviation.

4.2.1.2 Levels of Education prior to custody

Levels of education need to be taken into account when explaining offenders’ participation in education. Offenders’ initial education and skills levels may have played a role in participating in education classes and workshops while in custody. Moreover, self-reported levels of education were needed to ensure the homogeneity of the sample. Thus, offenders were asked about their achieved education and qualifications when interviewed. For the education level mode in different experimental conditions see Table 17.

The offenders’ self-reported education and qualifications were grouped into 8 levels starting with entry level qualification and finishing with a Doctoral level of education. This was done following ‘The National Qualification Framework’ which sets out levels at which qualifications become recognised and ‘The Qualifications and
Credit Framework’ containing employment-related qualifications (Office of Qualifications and Examinations Regulations, OFQUAL; 2014; see Figure 4). However, due to lack of offenders achieving higher levels of education and qualifications, only four out of the eight possible levels of education, outlined by OFQUAL, were used in this study (see Table 17).

This study identified 7 levels of education which were clustered into 4 levels of education. Entry level (L0), Level 1 (L1); Level 2 (L2); and Level 3 (L3). The EL qualifications are the lowest level in the NQF. The L0 learners develop basic knowledge and understanding such as in reading or problem solving. This level is also a stepping stone in order to achieve qualifications at L1. Level 1 includes lower grades of GCSEs while Level 2 includes GCSEs A*-C. Level 3 contains for instance A level qualifications. In this study, Level 3 includes levels 3-7 another as 1 participant achieved Level 7 which is a Master level qualification.
Table 17. Offenders’ self-reported achieved education and qualifications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of education</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage in a sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entry level (no or entry level qualification)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1 (GCSEs D-G; NVQ L1)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2 (GCSEs A-C; NVQ L2)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3-8 (A levels; University degrees; HNDs; Master Degree)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More than a third of offenders achieved Level 1 followed by offenders who had no or very little qualification. The offenders’ low levels of qualification have a scope for improving education. Custodial educational courses often include all levels of qualifications and therefore were available for the offenders while they were serving their sentences. STOs’ self-reported education level broken down by study group can be found in Table 18.
Table 18. Self-reported level of qualification within research groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>NI</th>
<th>PG</th>
<th>PMI</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-reported</td>
<td>L0</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>Chi square = 3.96; p= .68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NI = Non-intervention; PG = PACIO group; PMI = PACIO plus Motivational Interviewing.

4.2.1.3 Offence types and history of reoffending

Offenders with large offending histories are more likely to reoffend (Andrews et al., 2006, May et al., 2008). Therefore, this has a potential to affect offenders’ reoffending rates. Moreover, risk of reoffending for violent and sexual offenders is higher than risk of reoffending for non-violent offending (Howard, 2011). However, violent offending is less frequent than non-violent offending (Howard, 2011).

In this study, the number of the STOs’ previous offences committed by the offenders ranged from 1 to 218. The offences that the offenders were serving their sentences for were clustered into six types (Table 19). The Offenders Index Code book (Home Office, 2010) was used as a guide to form the six groups. Those offences that could not be clustered, as there may have been only one participant with such an offence, were put in the ‘Other’ section.
Table 19. Types of offences and percentage of their incidence in the study sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of offence</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Violent offences against people (Actual bodily harm; ABH, common assault, affray, in possession of offensive weapon, witness intimidation, harassment, threatening behaviour)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Theft, burglary and criminal damage (Receiving Stolen Goods; RSG, intent to steal, equipped to burgle, dwelling, arson)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Driving and motoring offences (Driving whilst disqualified, reckless driving, drink driving, drug driving)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sex offences (indecent assault, indecent photos of children, other sex offences)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Breach of community/suspended sentence or a probation order</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Other (fine, fail to surrender, no payment of child benefits, drug offences (2))</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Baseline analyses on STOs’ type of offending revealed that in this sample, most STOs were sentenced for ‘Violence against a person’. However, as seen in Table 18, STOs in PG group were the most frequently sentenced for ‘Theft, burglary and general damage’. Moreover, the time spent in custody may play an important role in education participation since those STOs with multiple prison stays may have participated in all educational courses, leaving little or no option to participate when serving the current sentence. However, it seems that there were no significant differences between experimental groups (see Table 20).

Table 20. Types of offences and percentage of their incidence in the study sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>NI</th>
<th>PG</th>
<th>PMI</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean days in</td>
<td>63.71</td>
<td>59.30</td>
<td>53.06</td>
<td>χ = 1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>current sentence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p = .38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean number of</td>
<td>45.70</td>
<td>53.42</td>
<td>38.94</td>
<td>χ = 2.28,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lifetime offences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p = .32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>39.12</td>
<td>45.96</td>
<td>36.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean days in</td>
<td>2,881</td>
<td>2,072</td>
<td>1,502</td>
<td>χ = 1.56,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lifetime custody</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p = .46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>3,704</td>
<td>2,372</td>
<td>1,746.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NI = Non-intervention; PG = PACIO group; PMI = PACIO plus Motivational Interviewing.
4.2.1.4 Employment prior to custody

Offenders’ employment status prior to custody can affect the outcome measures of this study such as education engagement and reoffending. Perhaps, offenders with regular employment before coming to custody may want to participate in a similar routine, for instance, in education or workshops in custody. However, it appears that STOs in all three experimental groups were mainly unemployed prior to custody.

4.3 Design

4.3.1 Randomised controlled trials (RCTs) in the prison setting

RCTs are often thought of as a ‘gold standard’ of research methodology (Raynor, 2004; Chitty, 2005; Campbell et al., 2010). RCTs have been recommended to be used when treatment outcomes are investigated. For instance, Chitty (2005) called for ‘developing randomised controlled trials in the correctional services’ in order to deepen the knowledge regarding ‘effective interventions with offenders’ (Chitty, 2005; p80). However, prior to conducting an RCT, it is important to conduct piloting and feasibility work to ensure that the intervention can be delivered as intended and that recruitment and retention are likely to be good enough for a full RCT (Craig et al., 2013). Thus, in this study a feasibility test for an RCT evaluating the effectiveness of a short motivational intervention for offenders, the PACIO, to improve STOs education participation and leading to reduced reconviction, was planned.
RCTs in criminal justice settings, including this study, bring both advantages and problems too. RCTs are characterised by a high validity such as construct validity, internal validity and statistical conclusion validity (Hollin, 2008). When evaluating offending treatment such as a brief motivational intervention, control over running the treatment is important. Since there was only one researcher involved, theoretically, achieving a high internal validity seemed to be possible as rigorous rule implementation of the treatment was in place. The disadvantage is that this may have low external validity.

Group sizes in an RCT are important in order to be able to detect significant differences between groups. If there are significant differences found a question occurs whether a significant outcome was caused by chance or whether the sample is a true representation of the population. Calculations of adequate sample power are necessary in order to avoid Type I error where a significant difference is detected when there is none and Type II error where no significant difference is detected when there is actually a disparity (Freedman et al., 2001). However, since the effect of the PACIO on STOs education participation has not been conducted previously this study was a feasibility study aimed at identifying outcome effect sizes on which to base a power calculation for a full RCT.

4.4 Outcome variables

In this study, education and reconviction can be both dependent and independent variables, depending on what aspect of education and reconviction was being measured. An overview of all variables involved and identifying whether it is a dependent or independent variable can be found in Table 21. Exact information on
IVs and DVs are provided in each experimental chapter. Education participation includes both educational classes and vocational workshops and will be referred to as education in this study. In this study, there were 21% of STOs who attended education classes, 30% of STOs participated in workshops and 49% of STOs did not participate in either education or workshops.

Table 21. Dependent and independent variables and type of investigation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Investigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adaptive motivation</td>
<td>DV</td>
<td>Differences in AM scores in intervention groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH/P</td>
<td>DV</td>
<td>Differences in LH/P scores in intervention groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention groups</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Differences in AM and LH/P in intervention groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education status (learners and non-learners)</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Effect of education status on reconviction status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education participation (measured in PEP)</td>
<td>DV</td>
<td>Differences in PEP in experimental group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconviction status (reconvicted and not reconvicted)</td>
<td>DV</td>
<td>1. Effect of education status on reconviction status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Differences in reconviction status between education only group and no education plus no PACIO group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Differences in reconviction status between education only group and education plus PACIO group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of reconvictions</td>
<td>DV</td>
<td>Differences in number of reconvictions in education status</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5 Interventions

4.5.1 The Personal Aspirations and Concerns Inventory for Offenders (PACIO)

In previous research, PACIO was suggested to be a motivation assessment for offenders’ to engage in treatment and also a motivation booster (Campbell et al., 2010). PACIO in this study is used as a preparatory motivational intervention to increase STOs motivation to participate in education and consequently the education participation to reduce reconviction.

4.5.2 PACIO plus Motivational Interviewing (MI)

Therapies using MI in forensic settings have provided some evidence for improved treatment retention, motivation to change and reduced offending (McMurran, 2009). MI is a form of treatment based on exploration of a particular issue or issues and resolution of discrepancy between the current situation and future goal (Miller & Rollnick, 2013). MI techniques were employed in order to investigate whether the PACIO plus MI can be useful addition in motivating offenders’ to engage in prison based activities such as education. PACIO has not been developed into a systematic treatment. However, there are guidelines for the PACIO administration developed by Campbell (2009). The guidelines were adapted from the PCI administration guidelines (Cox & Klinger, 2004). The Campbell (2009) guidelines for the PACIO administration were adhered to in this research (see Appendix 9). There were two intervention groups in this study. Table 21 shows the instructions and questions STOs were asked in the PACIO group and an example of additional questions can be seen in the PACIO plus motivational interviewing. More information
is available in the Brief User Guide (see Appendix 10). PACIO plus MI aimed to interview an offender in greater depth in terms of their personally meaningful goals. For instance, rather than stating a goal, asking what the offenders would like to happen and score the goal on a rating scale from 0-10, an offender in the PACIO and MI group was asked ‘why’ a particular concern or aspiration was selected and what barriers may hinder a particular goal. This was to improve a rapport between an STO and an interviewer and have a conversation that appeared more genuine. Furthermore, these questions were added to improve STOs’ motivation to education. During the interviews, four principles of motivational interviewing were employed which was expressing empathy, supporting self-efficacy, roll with resistance and developing discrepancy. Expressing empathy was important to use since it may show how the interviewer understands the offenders’ situation and in turn this may deepen relationship between the offender and the researcher. Reflections such as repeating what the offender said and prompt such as ‘hmm’ and ‘I see’ were used to promote understanding between an offender and the researcher. Self-efficacy to achieve goals and deal with the potential obstacles promoted empowering the offender to be successful in their goal attainment. At times, the offender had different ways of dealing with potential difficulties to achieve a goal than the researcher but rather than being in conflict, the researcher rolled with resistance as the change and adaptive ways of problem solving within the offender rather than being imposed by the researcher. Lastly, special efforts were given to developing discrepancy later in the interview (after establishing positive rapport) about the current situation in comparison to the future situation of a particular goal. STOs in PACIO and MI were given information about classes available in custodial education and workshops. The researcher was interested in introducing the PACIO and what to expect during the
PACIO interview effectively so that the STOs were familiar and comfortable when participating. However, STOs in the PACIO group were not encouraged to evaluate their goals in terms of what the goal meant to them and what are the pros and cons to achieve the goal. The researcher was aware that the principles of motivational interviewing are not to be administered in the PACIO only group. On average, the PACIO plus MI was longer than the PACIO only interview as the interviews took 50 minutes and 35 minutes respectively (Table 22).
Table 22. Examples of instructions and questions in the PACIO and PACIO plus MI interview.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PACIO</th>
<th>PACIO plus motivational interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic PACIO instructions:</td>
<td>Basic PACIO instructions were administered (see on the left).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will need you to tell me any concerns or aspirations you may have regarding a particular aspect of your life.</td>
<td>Why did you choose this goal?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I need you to describe what would you like to happen. How would you like for things to turn out?</td>
<td>How did it make you feel?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will ask you to choose the numbers that best describe how you feel about each of the goals and concerns that you talked about? Please rate on a scale from 0-10.</td>
<td>Why do you think it is a good idea?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In what way do you think it will help you to achieve the goal?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are you familiar with education classes and workshops in the prison? Let me tell you what the education offers that may be of interest to you.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5.3 Education

There was no minimum sentence length set so offenders were included despite being sentenced to as little as 7 days in custody. This was done as education department provide one day courses such as Food and Hygiene certificate and it was thought that offenders could participate in education even within a short period of time. Another inclusion criteria was no participation in education at the time of the interview. None of the STOs participated in education at the time of the interview, so education was used in this study as a form of intervention to reduce reconviction. Therefore, education was investigated as to whether it reduces STOs’ reconviction (Chapter 5) since education has been shown effective in reducing reoffending (Harer, 1995; Wilson et al., 2000). Education was investigated as to whether it is an effective intervention for STOs to reduce reconviction and the number of committed offences 12 month post-release.

Education in this study includes educational classes and workshops in custody. Classes and workshops were run 27 hours a week with a mean of 3.9 hours per day. Application forms to go to education or workshops for all offenders STOs’ were processed through the administrative office in education department. At times, there was a close link between education and workshops as offenders need to participate in relevant educational courses such as food safety before going to participate in the workshop. Participation in educational classes and workshops were called ‘education’ in this thesis. Hourly participation was monitored and proportion of education participation (PEP) was calculated.

The STOs were monitored on the education engagement on a weekly basis. This was done on the prison database without the knowledge of all the STOs. At the
end of their sentence the proportion of education participation (PEP) in relation to their sentence length was calculated and used for analyses.

4.6 Outcome measures

4.6.1 Primary outcome - STOs’ proportion of education participation (PEP).

As an outcome measure, STOs’ education status was defined as a binary measurement which was a learner or non-learner, and this was monitored on a weekly basis as was participated hours in education. The binary data was used to investigate whether being a learner or non-learner was associated with reconviction data 12 months post-release.

Further, STOs’ proportion of education participation (PEP) was calculated only for learners and was the available hours in custodial activities and STOs’ days served in custody multiplied by the mean hours per day. For instance, an offender sentenced to 30 days, served 16 days in custody. Thus, this offender was entitled to around 62 hours (16×3.9) of prison activities. The prison databases were consulted in order to monitor the offenders’ activity participation. For instance, an offender who was entitled to 62 hours in activities used 12 hours and did not use 50 available hours.

Education participation measured in PEP was a dependent variable as this study aimed to investigate PEP in NT, PG and PMI. This was to investigate for instance relationship between the sentence length and education participation (the strength of relationship between education participation and length of sentences). Since this was a feasibility study to conduct a RCT, regression analysis was not used. However, in a full scale RCT it may be useful to investigate whether or to what extent
sentence lengths predict education participation. For instance, the regression analysis may suggest that the lengths of sentences predict education participation. This may help with adjusting resources and provision in education for offenders. However, the question is whether this information has any practical use as offenders even with very short sentences should be offered a suitable educational support. Education status which was either learners (STOs who participated in education) or non-learners (STOs who did not participate in education) was an independent measure. This is since learners and non-learners were investigated with regards to their motivation profiles and reconviction 12 months after release.

The primary outcome in this study was STOs’ PEP which was monitored immediately after the PACIO interview. Hourly education participation was noted in order to see which offenders took part in purposeful activities while in custody. The hourly engagement was related to offenders’ sentence length and therefore a proportion of education participation (PEP) was calculated individually for each offender. At the time of the PACIO interview no STO had participated in education (non-learners).

4.6.2 Secondary outcome – Reconviction rates

The secondary outcome was reconviction 12 months after release. Reconviction status, whether STOs were reconvicted or not was a dependent variable. Reconviction status was investigated in relation to education participation and the PACIO. The number of offences, which was an independent variable, was also investigated. The number of offences was compared between the experimental groups and also between education status. Correlation between the number of offences and
education participation (PEP) was also investigated. Regression analysis was not conducted since this was a small scale feasibility study for a RCT and at the time when the study was conducted, the researcher was interested in investigating the strength of relationship between the two variables. However, it may be useful to consider a regression analysis in a full RCT. It could be useful to shed light on whether education participation can predict the number of subsequent offences. It would also be interesting to know what type of education can predict the number of future offences. Information was sought from the Police National Computer regarding the offenders’ reconviction 12 months after release. In order to achieve this, offenders’ initials, date of birth and their PNC number were required. The PNC numbers were available for the researcher on one of the prison computer databases. However, 40 offenders’ PNC numbers were not known. Therefore, the researcher had to require access to the prison establishment archives where paper copies of offenders’ cases were stored. The researcher was able to find 39 missing PNC numbers in the prison archives. Thus, one participant was excluded as his PNC number was not known. Data from the PNC was obtained in February 2012. Therefore, 12 months’ reconviction was able to be investigated.

4.6.3 Tertiary outcome – Adaptive motivation (AM (PACIO)) and Learned Helplessness/ Powerlessness (LH/P) Scores.

The tertiary outcome was offenders’ index scores in adaptive motivation (AM (PACIO Index)) and Learned Helplessness/ Powerlessness (LH/P). It was the hypothesised that the PACIO and the PACIO plus enhances the STOs’ motivational profiles when compared to the NI (Chapter 6). The STOs’ motivation was assessed using Personal
Aspiration and Concerns Inventory-for Offenders (PACIO) on a scale from 0-10. The offenders’ scores were used to calculate AM (PACIO Index) and LH/P in order to assess the offenders’ level of motivation to participate in custodial education (Chapter 6). Calculation on the AM and LH/P indices is described in 2.4.3.8.

The PACIO AM and LH/P scores, together with education participation, is tested in this study as a mediator of change. In this study, the PACIO AM and LH/P scores were used as a dependent measure to investigate the PACIO ratings across experimental groups (PG and PMI). Thus, the PACIO’s AM and LH/P scores were a dependent measure and the PACIO as an intervention was an independent measure. More details are provided in each analysis in Chapter 5 and Chapter 6.

4.7 Procedure

4.7.1 Ethical Approvals

The study was approved by the University Ethics Panel and the Head of Psychological Services (NOMS Cymru) and the Prison Governor. The PNC access was approved by Association of Chief Police Officers, Criminal Record Office (ACRO).
4.7.2 Offenders’ initial recruitment from the Local Inmate Database System (LIDS) and Computer-National Offenders Management Information Service (C-NOMIS)

The short-term offenders (STOs) were selected from a newly sentenced offenders’ list from the ‘Local Inmate Database System’ (LIDS). The LIDS lists of newly sentenced offenders were available for the researcher to inspect daily. The selection of participants for the study took place on the first working day after the weekend and the offenders were selected retrospectively from the up to six days prior if necessary, as the target was to allocate a minimum of 6 offenders with sentences under 12 months per week. The researcher contacted each participant within a week after being sentenced. The period of initial reception in prison can be crucial for many prisoners as it is time to come in terms with the prison life. Consequently, many prisoners may feel vulnerable and distressed (Liebling; Tait, Durie, Stiles & Harvey, 2005). It was necessary that the researcher approached all STOs in an empathetic manner and suspected vulnerability and distress was reported to the prison staff immediately.

Data regarding the STOs’ release dates, the nature of their offence and education engagement was reported using LIDS. However, a new centralised prison database, C-NOMIS, was introduced in May 2010 to replace the old LIDS system. This change required the researcher to be trained in using the new database effectively and also having adequate skills to compare the information held on both databases. Often, in the time of the database changeover, data about offenders’ sentence and prison activity were missing or incomplete, thus both databases needed to be
consulted. Furthermore, data regarding the offenders’ offending history was requested from the PNC 12 months after the release.

The LIDS and C-NOMIS’s list of all newly sentenced offenders was issued either in an alphabetical order or according to the time of offenders’ arrivals from courts. In this research, the offenders’ return time from courts was used to generate a list of offenders whose sentence was for 12 months and under. As the offenders’ names appeared on the printed lists from LIDS, all the STOs were allocated with a random number generated on a PC. Offenders’ random numbers were ranked from the lowest to the highest in each group which were offenders sentenced to less than 6 months group and in 6 to 12 months. This was since originally, STO’s sentence lengths was planned to be taken into account in relation to education participation, motivational profiles and reconviction. However, it was soon realised that insufficient number of STOs will be left in each cell for analyses. Thus, sentence lengths were not used to conduct analyses.

4.7.3 Randomisation procedure

A standardised allocating system of offenders into the three experimental groups was in place. Offenders’ random numbers were generated on the computer and put in an ascending order. The STOs were then allocated to one of the three conditions as following: Non-intervention group (NI), PACIO intervention (PG) and PACIO intervention plus Motivational Interviewing (PMI) in less than 6 months and more than 6 months group. Thus, a minimum of 6 STOs were to be recruited each week. This was important to do prior to the first contact with each STO as the researcher needed to know offenders’ experimental condition as the researcher
informed the STOs about their experimental group at the first contact. This was done after all STOs were given information about the research. If consent was granted, the STOs were asked to provide information for baseline analyses and finally the STOs were informed whether their participation in the study involved an interview. An appointment for the interview was arranged for later that week.

The researcher was not blind to the conditions as the recruitment and the administration of the PACIO and the PACIO plus MI was conducted by the researcher. This is important as knowledge of which group an STO was allocated to may be argued as a potential bias, since the researcher could have influenced the nature of the interviews in the PG and PMI plus motivational interviewing.

4.7.4 Recruitment – offenders’ number estimation

The aim was to investigate how many STOs it was feasible to assess within 6 months of allocated data collection. It was intended that at least 144 STOs would be approached regarding the study. Originally, it was planned to have 2 groups of STOs which were those sentenced to less than 6 months (<6 months) and more than 6 months but less than 12 months (>6 months). It was planned that one offender per condition (NI; PG and PMI) in each group (<6 months and > 6 months) would be recruited. This meant that for each group there was at least one offender randomly allocated to each condition. Based on prior research observations, it had been estimated that it was realistic to expect at least 6 offenders to be sentenced to less than 12 months per week. Thus, it was predicted that each experimental condition (NI, PG and PMI) would have 24 participants in each condition. However, data collection was carried out for 24 weeks as anticipated, but over the period of 8 months due to the
HMPS changes which involved transport of offenders sentenced to less than 12 months to other prison establishments and a lock down for the Christmas period. The research recruitment was terminated at the end of week 24th with 127 participants. After excluding STOs and taking into account missing data, there were in total data of 117 STOs used for analyses in this study (Appendix 4).

The last day before the weekend was selected as it was noticed that most offenders from the prison establishment come from courts on that day. Typically, there were more than six newly sentenced offenders to less than 12 months on the last working day before the weekend. For instance, if there were offenders recruited on Monday, offenders sentenced to less than 12 months on previous Friday were recruited for the study. Thus, if there were 14 offenders sentenced to less than 12 months on the Friday, all offenders were recruited and allocated with a random number. No participants from other days were recruited as the target of minimum of 6 offenders was satisfied. However, if there were fewer than 6 eligible participants available in one day, the researcher recruited more newly sentenced offenders from other weekdays retrospectively in order to achieve a minimum number of six. For instance if there were offenders recruited on Monday and there were two suitable offenders for recruitment on previous Friday, offenders were also recruited from previous Thursday. The target was to recruit at least another 4 offenders on Thursday to achieve the target of 6. Nevertheless, if there were another 9 offenders sentenced to less than 12 months that day, all offenders were recruited for the study.
4.7.5 Recruitment – distributing information and seeking consent

The researcher approached already randomly allocated STOs on their wing locations. All participants were informed about the confidential nature of the study and the right to withdraw at any point during the study. The offenders were informed that they were selected as their sentence was a short custodial sentence of less than 12 months. If an STO showed interest in the study, he was given an information sheet (Appendix 7) and if the STO wanted to participate in the study, he was given a consent form to read and sign if happy with the research conditions. The consent form (Appendix 8) was explained and signed before collecting baseline data and informing about the allocation to a group. The researcher needed to ensure that all information would be given at the first contact together with the interview arrangement, depending on the group allocation. STOs’ prison cell locations and movements can change quickly. This includes movements to other prison establishments within the first week after sentencing. Specific demographic data was collected on an interview sheet on the day of the initial contact with offenders in all experimental groups such as name, prison number, sentence length and achieved qualifications prior custody. Moreover, permission to access data regarding STOs’ re-offending was sought. Moreover, an interested participant and the researcher agreed on the date and a place of his interview.

The STOs were not informed that the researcher would be monitoring participation in custodial activities such as education of individual offenders. This was stated and approved by the Ethical panels at the university and the prison service. This was conducted without their knowledge as the researcher did not want to influence the
offenders in their prison activity involvement. Permission to monitor the offenders’ activity participation was sought both from the ethics boards in HMPS and the University. The recruitment interviews were brief, lasting from 5-15 minutes. This was dependent on whether the participant needed help with reading the information sheet and the consent form. The PACIO interviews were conducted in the same week of recruitment and they took place on different wings within the prison establishment.

4.7.6 Conducting Interviews (PACIO group; PG and the PACIO plus Motivational Interviewing; PMI)

The researcher was trained on principles and delivery of both PACIO and motivational interviewing in workshops held at Cardiff Metropolitan University. However, the researcher had no previous clinical experience with conducting MI with offenders. STOs were given a time and place for their interview during the recruitment interview. The researcher had to find a suitable place for an interview, ideally within the wing of the offender’s cell location. It was important that the interview room was off the landing in order to ensure privacy. However, an agreement was made between a wing officer on duty and a researcher to conduct regular checks of the interview room to provide safety for the researcher. If there was no room available within the wing, the offender was escorted to other locations within the prison where privacy and safety was ensured. The researcher was a part-time member of the Education Department, fulfilling a duty of an Information, Advice and Guidance officer responsible for providing relevant information regarding purposeful custodial activities for newly sentenced offenders.
All participants in the two experimental conditions were thanked for participating in the study and the information from the Interview sheet were discussed in order to check for the accuracy but also to start a conversation (Appendix 5). The Interview sheet included the STOs’ name, prison number, the level of education and achievement and previous employment history. The offenders were reminded of what to expect during the interview. During the interview, offenders were administered the PACIO which is a goal based tool, administered as a semi-structured interview (Campbell et al., 2010). Semi-structured interviews (SSIs) are characterised by developing a rapport between the participant and the researcher (Fylan, 2005) and it was possible to explore each offender’s concerns consistently on the PACIO life areas.

Different life areas of PACIO were introduced and offenders were asked to familiarise themselves with rating scales after being interviewed in the first life area of their interview e.g., Accommodation. The PACIO Life area Illustration sheets were used to introduce each life area (Appendix 6). These sheets using colourful images were to prompt offenders to talk about concerns and aspirations in particular life areas. After talking about concerns and aspirations, goals were formed and offenders rated their goals on a rating scale, each ranging from 0-10 (Appendix 11). In case they had more than one concerns or an aspiration in a particular area, the concerns and aspirations were moved to the ‘other’ section. The PACIO booklet for noting offenders’ goals in six life areas together with rating scales can be found in Appendix 12.

It was not possible for a researcher to allow the offender to stray from a particular life area if the existing one did not fit the offender’s needs as the same set of
questions was asked for each. The PACIO in its use has some features of a structured interview. For instance the order of the discussed life areas (Accommodation first and Employment, Education and Finance, Debt last) and also turning offenders’ aspirations and concerns to goals. The two experimental groups, the PACIO group (PG) and the PACIO plus Motivational Interviewing (PMI) used different interview techniques, however, both were followed consistently either for PG or PMI group.

4.7.6.1 Examples of the PACIO interviews in PACIO group (PG) and PACIO plus Motivational Interviewing (PMI)

Although both groups used the same tool to assess motivation to change and to improve motivation, different interview techniques were employed with the two groups. One of the ideas behind administering PACIO is to make a participant at ease when talking about the concerns and aspirations. Both, offenders in PG and PMI were encouraged to discuss aspirations and concerns in relevant areas as outlined in the PACIO. However, offenders in PG were not prompted to talk about wider implications of their current situation and they were not encouraged to evaluate discrepancy between the current situation and future goals. Appendix 13a provides an example dialogue with an offender in the PG condition.

The researcher relied on how much an offender was willing to say without being encouraged to do so. The main aim of the interview was to note offenders’ concerns and aspirations and ask them to complete the rating scales with a lack of evaluations regarding their issues.
However, the PMI used PACIO enriched by techniques used in Motivational Interviewing (MI). MI is a technique that uses emphatic listening to understand the clients’ point of view in order to minimise resistance (Miller & Rollnick, 2002, 2012). The clients’ motivation to change should be elicited from within rather than being imposed on them. The basic rules to apply during an interview are 1. Expressing empathy; 2. Rolling with resistance; 3. Support self-efficacy; and 4. Developing discrepancy. An example interview in the PMI condition can be found in Appendix 13b.

This study focused on ‘Expressing empathy’ and ‘Developing discrepancy’ between current and future situations. STOs in PMI group were encouraged to think about ways to achieve their goals. Additionally, STOs in PMI received detailed information on how to engage in education and what courses there are available. The PMI interviews may be considered as ‘more concrete’ as concrete steps to achieve a goal were encouraged together with developing discrepancy. However, the lives of many offenders are complicated and the PACIO interviews were time-limited. Thus, it was often beyond the scope of the interview to ‘solve’ STO’s concerns and problems. However, the interview offered the STOs time to think what to do to achieve their goals and how to resolve obstacles in the process of achieving their goals.

4.7.7 Extracting reconviction data from the Police National Computer (PNC)

In this research, the offenders’ main offences were noted from prison computer databases. This was since some STOs were charged and sentenced for more than one offence. For instance one participant was sentenced for’ Breach of Suspended Sentence’. However, later investigation on the PNC revealed that this
offender was also sentenced for ‘Other Criminal Damage’, ‘Possession of offensive weapons without lawful authority or reasonable excuse’ and ‘Harassment’; ‘alarm or distress’. Therefore, an offence that was marked as a ‘main offence’ on prison databases was used for the purpose of this study.

Furthermore, information about 18 participants’ main offence and sentence length at the time they were interviewed was found not to be reported on the PNC database. This had an effect on the number of total days of punishment and the total days spent in custody. Since the researcher had data regarding the participants’ main offence at the time of the interview, it was possible to add the offender’s total number of offences, total days in punishment and also total days spent in custody.

However, it was unknown to the researcher whether the offender was sentenced for more than one offence. Moreover, it was unknown whether the sentence consisted of one single punishment such as a sentence to 90 days in custody or whether the punishment was multiple and thus the offender served multiple concurrent sentences. Under the circumstances, one offence was added to the ‘Total number of offences’ to each of the 18 participants and the full sentence length was added to the ‘Total number of days in punishment’ and also to the ‘Total number of days in custody’.

Furthermore, eight offenders served more than a half of their sentences. This may indicate that the offenders did not have an address to go to (‘No Fixed Abode’) which is one of the requirements to have if considering eligibility for a half point release. Serving the whole term of the sentences may also indicate that those offenders were charged with another crime and were waiting for their sentences whilst in custody.
Six offenders’ were sentenced for another offence or offences during the time they were serving their custodial sentence as their reported release date was longer than their original sentence. Normally, offenders sentenced to custodial sentences of a duration of 12 months and under are released at the half way point. However, for the purpose of this study, the end of the offenders’ original sentence was reported and not the actual release date. This was done in order to show that re-sentenced offenders served at least the whole duration of their sentence.

As a result, the reconviction outcomes should be treated with some caution as when consulting the PNC data regarding the offenders’ reoffending rates it may appear that the offenders committed another offence after they had served their sentence. However, in fact the offenders were sentenced for an offence/ offences that had been committed before coming to serve their original sentences. According to the PNC, the punishment was for instance a community sentence, paying a fine or a custodial sentence. The reconviction rate was investigated in relation to STOs’ participation in education and also in different intervention groups.

4.7.8 Storing and handling data in the prison

Data about all newly sentenced STOs was entered on a database created by the researcher. The database was only accessible to the researcher and was secured with a password on a prison Quantum computer. The data stored on the database included the offenders’ first name, surname, date of birth, prison number, the nature of their current offence, a number of previous custodial sentences and duration of their sentences.
Further information about the offenders’ 12 months’ re-offending rates from the PNC was sent from Ministry of Justice to the researcher at the University. The data was sent on a CD and secured with a password only known to the researcher. All data about the 117 STOs reconviction were available to the researcher were anonymised. This meant that participants were coded with their research numbers, only known to the researcher. The CD was kept in a locked cabinet on the University premises with a unique access to the researcher.

4.8 Analysis plan

A range of parametric and non-parametric tests was used. PEP data showed to be drawn from normally distributed and homogenous population. However, due to small numbers in some tests, PEP was analysed using non-parametric procedures. Outcome measures in Chapter 5 were PEP and reconviction status and the number of reconvictions. Mann-Whitney test was used to investigate differences between NI and treatment groups which were PG and PMI together in PEP. The Kruskal-Wallis test was used to investigate differences in PEP between NT, PG and PMI to shed light on the effect of PMI. Spearman correlation was used to investigate relationship between sentence lengths and PEP and PEP and the number of convictions. Furthermore, firstly, Chi squared tests were used to investigate the effect of education status of reconviction status and the number of reconvictions. Secondly, Chi squared was used to investigate reconviction status in groups of STOs who were in education only group in comparison to no PACIO and no education group. Finally, Chi squared was used to investigate reconviction status if STOs in education only group in comparison to STOs who participated in education and were administered the PACIO.
Chapter 6 employed parametric testing, since data on adaptive motivation (AM) and learned helplessness/powerlessness (LH/P) were normally distributed and heterogeneous. Furthermore, previous research investigating motivational profiles used parametric testing (Campbell et al., 2010). AM and LH/P scores and PG and PMI used t-tests to investigate effectiveness of the added MI to the PACIO. However, Spearman’s correlation investigated correlations between AM, LH/P and education participation (PEP) since there was a small numbers of learners (N= 34) in PG and PMI. Additionally, two Mann-Whitney tests investigated AM and LH/P between learners and non-learners. Specifically, to establish whether learners had higher AM than non-learners and whether non-learners had higher LH/P than learners. The number of STOs’ goals between PG (N=38) and PMI (N=36) groups is investigated using a Mann-Whitney test.
Chapter 5 – Study 1: The PACIO as a preparatory motivational intervention for participation in education for short-term offenders (STOs) and the effect of education participation on STOs’ reconviction

Summary

The PACIO and the PACIO plus PMI were investigated in comparison with NI as a preparatory motivational intervention to increase STOs’ motivation to participate in education. Education in custody has been acknowledged to reduce reoffending and promote rehabilitation. Thus, custodial education was investigated to determine whether it was an effective intervention for STOs to reduce reconviction. A total of 117 STOs participated and the proportion of education participation (PEP) was calculated. STOs’ with PEP = 0 were non-learners and learners have PEP > 0. PEP and the number of reconvictions were dependent variables (DV) and intervention groups (NI; PG and PMI) were independent variables (IV). Reconviction rates were noted 12 months after release, and analyses with regards to education participation and reconviction rates conducted. The current study found that the PACIO and the PACIO plus MI were not effective tools in increasing STOs participation in education. Education participation, however, had a significant effect on STOs’ reconvictions. Learners were reconvicted significantly less than non-learners. The discussion considers whether it is feasible to conduct a larger scale RCT to evaluate the PACIO as a preparatory motivational intervention to increase participation in education which in turn reduces reconviction.
5.1 Introduction

The PACIO was shown to have potential to increase offenders’ motivation to treatment (Campbell et al., 2010) which in turn increases treatment engagement and how this may affect offenders’ reconviction. Custodial activities such as education and vocational workshops in custody (referred to as education within the chapter) were to contribute to improving STOs’ knowledge and skills and addressing issues such as having appropriate behaviours and a fulfilling structure in life (Ward & Brown, 2004). There is compelling evidence to suggest that custodial education can lead to reduced reoffending rates (Nuttall, Hollmen, Staley, 2003; Vacca, 2004; Zgoba et al., 2008). Education has been shown to be beneficial for offenders especially at lower educational levels in order to improve academic knowledge and behaviour modification (Adams et al., 1994). Therefore, motivating offenders to participate in education is vital in successful rehabilitation. This is especially relevant for STOs since they have limited access to rehabilitative activities during their short sentences in custody. Education is open and available for all offenders even those sentenced for a short period of time. Thus, the PACIO and PACIO plus MI as motivational interventions were investigated to improve education participation and the effect of education participation was addressed in terms of reduction of reconviction for STOs.

5.1.2 The current study

The study examined whether the PACIO and the PACIO plus MI are effective preparatory motivational interventions for STOs to participate in education. The extent of STOs participation in education was investigated by measuring the numbers
entering education and the proportion of time spent in education in NI, PG and PMI groups.

Motivational Interviewing (see Chapter 1 and Chapter 4) was used to enrich PACIO interviews by using techniques such as expressing empathy and developing discrepancy. In addition, STOs in PMI group received information regarding, suitable educational activities and workshops participation in custody. Effectiveness of Motivational Interviewing (MI) was assessed by STOs’ proportion of education participation (PEP). Moreover, the extent of STOs’ PEP and education status were investigated with regards to STOs’ reconviction (binominal data) and the number of reconvictions 12 months’ post-release.

5.1.3 Hypotheses

H1: PEP of STOs who completed the PACIO will be different in the intervention group (PG and PMI altogether) in comparison to NI (2-tailed).

H2: PEP of STOs will be different between PG and PMI groups in comparison to NI (2-tailed).

H3: PEP and STOs’ sentence lengths will be positively correlated.

H4: PEP will be negatively correlated with the number of committed offences 12 months after release.

H5: The number of learners (i.e., those who participated in education) who were reconvicted 12 month after release will be lower in comparison to non-learners (i.e., those who did not participate in any education) (1-tailed).
H6: The number of reconvictions in learners will be lower in comparison to non-learners (1-tailed).

H7: Fewer STOs who participated in education only will be reconvicted in comparison to those who did not participate in education and did not receive PACIO (1-tailed).

H8: Fewer STOs who participated in education and received the PACIO will be reconvicted in comparison to those who participated in education only (1-tailed).

5.2 Method

Participants: There were in total 117 participants used for analysing education and reconviction outcomes.

Design: This study was a feasibility study using a RCT methodology (see Chapter 4). The dependent variables were PEP and reconviction and the independent variables were experimental groups and education status which was learner and non-learners. Intervention groups which were NI; PG and PM were independent variables. Furthermore, education status was combined with the PACIO administration so that it was possible to analyse data regarding learners who were administered the PACIO (independent variable) and non-learners who were not administered the PACIO (independent variable) in terms of their reconviction status (dependent variable).

Outcome measures: Education. Previous research showed that education can be beneficial for prison population in terms of reduced reoffending. Therefore, education participation and education status were used in this study to investigate
STOs’ reconviction. The primary outcome was STOs’ proportion of education participation (PEP). PEP was calculated using the total available hours in activities and the actual STO’s participation in order to see the percentage of participated hours within the STO’s served sentence. The secondary outcome was STOs’ reconviction 12 months after release.

*The Personal Aspirations and Concerns Inventory for Offenders (PACIO).*

The PACIO was administered as a preparatory motivational intervention before education in PG. More information on the PACIO can be found in Chapter 2 and Chapter 4. The measures were the AM and the LH/P motivational indices of the PACIO.

*Reconviction.* Reconviction was ascertained via the Police National Computer 12 months after STOs release and was noted in the number of reconvictions and whether the STOs was reconvicted or was not reconvicted.

*Procedure:* STOs were interviewed within a week of their admission to custody in one prison establishment in South Wales. (Details on PACIO and PACIO plus interview procedure can be found in Chapter 3). There were 74 STOs (N=74) who received treatment. Offenders in PG were administered PACIO only (N= 38) and offenders in PMI group (N=36) were administered PACIO plus MI. Non-intervention group (NI) received no intervention (N= 43). The Police National Computer (PNC) excerpt was accessed and number of reconvictions was noted. The number of learners and non-learners were monitored after release and reconviction rates between learners and non-learners were analysed.
5.3 Method of Analysis

The data on PEP were normally distributed and qualified for the use of parametric tests, the data were treated with caution here. This was due to low numbers of learners in each group. A number of non-parametric tests were conducted using Mann-Whitney test and Kruskal-Wallis to test differences in PEP in experimental groups. Method of analysis for primary outcome (N=117): The primary outcome was learners’ PEP in experimental groups. Firstly, PEP was investigated in NI in comparison to treatment groups which were PG plus PMI. Secondly, learners’ PEP was investigated in three experimental groups which were (NI; PG and PMI). Thirdly, PEP was investigated in relation to STOs’ sentence lengths and reconvictions 12 months after release. Methods of analysis for the secondary outcome measure used Spearman correlation and Chi squared. The analyses investigated the relationship between the number of reconvictions and education participation (Spearman) and also differences in education status in terms of reconviction status and the number of reconvictions (Chi squared). In addition, Chi squared was used to investigate reconviction status between education only group and no education and no PACIO and reconviction status between education only group and education plus PACIO group.
5.4 Results

5.4.1 Primary outcome – PACIO as a motivational preparatory intervention to improve STOs’ education participation H1 – H3

The analyses used STOs who participated in custodial education (N=60). Analyses of eligibility to use parametric tests (Kolmogorov-Smirnov) was conducted to conclude that the proportion of education participation (PEP) scores were normally distributed D(60) = .073, p>.05 and homogeneous F(1, 58) = 1.43, p>.05 and F(1, 57) = 1.29, p >.05 in NI and PG and PMI altogether and in the three groups which were NI; PG and PMI respectively.

In this study, STOs participated in educational classes and in workshops in custody. These custodial activities were labelled as education. Table 23 shows the breakdown of STOs numbers in different custodial activities.

Table 23. Breakdown of STOs’ education participation in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Workshops</th>
<th>Total learners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NI</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMI</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NI=Non-intervention; PG=PACIO group; PMI=PACIO plus Motivational Interviewing

Information on descriptive statistics regarding the STOs age, sentence, offending and employment can be found in Chapter 4. Out of 117 STOs, 60 STOs
participated in education and 57 STOs did not participate which were learners and non-learners respectively (see Table 24).

Table 24. Number of learners (N=60) and non-learners (N=57) in NI, PG and PMI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Learners</th>
<th>Non-Learners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NI</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMI</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NI=Non-intervention; PG=PACIO group; PMI=PACIO plus Motivational Interviewing

STOs’ had in total 38,190 hours in education available to them within the time they served. The STOs’ participated hours, means and SDs of STOs participation can be found in Table 25.

Table 25 Learners (N=60) participated hours, mean and SD in education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Participated hours</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NI</td>
<td>6,850</td>
<td>263.46</td>
<td>259.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG</td>
<td>3,846</td>
<td>202.42</td>
<td>141.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMI</td>
<td>3,247</td>
<td>216.47</td>
<td>158.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13,943</td>
<td>227.44</td>
<td>186.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NI=Non-intervention; PG=PACIO group; PMI=PACIO plus Motivational Interviewing

The participated hours and time served in custody was used to calculate proportion of education participation (PEP). The PEP in NI and intervention groups, PG and PMI, can be seen in Table 25.
H1: A Mann-Whitney test revealed that there was no significant difference in PEP between the intervention group in comparison to non-intervention group, $U = 398.0$, $p= .512$, small effect size ($r$) = .06. (95% CI .515 - .534). Thus, STOs who were administered the PACIO and PACIO plus MI analysed together did not differ on their education participation when compared to the NI (see Table 25).

H2: A Kruskal-Wallis test revealed that was no significant difference between PG and PMI in comparison to NI, $H(2) = .450$, $p= .779$. Thus, it seems that there was no difference in STOs’ education participation between the intervention groups which were PG and PMI, and NI (see Table 26).

Table 26. Learners’ PEP and Mean and Standard deviations (SD) in NI and intervention groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>NI</th>
<th>PEP (M)</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NI</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>60.09</td>
<td>26.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>37.16</td>
<td>26.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMI</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37.86</td>
<td>24.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NI=Non-intervention; PG= PACIO group; PMI= PACIO plus MI; N=number of participants;

M=median; SD= standard deviation.

H3: Spearman correlation also revealed a significant positive relationship between PEP and sentence length. It appears that the STOs with longer sentences participated more in education than the STOs with shorter sentences (Rho = .538, $p= .000$) (see Figure 7).
5.4.2 Secondary outcome – Reconviction H4 – H8

H4: Data regarding the number of convictions 12 months after release was available. Thus, PEP was analysed in relation to STOs’ number of convictions. A Spearman correlation revealed that there was a significant negative relationship between the number of conviction and education participation. It seems that those STOs’ who participated in education were less likely to be reconvicted 12 month after release than the STOs who did not participate in education (Rho = -.284, p = .002) (see Figure 8).
Figure 6. Scatterplot of correlation between PEP and number of convictions.

H5: There were 24 learners who were reconvicted in comparison to 39 non-learners who were reconvicted. The total number of reconvictions in learners and non-learners was 253 reconvictions. Reconviction rates of learners and non-learners can be seen in Table 26. There was a significant association between education status (which were learners and non-learners) and whether they reconvicted or not $\chi^2 (1) = 9.50$, $p = .002$; large effect size (phi) = .88. This seems to represent the fact that based on the odds ratio non-learners were 3.25 times more likely to be reconvicted than learners (95% CI 1.51 – 6.95) (see Table 27).
Table 27. Number of STOs who reconvicted and the number of reconvictions in learners and non-learners 12 months after release.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Learners</th>
<th>Number of convictions</th>
<th>Non-learners</th>
<th>Number of convictions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reconvicted</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reconvicted</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H6: A Mann-Whitney test revealed that the number of reconvictions committed by learners was significantly lower when compared to non-learners ($U = 1238.0$, $p = .007$; medium effect size ($r$) = .25).

H7: Chi squared was used to investigate whether there was association between STOs’ reconviction and no PACIO no education group (NPNE); education only (NPYE) or PACIO plus education group (YPYE; see Table 28).
Table 28 Reconviction in four conditions combining the PACIO and education participation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NPNE</th>
<th>NPYE</th>
<th>YPNE</th>
<th>YPYE</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reconvicted</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% in reconviction</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reconvicted</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% in reconviction</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NPNE = No PACIO No education; NPYE = No PACIO Yes education; YPNE = Yes PACIO NO education; YPYE = Yes PACIO Yes education.

There was 76.5% of STOs with no PACIO and no education who were reconvicted in comparison to 38.5% who participated in education only and 64.1% who were administered the PACIO only.

Chi squared revealed that there was a significant association between STO who were not administered the PACIO and did not participate in education and those STOs with no PACIO and participated in education ($\chi^2 (1) = 5.97$, $p = .015$; moderate effect size (phi) = .373). Based on the odds ratio, if the STOs received no intervention they were 5.2 times more likely to be reconvicted than if they participated in education only (95% CI 1.32 – 20.49).

H8: It also appears that those STOs who participated in education only had fewer reconvicted STOs in comparison to those who participated in education and also received the PACIO (42.9%). However, this association was not significant, $\chi^2 (1) = .119$; $p = .73$, small effect size (phi) = .03. Education and the PACIO combined
group were 1.2 times more likely to be reconvicted than those who participated in education only (95% CI .43 – 3.38).

Association between STOs who received no PACIO and did not participate in education was investigated. The chi square revealed that there was not a significant association between intervention and reconviction, $\chi^2 (1) = .830, p = .36$, small effect size (phi) = .12. STOs with no PACIO or education were 1.8 times more likely to be reconvicted in comparison to STOs who were administered the PACIO (95% CI .50 - 6.66).

### 5.4.3 Exploratory post-hoc analysis

A post-hoc analysis was conducted to explore STOs’ employment status, which was employed and unemployed, and education participation (PEP). Mann-Whitney analysis revealed that there was a significant difference in the STOs’ participation in education as those STOs who were employed participated in education more than the STOs who did not report to be employed prior custody, $U = 1,041.00, p = .01$; effect size $r = .31$ (medium effect).

### 5.4.4 Feasibility of a Randomised Controlled Trial

Evaluation of the RCT with regards to the STOs’ recruitment and retention rates against the goals is important for future practice and use in forensic settings. Criteria set out to evaluate feasibility of a future RCT in this study took into consideration:
1. The recruitment rate to the project to be at least 80% of the study sample. This criteria has not been met since out of the approached 174 (N= 174) offenders, there were 117 (N = 117) offenders who participated in this study. This constituted 67% of the total approached offenders. The criterion was not met.

2. The uptake of the interview by at least 60% of STOs in the intervention groups of the trial (PG and PMI). This criterion was met since out of the total 116 allocated offenders to participate in the PACIO interview, there were 74 offenders who participated in the interventions of the trial. This constituted 64% of the total sample. The criterion was met.

3. Collection of education hours during the STOs’ sentence lengths. There were in total 117 offenders out of which 109 (N=109) STOs’ data on education participation was available which represents 93% of the total sample. The criterion was met.

4. PNC follow up at 12 months by at least 80%. This criterion was met since information regarding reconviction was available for 116 STOs which represents more than 99% of the target. The criterion was met.

5.5 Discussion

5.5.1 Summary

Firstly, the results showed that education participation measured in PEP was not significantly different between non-intervention and STOs who were administered the PACIO and PACIO plus MI. Therefore, the PACIO in its current form may not
motivate prisoners into education. Secondly, with regards to reconviction data, there was a negative relationship between PEP and number of convictions, indicating that involvement in education may have a beneficial effect on reducing reoffending. This is in line with other research findings. Thirdly, there was a positive relationship between PEP and sentence length indicating that people with longer sentences are more likely to be involved in education. Learners had significantly fewer reconvictions than non-learners and there were significantly fewer STOs who participated in education only and were reconvicted in comparison to those who did not receive the PACIO and did not participate in education. Lastly, there were fewer STOs in the education only group who reconvicted in comparison to those who received both the PACIO and participated in education. However, it seems that although not significant, STOs in PACIO only group were less reconvicted that the STO who did not received any intervention. These results again show that education has a beneficial effect and that the PACIO appears to add little benefit to this.

5.5.2 The PACIO, education participation and intervention groups

In this study, education participation for STOs was on a voluntary basis and STOs had an opportunity to participate in educational courses such as English and Mathematics, IT, Food and Hygiene course and also work in custodial workshops and gain qualification such as Health and Safety Certificate. PEP was noted without STOs knowledge on weekly basis. The PACIO and the PACIO plus MI administration preceded education participation. The PACIO was administered by a researcher who was known to be part of a team in the education department. The results revealed that neither the PACIO administration nor the PACIO plus MI were effective in increasing
STOs’ hourly participation in education. This is an important finding as it seems that the PACIO as a short motivational treatment did not improve STOs’ participation in custodial education.

However, education participation does not simply depend on STOs motivation and willingness but on other factors. Firstly, education participation is not compulsory and often it is independent from terms and conditions for prison release. STOs in this research were not investigated whether education participation was a court order. Nevertheless, no STOs mentioned during their recruitment interview or their PACIO interview that this was the case. All STOs receive a financial reward for participating in education. Thus, education participation may attract some STOs since it may be considered as a place to socialise with other inmates and earn some money. Also, the ability to participate in education also depends on staff availability. Both teachers in education and prison escorts have to transport STOs to the education department or workshops. Staff sickness or prison lock down (over Christmas period) may have altered the data.

As a result, the social aspect, money and regime could have affected STOs’ education participation and the effect of the PACIO in terms of motivation to increase education participation may have become difficult to detect. It appears that perhaps practical aspects of prison life, such as socialising in a possibly safer place in comparison to prison wings and earning money to be able to buy goods in a prison canteen and staff availability may be important factors in education participation.

Despite this, hourly education participation was considered as a good indicator of STOs engagement in education. However, it may be that STOs participate in education without sufficient engagement. In the future, teachers’ reports of STOs
work and progress may be considered to provide a fuller picture of STOs’ education engagement. Moreover, certificates of achievement may also be indicative of motivation to achieve goals in education. In this study, STOs application process was not monitored. Completing an application form to education may also signify motivation of an individual to participate and engage in education. Therefore, the STOs application process would be worthwhile investigating and feasible as information regarding STOs’ education application process and achievement is available on C-NOMIS.

Furthermore, the effect of added motivational interviewing to the PACIO was not significant. This means that despite more in-depth evaluation of STOs’ goals, providing comprehensive information on educational opportunities in custody, expressing empathy and developing discrepancy between current situations and future goals did not seem to have any effect on the number of participated hours. Therefore, using the PACIO and the PACIO plus does not appear to be feasible in increasing education participation with STOs.

Sentence length and education participation were related in this study suggesting that STOs with longer sentences participated proportionally to their served sentences more that STOs’ with shorter sentences. This result is important since programme availability and application process is time bound and offenders sentenced for short sentences may have perceived that they did not have time to participate in education or there was an insufficient availability of education courses for them at the time of their sentence. Unavailability of variety of educational courses may have also had impact STO education participation. Many STOs have served multiple sentences and may have participated in education previously. Perhaps, there were no courses in
education they did not complete. The shorter sentence length may have also prevented some STOs from applying for an educational course. Furthermore, the new legislation of an extended sentence in community for all STOs may be conducive to education participation. It seems that having a coherent education plan in place during custody and well-managed ‘through the gate’ initiatives may allow some STOs to participate in education after release under a community supervisory order. Future research should investigate STOs who did not participate in education at all during their prison stay as they may be the most difficult to change STOs in terms of education participation and reconviction.

Furthermore, the researcher’s status within the prison service could have influenced the outcome of the study. The researcher was a member of education department and some STOs may have felt that they had already done something positive with regards to education. As a result, they did not participate in education.

A question arises as to what the PACIO is the most appropriate tool to be used for. It appeared that PACIO was previously effective with long-term offenders in terms of increasing their motivation to engage in ETS (Campbell et al., 2010). The PACIO’s predecessor, such as the PCI-OA, was effective to increase offenders’ motivation to engage in treatment (Sellen et al., 2009). This study was the first study conducted with the PACIO in STOs and a mainstream treatment such as ETS was not used. The PACIO investigated STOs’ motivation in order to improve education participation. The PACIO in its current configuration does not seem to be suited for the task to increase education participation.

The PACIO covers life areas which have been thought to assess offenders’ general motivation structure (Cox & Klinger, 2004b). It may be that PACIO was not
specific enough to generate the desired motivational boost for offenders to enter and engage in education. Previously, the PCI focused on the issue in question such as substance use and the PCI-OA on offending and how it interferes with goal attainment. In this study, the PACIO was administered as described in Campbell (2009) so that the PACIO addressed STOs’ goals in six areas such as accommodation and education. Rating scales included items such as importance and likelihood of a goal to be achieved and how future offending may interfere with goal achievement. Specific goals were not mentioned. On reflection, this should have been addressed by asking STOs about how they believed education may help or interfere with their goal achievement. In addition, the PACIO was not able to take into account and assess aforementioned variables such as socialising in education and financial reward. These external motivators were not open to be assessed by the PACIO as potential influence on STOs’ education participation and motivation to participate. Analyses of the PACIO as a motivation assessment can be seen Chapter 6.

5.5.3 STOs’ reconviction and the effect of education participation

Fewer learners were reconvicted in comparison to non-learners and no interventions (PACIO and education) and generally, education participation seemed to reduce the number of reconvictions. However, there were more reconvicted STOs who were administered the PACIO and participated in education than in the education only group.

Education reduced the number of those who reconvicted and the number of reconvictions in comparison to the non-intervention group. This finding supports existing literature on the effect of custodial education. However, education when
preceded by the PACIO as a motivational tool for education participation, increased the number of the STOs’ who were reconvicted by almost 4.5%. Providing that the general reoffending in STOs is about 65%, both STOs in education only and education combined with the PACIO represented reduction in reconviction as their reconviction rate was 38.5% and 42.9% respectively compared to 76.5% in STOs with no education or the PACIO. Therefore, delivering the PACIO prior to education cannot be recommended to be used as a means to improve uptake in education as that in turn reduces reconviction. Nevertheless, PACIO only may be worth investigating in more powered studies as a mediator of change since STOs in the PACIO group seemed to be less likely not to be reconvicted than STOs with no intervention. This needs to be treated with caution as the result was not significantly significant.

5.5.4 Feasibility of conducting a future RCT in this study

5.5.4.1 The recruitment rate

Treatment effectiveness is decided upon statistical analyses, and procedures employed during the trials (such as recruitment of participants). In this trial’s original study design, 24 participants were planned to be recruited in each experimental condition. Originally, STOs were recruited and allocated to non-intervention (NI), PACIO group (PG) and PACIO plus MI (PMI) in 2 conditions which were sentence lengths of less than 6 months (<6months) and more than 6 months but less than 12 months (>6months). However, it was soon realised that sentence groups (<6 months and >6 months) were not needed for the data analyses. Nevertheless, for the consistency of the randomisation and recruitment process, sentence group allocation was adhered to. However, there were different number of STOs recruited in each
group which were 43 (N=43) in NI, 38 (N=38) in PG and 36 (N=36) in PMI. The group sizes seemed to be acceptable number to be recruited in a clinical setting. However, attention needs to be given to recruitment of STOs since many were transferred to another prison establishment. This was due to HMP Service structural changes and there was lack of participants to recruit at the end of the study. As a result, the data collection was extended by another 2 months. Secondly, if there were participants to recruit, as this was the standard way of allocating offenders and no deviations were allowed as RCT recruitment requires a rigid recruitment procedure. This, however, became problematic when there was only one or two participants to recruit a week. It caused the non-intervention group to have the highest number of participants as it was the first experimental group to allocate offenders to and PACIO and Motivational interviewing group had the least participants.

Future research with STOs should focus on promoting the interest of the ‘hard to change’ STOs who did not express interest in participating in this study. The decision of not participating in research must be respected, however, it is important to promote help and support ‘informally’ without assessment or testing such as providing a book from a library, should the STO require so.

5.5.4.2 The PACIO uptake

Generally, STOs were happy to participate in the PACIO interview and were cooperative when the date was suggested for an interview. However, STOs in the intervention group had a higher dropout rate in comparison to the non-intervention group which was 36% and 26% respectively. It seems that STOs who were asked to participate in an interview were more reluctant to do so than when there were no
implications for the STO. This suggests that in a clinical setting it may be important to make sure that those STOs who did not want to participate are given more attention in terms of their reasons why they did not want to participate in an interview, or participate in research or participate in an intervention. It may be that a treatment or an intervention may not be for them for some reason but an alternative should be selected. For example, it may be that an STO would like to write a letter home and does not have any writing paper or a pen. It is important that they are provided in order to support STOs in their goal achievement. Through these alternative routes an STO may find interest in education as, in the case of having difficulties with letter writing, education in custody may be of assistance.

5.5.4.3 Collection of education hours

The collection of hours of offenders with short sentences who participated in education was easily accessible. All data regarding offenders movement within the prison environment is entered into the prison computer system C-NOMIS. The researcher was a member of the staff in the education department and therefore, the researcher was able to access the C-NOMIS regarding the offenders’ education and workshop participation at any time. Despite the complication of database changes at the time of the data collection, the data was available for all participating offenders. The complications started when STOs’ were transferred to other prison establishments. Due to relying on the staff good will and time to find out the offenders’ hours in education for you. Thus, the researcher’s position within the education department and familiarity with the prison computer system was conducive to data collection.
5.5.4.4 PNC follow up

The researcher had permission to access and excerpt from the PNC. In order to do so, it was important to provide exact information about the STOs such as their date of birth, prison number and the date of their court appearance. All the information about the STOs was noted from the prison database and also from the prison archive. As a result of providing detailed information in the application form to the Association of Chief Police Officers, Criminal Record Office (ACRO), 99% of the STOs reconviction rates were able to be traced. However, the PNC records may have been incomplete at the time the excerpt was sent and some important details regarding reconviction were missing.

5.6 Conclusion

In this study, the findings support previous evidence on education and reoffending in that offenders who participate in custodial education are less likely to reoffend. Therefore, it is important that offenders are motivated to participate and engage in pro-social custodial activities such as education as education seems to be a mediator in reduction of reconviction.

However, education participation did not seem to improve for STOs who were administered the PACIO in order to boost motivation to education participation. The effect of MI on education participation was not significant. Therefore, the PACIO and the PACIO plus MI cannot be recommended for use with STOs to improve education participation. However, it is clear that longer custodial sentences were positive in terms of participation in comparison to shorter sentences. New community orders for
STOs may be useful in giving STOs time in community to participate in education which in turn may lead to reduced reconviction (Ministry of Justice, 2013).

Regarding reconviction rates, learners had better outcomes than non-learners since the number of convictions was lower and the more learners participated in education the less likely they were to be reconvicted in comparison to those with fewer hours in education. The effect of education on reconviction was significant in terms of fewer reconvictions when compared to no treatment. The PACIO group also seemed to show a slight reduction in reconviction but combination of the PACIO and education participation showed an increase in reconviction in comparison to education only group. Therefore, education participation is strongly recommended as an intervention for STOs in order to reduce reconviction. However, administration of the PACIO combined with education participation should not be encouraged since the education only group resulted in better outcomes. The ‘motivation challenge’ still stands in that motivating STOs to participate in education is vital in reconviction reduction. Thus, future studies should focus on developing effective tools to motivate STOs to education participation as an effective way to reduce crime. Moreover, effective elements of ‘what works in education’ should be investigated.

Regarding the procedural outcome such as recruitment rate, the interview uptake, collection of education hours and the PNC follow up, it can be concluded that it seems not to be feasible to use the PACIO as a tool to increase STOs’ motivation to education in custody. Despite having above target results for data collection in education and PNC follow up which had 93% and 99% success respectively, the STOs recruitment and the uptake of the interview was lower than the target which was 67% and 64% respectively.
Although the PACIO does not appear to be suitable as a preparatory motivational intervention to improve education participation in STOs, education participation should be strongly promoted since there seem to be evidence to suggest that education reduces reoffending (e.g., Vacca, 2004). If the PACIO were used for education in the future, specific-to-education scales need to be added to the PACIO (see Chapter 7).
Chapter 6 - Study 2: Motivational profiles as assessed on the PACIO and education participation

Summary

The PACIO has been suggested to be a useful tool to assess offenders’ motivational profiles. This study aimed to examine STOs' motivational profiles derived from the PACIO rating scales and compare profile scores between PG and PMI. Firstly, the STOs’ motivational profiles were assessed and two motivation indexes, adaptive motivation index \( \text{AM}_{\text{PACIO}} \) and Learned Helplessness/Powerlessness Index (LH/P), were calculated. Secondly, STOs’ education participation was analysed as to how STOs’ motivational profiles affect education participation. Furthermore, education status, which were learners and non-learners, and motivational profiles were investigated whether learners have higher AM and lower LH/P than non-learners. Thirdly, STOs’ goals were evaluated. There were in total 74 STOs (N=74). The PACIO was administered in order to calculate STOs’ AM \( \text{AM}_{\text{PACIO}} \) and LH/P which were DVs and intervention groups and education status which were learners (N=40) and non-learners (N=34) were independent variables (IVs). Parametric testing was used for motivational profiles and non-parametric testing when PEP was analysed. No significant results were found in offenders’ AM \( \text{AM}_{\text{PACIO}} \) and LH/P index between intervention groups. STOs’ motivational profile had no effect on education participation.
6.1 Introduction

The PACIO has been previously used in order to assess offenders’ motivational structure. It was noted that the PACIO can measure motivation for any goal providing that goals are personally meaningful and will lead to successful outcomes (Campbell, 2009). Previous research suggested a three factor profile consisting of adaptive motivation (AM), maladaptive motivation (identified as learned helplessness/powerlessness on the PACIO; LH/P) and lack of direction (LoD). The PACIO has been suggested to assess offenders’ treatment motivation by calculating adaptive motivation Index (AM (PACIO) Index) and learned helplessness/powerlessness (LH/P Index). Moreover, the PACIO was suggested to be an engagement intervention for offenders (Campbell et al., 2010). In addition to the PACIO, MI was added in order to investigate whether the additional MI would improve STOs motivational profile. Moreover, offenders’ rehabilitative goals are seen as conducive to treatment readiness (Ward et al., 2004) and correctly identifying offenders’ goal structure may hold a key to offenders’ successful rehabilitation (Ward et al., 2004).

6.1.1 The current study

In this study, the PACIO is used as a motivation assessment tool and it is related to education participation in the treatment arm. This study aims to further test the process of change. The PACIO was used to assess 74 STOs’ motivation to participate in education in two treatment groups. There were 38 STOs in the PACIO group (PG) and 36 STOs in the PACIO plus Motivational Interviewing (PMI). Non-intervention group (NI) was not used in this study, since NI participants were not administered the PACIO. The aim of this study was to investigate the effect of MI
addition to the PACIO on the STOs’ motivational structure. This chapter will deal with description, analyses and evaluation of offenders’ adaptive motivation scores (AM \(_{(PACIO)}\) Index) and LH/P in PG and PMI. Furthermore, outcomes from AM and LH/P will be investigated in relation to education participation as to whether learners had different motivational profiles in comparison to non-learners and whether learners’ PEP correlated with motivational profiles. Lastly, STOs’ goals were investigated in PG and PMI.

### 6.1.2 Hypotheses

H1: STOs’ AM in PG and PMI groups will be different (2-tailed).

H2: STOs’ LH/P in PG and PMI groups will be different (2-tailed).

H3: There will be a negative relationship between AM scores and LH/P Index scores.

H4: There will be a positive correlation between AM and PEP.

H5: There will be a negative correlation between LH/P and PEP.

H6: Learners will have higher AM than non-learners.

H7: Non-learners will have higher LH/P than learners.

H6: STOs in PMI group will have more goals than PG.
6.2 Method

Participants: There were in total 74 participants (N=74). There was no data generated in Non-intervention group (NI) with regards adaptive motivation and LH/P as participants in NI were not administered the PACIO. Offenders in PG were administered PACIO only (N= 38) and offenders in PMI group (N=36) were administered PACIO enriched with MI. Also, 34 STOs were used to analyse relationship between motivational profiles and proportion of education participation (PEP). This is since out of the 74 STOs who were administered the PACIO, only 34 participated in education. There were 19 STOs learners and 15 STOs learners in PG and PMI respectively.

Design: This study adheres to RCT methodology. Eligibility of STOs, randomisation, recruitment and allocation followed methodology in Chapter 4. Adaptive motivation and LH/P were DVs and intervention groups which were PG and PMI were independent variables (IVs).

Measures: The Personal Aspirations and Concerns Inventory-for Offenders (PACIO; see Chapter 2). There were three motivational profiles in the PACIO which loaded both positively and negatively. They were adaptive motivation, learned helplessness/powerlessness and lack of direction (Table 29).
Table 29. Factor loadings on Adaptive motivation (AM), Learned Helplessness/Powerlessness (LH/P) and Lack of Direction (LoD) (Campbell, Sellen & McMurrain et al., in preparation).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>LH/P</th>
<th>Lack of Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Importance</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing how</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison helps</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offending helps</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: + = positive loading; - = negative loading; X = item did not load.

Seven factors loaded positively on AM which were likelihood, knowledge, control, happiness, importance, commitment and prison helps. ‘Offending affects’ did not load on Factor 1. According to Campbell et al. (2010), high AM (PACIO Index scores indicate that an offender is likely to attain goals, expects happiness when goal is achieved, commits to goals, knows how to achieve them, is in control and believes that goal achievement is important. Moreover, it is viewed that prison will help with goal achievement.

Four scales loaded positively on Factor 2 which were reoffending helps, commitment, importance and happiness. Three factors loaded negatively which were
control, prison helps and likelihood. Thus, offenders who score high on LH/P also feel they are committed and understand that goal achievement would bring them happiness while future reoffending will interfere in their life. Nevertheless, they also feel they lack control over goals, think goals are unlikely to be achieved and think prison will interfere rather than help with achieving goals are indices with negative loading (see Table 28). High LH/P (PACIO) Index may be a motivational problem with regards to the offenders’ readiness to change (Campbell, Sellen & McMurran., in preparation).

AM had an alpha level of .67 which is just below an acceptable level .70 as a cut-off point. Deleting prison scales would increase alpha to .72 Increasing alpha was suggested to .72. However, prison scales whether prison and offending affect were claimed to be a useful source of information regarding offenders’ motivation and therefore kept in the PACIO (Campbell, Sellen & McMurran, in preparation). In this study, Cronbach’s alpha for AM was calculated and it was revealed that the Cronbach’s alpha has improved at level .72 and after prison affect scale removal the alpha could be further improved to .84.

The LH/P yielded unacceptable alpha level of .53 which could be increased to .60 if prison scales were removed (Campbell, Sellen & McMuran, in preparation). In the sample reported in this study, Cronbach’s alpha has improved to .65 and the removal of prison helps would increase alpha to .72. LoD was not used in this study since it yielded a low and unacceptable level of .18.

**Outcome measures:** The primary outcome of this study was to assess STOs’ motivational profiles which were adaptive motivation (AM (PACIO)) Index and Learned Helplessness/Powerlessness index. Calculation of the indexes can be found in 2.4.3.8 and 4.6.3. The secondary outcome was to investigate STOs’ motivational profiles in
relation of education participation measured in PEP. This means that scores on motivational profiles and PEP are investigated in relation to intervention groups. The tertiary outcome was to investigate STOs’ goals in terms of frequency in intervention groups.

**Procedure:** The study was approved by the University’s ethics panel and by the HMPS’s ethics panel. STOs were interviewed within a week of being sentenced. The PACIO was administered as a semi-structured interview (see Chapter 2). While the PACIO was administered, STOs talked about their aspirations, concerns and their goals. These goals were then rated by the STOs on a scale from 0-10 on 8 indices which were the goal’s importance, likelihood to happen, control over the goal, knowing what to do, happiness on the goal’s attainment, commitment and two indices relating directly to reoffending which were prison affects and reoffending affects goal achievement. Interviews in the PACIO and PACIO plus MI used different interview techniques such as more expressed empathy, developing discrepancy, acknowledgement of obstacles to achieve goals and provision of information regarding custodial education in PMI group (see Chapter 4). PEP was calculated taking into account STOs’ hourly education participation and the time they served in custody. STOs goals were noted in the PACIO interview sheet and their frequency in each life were noted.

**Method of Analysis:** The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was conducted in order to test whether the sample score distribution deviates from a comparable normal distribution. The analyses revealed that the scores on adaptive motivation, D(38) = .103, p>.05 in PG and D(36) = .123, p>.05 in PMI were normally distributed. Levene’s test of homogeneity for adaptive motivation indicated equal variances in the
sample F (1, 72) = .881, p >.05. The analyses revealed that the scores on LH/P, D(38) = .088, p>.05 in PG and D(36) = .089, p>.05 in PMI were normally distributed. Levene’s test of homogeneity for LH/P indicated equal variances in the sample F (1, 72) = .143, p>.05.

Therefore, parametric tests were used. T-tests and Pearson’s correlation were used to analyse AM and LH/P in PG and PMI. Furthermore, non-parametric tests were used to analyse the relationship between motivational profiles and education participation. This is despite the fact that data on motivational profiles and education participation were normally distributed and homogenous. However, there are only 34 STOs used in this analyses with small numbers of STOs in each cell and therefore, a non-parametric test, Spearman correlation was employed.

6.3 Results

6.3.1 Primary outcome – Assess STOs’ Adaptive motivation (AM\textsubscript{PACIO}) Index) and Learned Helplessness/Powerlessness (LH/P Index) - H1-H2

The minimum possible score on the AM\textsubscript{PACIO} Index was 0 and the maximum was 10. The data ranged from 2.14 to 9.07. For the 74 participants involved in this analysis, the mean AM\textsubscript{PACIO} Index score for the population was 7.42 (SD = 1.04; 95% CI = -.38 - .57). The minimum possible score on the LH/P Index was 0 and the maximum was 10. The data in this study ranged from 4.79 to 7.48 and the mean LH/P Index was 5.97 (SD=.51). Main effect means (M) and standard deviations (SD) of AM\textsubscript{PACIO} Index and LH/P Index in the two experimental conditions can be seen in Table 30.
Table 30. Group means of Adaptive motivation and Learned Helplessness/Powerlessness (LH/P) in two experimental conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Adaptive motivation</th>
<th>Learned Helplessness/Powerlessness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG</td>
<td>7.45</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMI</td>
<td>7.39</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PG=PACIO group; PMI=PACIO and Motivational Interviewing; AM=adaptive motivation; LH/P Learned Helplessness/Powerlessness; M= main effect mean; SD= standard deviations.

H1 and H2: A t-test found no significant differences in adaptive motivation scores between PG and PMI, t(72) = .248, p=.805 (2-tailed), Cohen’s d = .08. A second t-test showed no significant differences in LH/P scores between PG and PMI, t(72) = -.510, p = .611 (2-tailed), Cohen’s d = -.12.

6.3.2 Correlation between AM (PACIO) Index and LH/P Index scores - H3

H3: In this study, Pearson’s correlation r was used to investigate the relationship between AM (PACIO) Index and LH/P Index. The analysis revealed that there was a negative correlation between AM (PACIO) Index and LH/P scores. However, this relationship did not show as statistically significant, (r=-.187; p=.111; Figure 7). A removal of the outlier (participant 38) demonstrated that there was a negative relationship between AM and LH/P. However, this relationship was not significant, (r=-.159; p=.375).
6.3.3 Motivational profiles and STOs’ education status (ES) – H4

There were in total of 74 STOs (N=74) out of which 34 were learners (N=34) and 40 were non-learners (N=40; see Table 31).

Table 31 Number of learners and non-learners in PG and PMI group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Learners</th>
<th>Non-learners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PG</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMI</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PG=PACIO group; PMI= PACIO plus MI group.

H4: A Spearman correlation coefficient rho indicated that there was a weak, non-significant, positive relationship between adaptive motivation and PEP in learners
(N=34), $r = .117$, $p=.25$, (see Figure 9). One outlier was removed (participant number 38). However, there was an even weaker correlation between AM and PEP after the removal of the outlier $r = .043$, $p = .81$.

Figure 8 Correlation between adaptive motivation (AM) and proportion of education participation (PEP).

H5: A Spearman correlation revealed a negative relationship between LH/P and PEP $r = -.154$, $p = .19$. However, this relationship was not significant (see Figure 9).
H6: Mann-Whitney test revealed that there was not a significant difference in AM between learners and non-learners. Learners did not have significantly higher AM, $U= 553, p=.17$, small effect size $r = .16$ (see Figure 10).

Figure 9 Correlation between learned helplessness and powerlessness (LH/P) and proportion of education participation (PEP).

Figure 10 Shows spread of AM scores in non-learners and learners.
H7: Mann-Whitney test revealed that there was not a significant difference in LH/P between learners and non-learners (N=74). Non-learners did not have significantly higher LH/P, U= 652.0, p=.76, effect size r = .035 (see Figure 11).

![Box plot showing LH/P scores for non-learners and learners.](image)

*Figure 11 Shows spread of LH/P scores in non-learners and learners.*

After the removal of the outlier, participant 149, LH/P showed no significant difference between non-learners and learners (N= 73); U = 652.0; p = .903.

### 6.3.4 Goals

During the PACIO interview, each STO stated goals with a degree of importance. The STOs stated in total of 472 goals in 7 life areas. Education, training and employment (ETE) area had the most goals (N= 87) and accommodation and recreation had the fewest goals (N=75). Table 32 shows the number of goals in each life area in different intervention groups.
Table 32 Overview of STOs’ goals in different life areas in PG and PMI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>PG</th>
<th>PMI</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-changes and attitudes</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETE</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean rank</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>472</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ETE= Education, Training and Employment

H8: Goal formation and goal achievement are crucial in motivation as it was argued that offenders with meaningful goals who change their narrative of self-identity and their goals may seem to be unrealistic, are less likely to reoffend (Maruna, 2001). This type of qualitative analysis was not conducted here; however, the number of goals was explored in the intervention groups. A Mann-Whitney test revealed that there was not a significant difference between PG and PMI in the number of goals, $U= 661.5$, $p = .76$. 
6.4 Discussion

6.4.1 Summary

The results indicated that the PACIO enriched by the MI did not improve STOs’ scores on AM and did not decrease STOs’ scores on LH/P in comparison to the PACIO only group. AM and LH/P scores correlated negatively. The negative correlation between AM and LH/P on the PACIO is supported by previous research (Campbell et al., 2010; Campbell et al., in preparation). However, in this study, the negative correlation was not statistically significant. Further, there was a positive point, however, as no significant correlation between AM and PEP and a negative correlation between LH/P and PEP. There was not a significant difference between learners and non-learners in the AM and LH/P scores. AM in learners was not higher than in non-learners and LH/P was not lower in learners than in non-learners. In addition, there was no significant difference in terms of the number of STOs’ goals between PG and PMI. In this study, the PACIO as an assessment, showed an improved reliability in comparison to Campbell’s study. The internal reliability was established at .72 for AM and slightly under .70 cut of point, .65, for LH/P. The outcomes of the PACIO as an intervention tool revealed that predictions in relation of motivational profiles and education participation did not show significant differences between AM in PG and PMI and LH/P in PG and PMI.
6.4.2 Adaptive motivation (AM) and learned helplessness/powerlessness (LH/P) as assessed on the PACIO

The administration of the PACIO plus MI did not increase AM and did not decrease LH/P as predicted in comparison to PACIO only group. Moreover, behavioural outcome, which was education participation, was not higher in the PMI group. Moreover, non-learners did not have lower AM than learners and higher LH/P and lower AM respectively. However, there are several limitations in this study which had impact on the results.

The PACIO is both an assessment and an intervention tool. It is questionable whether the PACIO is suitable to assess STOs’ motivation to participate in education. Previously, the PACIO and its predecessors such as the PCI-OA were used as assessment of offenders’ motivation to engage in treatment. The PACIO’s reliability was adequate; however, the PACIO may have low validity. It seems that in this study, the PACIO was not specific to assessing motivation to education participation. Perhaps, amendments in the ‘Education’ area may be necessary in order for the PACIO to assess education motivation and to strengthen face validity. Moreover, the PACIO must be questioned on the suitability to assess motivation to education in offenders sentenced to short sentences. Perhaps, the PACIO was not able to capture STOs’ motivation due the constraint of the sentence. The time spent in custody may be too short for some STOs’ to participate in meaningful activity. It is likely that this may impact on the level of their motivation to participate in education in custody. Secondly, the availability of the prison provision may have affected the findings of this study. STOs may have perceived that education classes are not suitable for their
needs. Based on the PACIO interviews, STOs’ often talked about the importance of finding employment. Thus, education courses should include training on transferrable employability and employment skills such as communication and vocational training. It seems that STOs’ motivation to education cannot be assessed separating from the prison regime in place. Except for the variety and the relevance of education courses, education participation may be affected by other variables such as financial rewards for participating in education and socialising with other inmates. Since the different aspect of motivation may play a role in order for STOs to participate in education, a question arises whether it is important to assess STOs’ education motivation. Future research should investigate whether suitable educational courses relevant for local employment demand and establishing education pathways, linking custody to colleges after release, can be effective in increasing education participation in custody. Furthermore, future research needs to develop a specific tool to increase STOs’ motivation to participate in educating and establish its validity and reliability.

6.4.3 The PACIO as an assessment of education participation

Education participation was expected to correlate with the motivational profiles. PEP correlated positively with AM and negatively with LH/P which was the expected prediction. There are other variables that may have contributed to the results such as those already mentioned, including educational courses which are not suitable for STOs, lack of relevant courses, payment for participating in education and social aspect of education participation.

The PACIO as an assessment did not accurately assess the motivational profiles in relation to education since there was no difference between learners and
non-learners in their AM and LH/P scores. The results indicated that those who participated in education did not have a higher adaptive motivational profile in comparison to those who did not participate in education. Thus, currently, the PACIO cannot be used as an assessment tool of STOs’ motivation to education participation.

6.4.4 The PACIO and goals

The PACIO is a goal-based tool. Goals are central to the PACIO as an assessment and also as a motivational intervention. However, the type of goals was not taken into account and it was assumed that the goals the interviewer noted were pro-social goals. The content of the goals was not taken into account when calculating adaptive motivation index and LH/P. For instance, an offender can have one goal such as ‘I will improve in my career’. This however, may be explained further as ‘I will improve my career as a criminal’. In such case an offender set a goal that was important to him, likely to happen, he was committed and in control and its achievement would bring happiness to his life. This goal may be viewed as supported by prison as many criminal peers may offer advice on how to become a more successful criminal. Therefore, such an unlikely offender even with one goal would score highly on adaptive motivation and participate in education but without the future positive behaviour change, such as stopping reoffending. Thus, there is a problem with identifying appropriate goals in the PACIO as it is administered as a semi-structured interview. This may be made more accurate by finding out more personal details provided by the prison system about an offender. This addition may prove beneficial as potentially dangerous and harming goals may be detected. Another example may be an offender stating a goal ‘I will live at home’ in Accommodation
area. It may seem to be positive as an offender claims to have a place to live after release. However, if a background check is completed before the PACIO interview it may be understood as and ‘I will live at home where I abused my partner and am serving the current sentence for.’

A question arises to what extent an interviewer should become involved in finding out more about the offenders’ background and the reality of the offenders’ goals to happen. Even limited access to offenders’ background information may bring positive outcomes such as identifying offenders with risk to harm or reoffend. The meaning of offenders’ goals should be made more transparent rather than being hidden beyond calculation of the motivational profiles.

### 6.4.4.1 Exploring STOs’ goals

There was no significant difference found between PG and PMI in terms of the number of goals. STOs in the PMI stated more goals, but not a significantly higher number, of them. The lower frequency of goals in PG may indicate more focus on the set goals. However, strategies and focus to achieve goals would need to be investigated in a future study.

During the PACIO interview it was noted that generally STOs selected one goal per area which may not be a true reflection of the offenders’ goals. This could be avoided by splitting the areas into smaller ones as previously in the PCI-OA. As a consequence of the PACIO abbreviation, the application of the PACIO has been shorter, but this does not mean that the new, more time convenient form, is more accurate when researching offender’s goals. Furthermore, the PACIO life areas seem not to be of the same bearing with regards to offenders’ meaningfulness. For instance,
during interviews offenders found it hard to form goals in the ‘Other’ area but seemed to have many concerns and goals in areas such as ‘Accommodation’ and ‘Employment, Education and Financial situation’. Therefore, providing the widths of each area ‘Other’ area seems not to be necessary to be included. Importantly, the meaning of the goals needs to be questioned and challenged. This may be advanced by gaining wider knowledge about the offender provided on the prison databases and prior conversations with personnel involved in the offender rehabilitation. Therefore, both, self-report and systemic information can be combined in order to provide offenders with rounder rehabilitative care.

6.4.5 The PACIO and the Good Lives Model (GLM)

Goals are central to Good Lives Model of Offender Rehabilitation (GLM; Ward & Brown, 2004; see Chapter 2). The GLM is a strength-based approach proposing that offenders’ values, capabilities and well-being together with meaningful goals are central to living a pro-social and meaningful life (Ward & Maruna, 2007). Offenders, like the rest of us, seek similar life values which are defined in ‘primary goods’ (Ward et al., 2006). For instance, taking an educational course or completing a vocational course may satisfy primary goods of knowledge and excellence at work while, for instance, a yoga class may satisfy the primary good of inner peace. Therefore, positive approaches using offenders’ strengths in rehabilitation should be encouraged. Offenders’ goals should be inspected closely as the goals may be the offenders’ strengths upon which a rehabilitative plan may have the potential to be based.
Campbell et al. (2010) suggested the PACIO may have utility to be an assessment of the GLM. It seems that the PACIO shares some similarities with the structure of the GLM. This is especially in the life areas that have been suggested both by the GLM and by the PACIO authors as important in rehabilitation such as having relevant education and being motivated to change behaviour. Currently there is no evidence available on the use of GLM and STOs, however, the GLM life areas do seem to be relevant for STOs’ rehabilitation. Although the PACIO was suggested to be used as an assessment of offenders’ treatment motivation (Campbell, Palmer et al., in preparation; Campbell, Sellen & McMurran, in preparation), in this research the PACIO did not seem to assess STOs’ motivation with regards to education participation. Therefore, the PACIO in the current form administered to STOs and its potential utility in the GLM cannot be currently be anticipated.

6.4.6 Future research

Future research should investigate the underlying processes between adaptive motivation and how it relates to motivation for treatment. Currently, it is not clear how offenders’ motivation structure relates to ‘specific’ motivation such as motivation to treatment engagement and motivation to engage in education. Moreover, research in maladaptive motivation should investigate how scores on LH/P reflect STOs’ behaviour and also the impact and its extent on adaptive motivation.

There is a need to investigate how offenders’ sentenced to short sentences view themselves with regards to their life situation, how they perceive the chance of stopping reoffending and the resettlement in society after release. This may shed light on the meaning of offenders’ goals set and how they reflect their reality. Moreover,
the research may provide a deeper understanding of processes involved in stopping reoffending (Maruna et al., 2004).

Offenders’ adaptive motivation in this study was assessed only once and that was at the start of the custodial sentence. The PACIO motivation assessment at the end of offenders’ sentence together with offenders’ behaviour and activity monitoring would have shed more light onto offenders’ behaviours and adaptive motivation and LH/P. In addition, two-point testing and also establishing a control group would contribute to evaluating the effectiveness of the PACIO as an assessment tool and as an intervention tool.

Furthermore, follow up studies and longitudinal studies are important to establish whether higher adaptive motivation affects STOs’ general readiness to change (Cox, Blount, Bair & Hosier, 2000) and how the changes impact on STOs’ reconviction.

6.4.7 Conclusion

In conclusion, the current study investigating motivational profiles as assessed on the PACIO cannot be recommended as an assessment tool of STOs’ motivation to participate in education. This is since AM scores and LH/P scores of the STOs in the PACIO plus MI were not higher and lower respectively. Motivational profiles, AM and LH/P, were not negatively related and therefore contradict findings of previous research on motivational profiles and treatment engagement (Campbell et al., 2010). In addition, STOs’ education participation in custody was not higher in comparison to the PACIO group. Moreover, learners did not have higher AM scores in comparison
to non-learners. However, there was no control group established since the PACIO has been shown to be a motivational intervention. Thus, inferences from the analyses can only be made about the effectiveness of the PACIO plus MI and also education participation in the PACIO plus MI group. Based on these results, the PACIO plus MI does not seem to be useful as an assessment and intervention enhancer of STOs’ motivation to participate in custodial education. Nevertheless, an accurate and a reliable assessment of offenders’ motivation to education needs to be developed. If the PACIO was to be used as an assessment, it would need to be amended specifically for education (see Chapter 7).
Chapter 7 – Discussion

Summary

It is vital to try to enhance short-term offenders’ (STOs) motivation to engage in those interventions in which they participate while in custody in order to promote change. Education is one of the few interventions that is accessible to STOs and there is evidence to suggest that education reduces reoffending. STOs have the highest reoffending rates compared with offenders with longer sentences, and are thought to have the most rehabilitation needs such as behavioural problems and lack of education. Thus, enhancing STOs’ motivation to education could be beneficial for offenders, and for society as it has the potential to help offenders achieve certain life goals, and so desist from crime and prevent further victims of crime.

This thesis includes an exploratory qualitative study on STOs’ thoughts and feelings with regards to employment, education and attitude and self-change issues. This exploratory study led to the investigation of STOs’ motivation to participate in education as the results of the exploratory study suggested that STOs may not perceive education as conducive to gaining employment post-release

An RCT feasibility study was conducted to investigate the PACIO as a preparatory motivational intervention and an assessment of STOs’ motivation to participate in education. The results of the PACIO investigation will be evaluated in this chapter.
7.1 Summary of results

An average offender in this study was between 31-32 years old and was serving a sentence of 12 months or less for either a violent offence or a theft. However, this typical offender had been given sentences in his lifetime of a length of almost 20 years (this includes community and concurrent sentences). This typical short-term offender was sentenced to almost 6.5 years in custody over their lifetime and was most likely to have been unemployed prior to custody and educationally achieving Level 1 (see Chapter 4). Offenders typically have goals to gain employment or improve education (McMurran, Theodosi, Sweeney & Sellen, 2008). Research has shown that education reduced reoffending (e.g., Steurer & Smith, 2003; Wilson et al., 2000; Vacca, 2004) and therefore, increasing STOs’ motivation to participate in education is worth pursuing.

7.1.1 Exploratory study

There is some evidence to suggest that relevant education and appropriate attitudes, thinking and behaviours are conducive to employment post-release (Wilson et al., 2000; Hopkins, 2012; Brunton-Smith & Hopkins, 2013; Duwe, 2014). Therefore, engagement in education in custody needs to be encouraged. The findings of this exploratory study revealed that STOs did not make a clear connection between the benefits of education and better employment prospects post-release. Although STOs discussed their offending in relation to factors established by NOMS (2004), there was little evidence suggested that STOs were aware that education and the
qualifications gained while in custody and better prospects of gaining employment or thinking that education may be contributory to a crime-free future.

This chapter provided evidence that employment and employability issues are linked with other factors that have been outlined by NOMS as contributory factors leading to crime. The results showed that despite many references to connect employment with issues and concerns in areas such as lack accommodation, problems with mental and physical health and drug and alcohol abuse, no explicit links were made with regards the importance of education, attitudes and behaviour and better prospects of employment after release. This is contrary to some existing literature on offenders’ employment, education and changing attitude needs (Hopkins, 2012).

The lack of awareness can affect offenders’ motivation to enter and engage in education in custody. Therefore, it is important that STOs are aware of the benefits of custodial education and workshops and motivation to improve motivation to participate in education. Motivation of offenders is important because in order to change behaviour and rehabilitate effectively, an offender must be motivated to participate in a programme (McMurran & Theodosi, 2007). Offenders can have issues and concerns in many of the life areas which have been outlined in NOMS pathways (Home Office, 2004). Similar pathways have also been identified in theoretical rehabilitative frameworks such as the Risk Need and Responsivity (RNR; Andrews & Bonta, 2003) framework and the Good Lives Model (GLM; Ward et al., 2006). The RNR introduced factors contributing to crime as criminogenic needs. One of the needs is lack of education and thus, offenders’ education needs to be improved in order to reduce reoffending (Wilson et al., 2000; Vacca, 2004). The GLM also acknowledges the importance of education but the lack of education is thought to be an obstacle to
achieve a primary good of ‘Knowledge’. It is understood that to improve the lack of education or aiming to achieve the primary good of knowledge would not be possible without motivation to change. The Multifactor Offender Readiness Model (Ward et al., 2004) included both internal and external factors that can contribute to a level of motivation to participate in an intervention, such as education. It includes awareness of a problem and understanding that an intervention can help you to rehabilitate (Ward et al., 2004). In the interviews of the exploratory study of this thesis (chapter 3) the STOs acknowledged that education is important to have but they did not mention in what way education could help them. The STOs did not make a link between a lack of custodial education and employment post-release. It seems that despite offenders’ claims that gaining employment and having relevant education is important (McMurran, Theodosi, Sweeney & Sellen, 2008), offenders do not always make connections between employment and education, as indicated in chapter 3, which may influence offenders’ motivation to participate in education in prison. There is some evidence in the literature about increased employment rate for offenders who participated in custodial education and vocational training (eg., Wilson et al., 2000). Therefore, it is vital to enhance and assess STO’ motivation in order to maximise offenders’ education participation which may in turn increase prospects of employment after release. This is especially important for those offenders on short sentences and with limited provision in custody (Lewis et al., 2003a).

The PACIO has been previously suggested to have a potential to be a motivation enhancer and motivation assessment for offenders prior to psychological treatment (Campbell et al., 2010). Therefore, the PACIO was used in this study as a preparatory motivational intervention and a motivation profiles assessment for STOs prior to participation in education. The results indicated that the PACIO did not
increase STOs’ motivation for education in comparison to a non-intervention group. However, it appears that education had a significant positive effect on reducing the number of offenders who were reconvicted and on the number of their reconvictions.

The process of change was tested in a sample of STOs by investigating STOs’ motivational profiles. It appears that the PACIO did not improve adaptive motivation scores and did not lower LH/P scores in comparison to a group who received the PACIO plus MI. It looks as if learners’ motivational profiles did not differ from non-learners’ motivational profiles, indicating that the PACIO as an assessment tool did not reflect the motivational profiles predicted to be associated with education participation. The concept of motivation for a particular behaviour and the behaviour itself are inseparable and therefore motivation to achieve a goal, should resonate with the motivation in a relevant behaviour (Drieschner et al., 2004).

Furthermore, the results from the RCT targets indicated that recruitment rate for the trial was 13% lower than expected. It seems that the feasibility study did not produce results to support the set target regarding recruitment rate. However, other targets were exceeded, namely the uptake of the interview in the active arm, collection of hourly education participation and PNC data collection. Currently, this feasibility study indicated that the PACIO cannot be recommended as a preparatory motivational intervention and motivational assessment for STOs to participate in custodial education.
7.2 PACIO as a preparatory motivational intervention to motivate STOs to participate in education

The results showed that STOs did not differ between treatment and control groups in how many hours they spent in education, proportionally to the sentence length. One of the reasons why the PACIO did not seem to enhance STOs’ motivation to education was that the PACIO as an intervention to boost motivation may have been too general for a specific use such as enhancing motivation to education participation. An important aspect is to know how the PACIO was supposed to motivate STOs to participate in education. The PACIO in this research used elements of Campbell’s (2009) model where the PACIO was used prior to intervention to improve long-term offenders’ motivation to engage in treatments such as Enhanced Thinking Skills. Since the STOs’ access to interventions can be limited, education was taken as a form of an intervention, but the PACIO was not adapted for this purpose. It seems that the PACIO would need to be adapted specifically for educational purposes. Given that education appears to reduce reconviction (e.g., Wilson et al., 2000; Chappell, 2004; Aos et al., 2006) and increase employment rates after release (Wilson et al., 2000) it may be worth revising the PACIO to suit education better. Firstly, the PACIO life areas need to be related to education. This means that the interviewer should suggest how the goals selected in each area could be achieved through the means of education. For instance, knowledge and skills gained in a Key Skills course may contribute to a better ability to understand domestic bills and how they can be calculated so the STOs may be able to budget better. These skills may help to keep up with the rent and plan for the next payment and in turn prevent eviction (Table 33).
Table 33 Suggestions for PACIO goal attainment through education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PACIO wider life areas</th>
<th>Related to education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>To gain budgeting skills and calculating bills may prevent house eviction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close personal relationships</td>
<td>To improve and gain new skills such as reading to make partner/children to be proud what I have achieved. This may help with supporting own children with homework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical or mental health issues</td>
<td>To participate and socialise in education in story writing classes for example. The classes may help to release stress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Art classes may help improve drawing and interest in arts in general.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-changes and personal improvement, and problem with anger and violence.</td>
<td>Participation in any education may contribute to improved self-esteem. The employability course contains a module on appropriate behaviour in the workplace. This module addresses problem solving and anger management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment, training and financial situation</td>
<td>Skills and knowledge gained in English, Maths, and IT classes may contribute to better prospect of employment, improved budgeting skills, and improved self-esteem and self-efficacy beliefs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Secondly, the PACIO contains rating scales asking about the importance of the goals, the likelihood of the goal happening, control over the goal, how achievable the goal is, how happy and committed an offender may feel upon the goal achievement and when will the goal happen. The PACIO also contains an offending scale and a prison scale where offenders can score on a 10-point scale how offending and prison affect the set goal. Offenders are also asked to list ways (good or bad) in which being in prison may affect the goal attainment (Campbell et al., 2010). It is suggested that a new 10-point rating scale replaces the existing prison scale asking ‘How could education help you to attain your goals?’ This may add to the potential to develop the PACIO into an intervention to enhance offender’ motivation to education (Table 34). However, another feasibility study would need to be conducted to investigate validity and reliability of the new tool specifically adapted for education use.
Identifying meaningful goals and recognising that education can help and how offending interferes with goal achievement could create motivation to change which would help offenders engage in education. The changes should be supported via education tapping into areas where STOs set their goals which have been argued to be personally meaningful means for change (Karoly, 1993).
The results of this study revealed that the longer the sentence was the more likely STOs were to participate in education. This finding indicated that longer sentences support the uptake of education. STOs with longer sentences may feel that participating in education may be more meaningful in terms of their goal attainment in comparison to STOs with short sentences. Also, the prison may offer more courses available for longer serving offenders. The longer running courses may be more useful and applicable to for STOs in terms of applicability for instance to employment. Further research needs to be conducted in order to investigate STOs’ reasons for attending education and how education can help STOs to achieve goals.

7.2.1 The PACIO plus Motivational Interviewing

Despite previous evidence that MI can improve offenders’ motivation to change and treatment engagement (McMurran, 2009), MI as an adjunct to the PACIO in this study did not seem to improve STOs’ education participation. In the RCT, the predicted increase in adaptive motivation and decrease in LH/P in PMI group was not confirmed. STOs who were administered the MI in addition to the PACIO did not improve their education participation more than those who received the PACIO alone.

The lack of any positive finding may be because, as highlighted in the previous section, the PACIO structure needs to be revised to relate the PACIO to education (see 7.2). For instance, if an offender could not read well and wanted to go to education, the implications of his inability to read well and the impact of improved reading and better understanding was not explored fully. There may also have been a problem with using MI with STOs. One of the principles of MI is ‘Developing discrepancy’, which promotes motivation to change behaviour by evaluating the
current situation against future plans and goals. This promotes recognition of
discrepancy between the current and future goals which is thought to motivate the
client to make desired life changes (Rollnick & Miller, 1995). However, if an offender
is not equipped with tools to achieve the goal or does not feel in control over the goal,
it is unlikely that the offender will achieve the goal without further support. For
instance, in this study, an offender found finding employment difficult and therefore
he wanted to gain a vocational qualification, but this could only be done after release
(see Chapter 3). Previous studies mention offenders’ time-constraints in terms of their
goals as in order to achieve their goals, some offenders needed to wait until their
release (Sellen et al., 2009; Campbell, 2009; McMurrant, 2010). Therefore, in the
future, if the PACIO were to be used in education, supporting mechanisms would
need to be implemented in order to minimise the discrepancy between current and
future situation and promote goal achievement.

Currently, the PACIO seems to be more driven by assessing offenders’
motivation rather than exploring offenders’ concerns and focusing on understanding
possible underlying issues regarding his/her motivation to change. Moreover, there
are no guidelines as to for whom the PACIO is most relevant and beneficial (e.g.,
long-term/ short-term offenders; low, medium or high risk). Thus, attention should be
given to further research in order to establish for whom the PACIO is suitable for and
whether it can be developed into a motivational intervention for STOs entering
education.

Based on the interviews that were conducted in this study, the PACIO seemed
to provide a useful interview structure noting STOs’ concerns and goals. Such
structure may be useful to identify and explore the STOs’ motivational structure and
has potential to contribute to transition from custodial setting to supervision in community.

7.3 Education as a means to reduce reconviction

In this study, 30% of STOs achieved below level 1 in literacy or numeracy. This is a lower number in comparison with an average of 65% in literacy and numeracy levels in the resettlement study of more than 2,000 offenders (Niven & Olagundoye, 2002). Further, 36% of STOs in this study self-reported to achieve level 1 in literacy or numeracy. Furthermore, in this study, almost a half of STOs did not participate in education or workshop and only a third achieved above level 1. Therefore STOs’ participation in education needs to be improved.

In this study, the STOs entered education on a voluntary basis and no sanctions were in place if offenders did not choose to enter or if they dropped out. As well as offenders’ motivation to education, it is important to consider other factors that may have influenced the STOs’ decision to participate. The hourly education participation can be thought to be a reasonable indicator of STOs motivation but the prison system and the education application process may impact on STOs’ motivation. In order to participate in education or workshops, an offender needs to fill in an application form and states which courses he/she is interested in attending. This process may be challenging for many offenders. One of the discriminatory factors may be the offenders’ sentence length since there may not be enough time to apply and meaningfully engage for STOs. Due to the STOs short sentences, there can be lack custodial education provision for this group. Only a few programmes are
available for offenders who follow the re-offending cycle the most frequently. Therefore, those motivated for education may not have the opportunity to engage in it. STOs’ sentence lengths can therefore influence education participation as STOs. This was supported in this study as the results showed that longer sentences were associated with higher education participation.

In this study, STOs who participated in non-vocational workshops, as well as those STOs who participate in classes in education were also included. This was since these were the few activities STOs were able to participate within the constraints of their sentence. However, retrospectively, future studies on the impact of STOs’ reconviction should clearly distinguish between different types of prison activities/education courses. This distinction may help to identify what type of educational activity work the best in terms of reduction of reconviction.

Also, STOs who struggle with literacy may not be able to fill in an education application form. Further, many offenders have negative and disrupted experience with schooling due to their personal characteristics such as antisocial personality and cognition and also social factors such as criminal peers.

All offenders are paid for attending education classes, which may complicate assessment and treatment of STOs’ motivation to participate in education (MoJ, 2004). The question is whether education is taken as a means to gain money to finance cigarettes or other luxuries, or as a means to improve English and IT skills. Other external factors may have influenced the learners’ education participation such as socializing aspect with other learners. This study also suggested that previous employment status may play an important role in education participation. Those STO who had employment prior to custody participated in education more than the STOs
who were unemployed prior to custody. Thus, prior employment seems to be a factor which has impact on education, perhaps by giving individuals experience of the value of education (see 5.4.3).

### 7.3.1 Learners and non-learners and reconviction

It is important to introduce and apply an effective preparatory motivational intervention for STOs in custody to improve motivation to participate in education. However, it seems that those offenders who were administered the PACIO prior to going to education were reconvicted more than offenders who went to education only. Fewer STOs who participated in education only, compared with education plus the PACIO, were reconvicted. This confirms the existing research conducted on the PACIO’s predecessor, the PCI-OA, may measure treatment motivation rather than motivation to change, including reconviction (Sellen et al., 2009). However, there was not a significant difference between the groups in the number of reconvicted learners with odds ratio close to 1 (see 5.4.2).

This may perhaps refer to the argument that a version of the PACIO should be related to education in the future in order to promote motivation to education engagement and motivation to change. Perhaps, STOs’ goals that were stated on the PACIO and then later participation in the education may have not helped them to achieve their goal. Thus, the meaning of the goals and whether education may help to attain the goals, and how this affects motivation to change, should be investigated in the future research.
Furthermore, those STOs who spent a longer time in education had fewer convictions. Firstly, it has been acknowledged that many STOs do not have time to fully engage in education in custody (NAO, 2010). However, it may be that there is better provision for those sentenced to longer sentences. Secondly, STOs who decide and are able to spend more time in education may be more motivated to make positive changes in their lives in comparison to those who do not participate or who participate only for a short period of time. As a result, the STOs may be less likely to recidivate in the future (Kim & Clark, 2013).

7.4 Randomised Controlled Trial methodology

The Randomised Controlled Trial (RCT) methodology was used in this study to determine the feasibility of a full-scale RCT (Craig et al., 2013), which would be the best design to explore the properties of the PACIO as a preparatory motivational intervention and as an assessment. However, the RCT methodology is not often used in UK prisons (Farrington & Jolliffe, 2002; Chitty, 2005). The RCT helps to reduce confounding factors (Schulz & Grimes, 2002) so that differences in the group characteristics do not influence the effects of an intervention. An RCT methodology requires strict procedures in place in order to ensure consistency across the control and experimental groups (Farrington & Jolliffe, 2002) and also in terms of the intervention integrity (Marshall & Marshall, 2007).

It was important that an identical and systematic interview plan was in place during interviews with each STO when using the RCT methodology. During the PACIO interviews, it was noted by the researcher that for some offenders talking about their life and offending life was a painful experience. Out of 74 interviewees
who were administered PACIO or PACIO plus MI, 5 offenders burst into tears and another 7 were extremely emotional. Vulnerability of prisoners in the early stages of incarceration has been acknowledged in the literature (Liebling et al., 2005). This was especially when they talked about their relationships and also about their situation after release. Some STOs in this study found not knowing what was going to happen regarding their housing, finances and employment distressing and difficult to influence at the time of the interview. Other STOs expressed feelings of guilt towards the victim and grievance. These topics were not part of the PACIO intervention. Nevertheless, all STOs were supported in time of distress and treated with respect and empathy. These difficult situations for the STOs and relevant response from the researcher promoted therapeutic alliance which has been suggested to be conducive to positive therapeutic outcomes in different offenders’ population (Marshall et al., 2003; Benjamin & Karpiak, 2001). Therapeutic alliance has also been suggested to play an important role in the Multifactor offender readiness model (MORM) as, for instance, an affective relationship between an offender and an intervention facilitator may reduce obstacles during an intervention and increase offenders’ readiness to treatment (Ward et al., 2004).

Such behaviour that was not predicted during the interviews reflected the offenders’ real life situation. The fact that the researcher followed the natural flow of the PACIO interview and expressing support for those STOs who needed extra time to talk about matters that were upsetting may have affected the differentiation in delivery of the PACIO and the PACIO plus MI. As such it may have had impact on the results in terms of education participation and also when motivational profiles which were adaptive motivation and LH/P were calculated. This may have affected internal validity. Furthermore, such emotional behaviour was not reported in previous study
with long-term offenders who were administered the PACIO (Campbell, 2009). It seems that STOs were more vulnerable and less resilient when in custody. Perhaps, the time of the PACIO interview may have also contributed. All STOs in this study were interviewed in the first week after sentencing, while the long-term offenders recruited for the ETS had been incarcerated for longer than a week before they were administered the PACIO (Campbell, 2009). Further, it may be interesting to explore STOs’ well-being and resilience in the future research.

Thus, there may be other motivations than the administration of the PACIO or the PACIO plus MI that have influenced participation in education such as feelings of loneliness and wanting to socialise in education classes. Hollin (2008) pointed out that the low internal validity in an RCT may affect the external validity. So by taking into account the STOs’ psychological state and adjusting the interviewing accordingly, may affect the way to what extent the results may be generalizable to the population. In this study, by taking into account the offenders’ psychological states compromised internal validity but external validity was increased as minimal artificial circumstances were created during the interviews. As a result of the increased external validity, the interviews reflected the real life situation in a prison setting and the results may be more applicable to STOs. Despite the internal validity not being optimal, it seems that the study gained useful results (Ogilvie, Mitchell, Mutrie, Petticrew & Platt, 2006).

This study was not a double-blinded trial. The STOs and the researcher knew that they were either allocated to the treatment group or the control group. A computer-generated list of random numbers was used to ensure scientific credibility and accuracy during randomisation into groups (Schulz & Grimes, 2002). STOs were
approached in their cell locations and informed verbally and in writing about the study. Written consent was taken should they have wished to participate. Baseline measures were taken at the point of the first contact. The STOs were also informed whether they would participate in a control group, a PACIO interview or a PACIO plus motivational interview. STOs were randomised to a condition and an appointment for an interview was given to those who were allocated to one of the intervention groups. All interviews were held within 4 working days of the initial contact. It was important that arrangements had been made for the location of the interviews before approaching a potential participant. The interview location and also conducting the interview within the same week the STOs were approached was vital because of the rapid movement of STOs to other locations within the prison, transfers to other prison establishments, and being released.

The procedure of recruitment, randomisation and allocation during the initial contact was vital for the researcher to manage time effectively. However, it is clear that this procedure can be biased. This is because the researcher knew to which group an STO had been allocated to before approaching and recruiting to the study. This may have had an effect on the way offenders were given information about the study, depending whether the offender was allocated to one of the groups. For instance, the researcher may have promoted potential value of education in the PACIO intervention groups. In future, allocation to groups may be useful to manage research with STOs, however, another researcher should be in charge of the randomisation and allocation so that the recruiting researcher is blind to the STOs’ condition. Furthermore, in order to manage time better, a decision about offenders’ competence in English should be made at the first contact rather than at the interview.
The number of allocated offenders were relatively balanced across groups which were N=58 for a NI group, N=57 for a PACIO group and N=59 for a PACIO plus MI group, there was an unequal number of participating offenders which was N=43 in NI group, N=38 in PACIO group and N= 36 in PACIO plus MI group. This seems to be an acceptable variation due to the allocation procedures. However, studies in the future may also use restricted or block randomisation (Craig et al., 2013). For instance by creating blocks of sequences such as ABC, ACB, BAC, BCA, CAB and CBA may ensure more even number of participants in each experimental group (Schulz & Grimes, 2002). However, it will not be a guarantee that it will actually happen in a real clinical trial. STOs had various personal reasons for participating or not participating. Moreover, some STOs were excluded from the study as they were not in the prison establishment or they had difficulties communicating in English. Drop out of the STOs in the control group and the treatment groups were 36% and 26% respectively.

Consequently, specific reasons for not participating may be investigated in the future as this group is ‘hard to change’ offenders and their needs should be supported in their goal achievement and reduction in reoffending. It has been suggested that taking offenders’ interests and capabilities and motivating them to live better lives rather than reduce reoffending, may be a more effective way to rehabilitate offenders (Purvis et al., 2011). According to the Good Lives model, reduction in reoffending was thought to happen as a consequence of living better lives (Ward & Brown, 2006). This approach may be encouraged in terms of treatment motivation in STOs, or difficult to engage STOs. The STOs would be able to use their strengths and capabilities to achieve their goals which may promote motivation to treatment and treatment engagement which in turn may promote motivation to change.
Since the ‘hard to engage’ STOs were not offered an interview this may have caused a potential bias in a future full–scale RCT. Thus, in order to address potential attrition bias in the treatment arm, the controls should be introduced a task such as a general interview so participants in both arms are likely to opt out.

Another issue is refusal and withdrawal from study. The offenders were given information so they could give an informed decision whether to participate or not in the study. There were 29 offenders who decided not to participate for reasons such as lack of interest or being ill. One offender withdrew 3 weeks after being interviewed. It would be interesting to know how many STOs who did not give consent to the study yet still participated in education. This is since motivation to participate in research may also be indicative of participating in rehabilitative interventions. However, such research may be challenging to conduct as this involves withdrawing information from STOs regarding their prison activity participation.

The targets that were set out for the RCT trials were 80% recruitment for the project, 60% education uptake and collating education data and 80% PNC follow up. The recruitment to the project was 67% of the total number of STOs who were randomly assigned to Non-intervention, PACIO group or PACIO plus Motivational interviewing. This was 13% under the aim. There were 57 STOs who did not participate in the study. This is almost 33% of the total sample. However, there were several reasons for not participating in the research that seems to be specific for population of offenders with short sentences. The reasons were being released before interview (6 STOs) and reoffending (2 STOs). There were, in total, 23 STOs who were not interested in participating. The insufficient number of offenders in the trial was partially due to a high turnover rates in STOs which included transfers to other
establishments. Therefore, in the future, recruitment of STOs should take place in multiple sites ensuring to recruit sufficient number of participants. The uptake of the PACIO, which was 64%, was 4% higher than target. Additionally, collating education data and the PNC follow up was 91% and 99% respectively, exceeding the estimations which were 80% for both.

However, despite the problems during the RCT trial in this study, the RCT methodology should be the ‘gold standard’ for intervention evaluation in prison settings (McDougall, Clarbour, Perry & Bowles, 2009). This study demonstrated what potential problems may occur during investigation of the PACIO as a motivation intervention and as an assessment.

### 7.5 Practical issues

During the data collection, minimal strain was put on the prison staff as the researcher was familiar with the prison environment and had a set of keys in order to move around the prison. Most interviews were conducted in the main areas of the prison where offenders were moved on regular basis anyway. These included areas in education department, resettlement area and prison wing which did not require any offenders movement supervised by the officers. Convenient areas which are appropriate for conducting interviews, such as education department and prison workshop areas, should be considered to minimise extra work demands, especially with offenders escort.
7.6 The PACIO as an assessment of STOs’ motivation structure

The PACIO being a motivational assessment and a motivation intervention is a paradox (Campbell, 2009) since the PACIO is supposed to boost offenders’ motivation and also assess offenders’ motivational structure. Regarding the testing in the intervention arm, comparing the PACIO and the PACIO plus MI revealed that the PACIO plus MI did not seem to differ in AM scores and LH/P scores between groups. However, AM and LH/P were positively but not significantly related. Positive relationship between adaptive profile and maladaptive profile (LH/P) has been acknowledged in previous literature on the PACIO (Campbell, 2009; Campbell et al., in preparation) and the PCI (Klinger & Cox, 2011b) and the PCI-OA (Sellen et al., 2009) Hourly education participation positively but not significantly correlated with AM and negatively with LH/P. However, interestingly, STOs’ motivational profiles did not seem to be higher in learners than non-learners and LH/P was not lower in learners in comparison to non-learners. STOs in PACIO plus MI group did not have more goals than STOs in PG.

The PACIO as an assessment tool encounters a similar problem described in 6.2 as a motivational intervention. It is important that the PACIO is related to education in the future research to have a potential to assess STOs’ motivation to education in a valid and reliable manner. Moreover, it is not known when the PACIO increases offenders’ motivation. It is not known whether it is before or after the offenders’ goals are scored. The time when the PACIO is effective is vital as it may affect the ratings of offenders’ motivation.

Previously, the PACIO has been questioned over the reliability of assessment for treatment engagement (Campbell, 2009). In this study, the internal reliability was
assessed and Cronbach’s alpha revealed that both adaptive motivation had an acceptable internal reliability to assess STOs’ motivation to participate in education and LH/P was five points under the recommended level of .70 (offending scales included). This may have affected the results since similar research may not provide similar results, especially when assessing LH/P. However, content validity needs to be given attention to as the PACIO should be specific to assessing education participation and therefore items on the PACIO should be related to education (see 6.2). However, the interviews did provide useful information about the STOs’ motivational structure and their goals (Ogilvie et al., 2006)

‘The right amount’ of motivation for education or ‘the right amount’ of motivation for education non-engagement is not known as there is no ‘cut off’ point to suggest which offenders are motivated to engage in treatment or education and which offenders are not. It is not clear what the difference may be between individuals with low adaptive motivation and individuals who score high on LH/P with regards to their behavioural outcome such as education participation. It may be that the non-learners may have had the ‘right amount’ of motivation to engage in education but there could have been other reason why non-learners did not participate in education. For instance, there was no appropriate educational course since the non-learners sought for different courses or the non-learners may have completed the current educational courses on previous sentences. Therefore, motivation to participate in education appears to be multi-faceted which may depend on the STOs’ on personal circumstance but also on the systemic support such as relevant course provision for STOs.
This may resemble elements of offenders’ readiness as outlined in the Multifactor Offender Readiness Model (Ward et al., 2004). The MORM states that offenders are ready for treatment when they are motivated, able to respond and have the capacity to enter a meaningful intervention but also offenders’ are ready for treatment when they find that there is an appropriate intervention available where goals and goal attainment can be addressed (Ward et al., 2004).

7.6.1 Goals and the PACIO

Goals are central to assessing and calculating offenders’ motivation. The goals selected by the STOs seemed to be meaningful and personal to each offender (Karoly, 1993). Despite the claim that the PACIO is a goal-based tool, goals are not paid sufficient attention to. For instance, offenders’ number of goals and also the goals themselves are not taken into account when assessing STOs’ motivation. Regarding the number of goals, there are fewer areas on the PACIO in comparison to its predecessor the PCI-OA. This means that offenders are likely to state fewer goals. As a result of the condensed life areas in the PACIO, it is not clear, what area a goal comes from. For instance, if an STO stated a goal in the area of Employment, Training and Finance, it is not clear to the reader whether the goal is to improve education or pay off the debt. However, offenders stated the most goals in the Employment and education area which is in line with previous research on the PACIO (Campbell, 2009).

Moreover, the meaning of goals needs to be focused on and explored if the PACIO is developed into a motivational intervention for education participation in the future. It is important that individuals’ goals and their priority are respected and the
participants are helped and supported in their goals. Offenders’ goals are vital in offenders’ motivation. Therefore, in order to increase and assess STOs’ motivation to education, the goals need to be explored as to how education can be useful for the STOs to achieve goals. The STOs’ goal exploration would lead to establishment of the PACIO as a motivation enhancer rather than a measure. Education provision may differ across prison establishments which may influence STOs’ motivation to participate in education and consequently motivation to change behaviour such as reoffending.

7.6.2 Administering the PACIO in simpler language

Providing assessment and intervention that are clear to understand and follow should be paramount in rehabilitation. Although the PACIO offered different wording of some of the scales to the PCI-OA, some STOs seemed to have difficulties understanding. For instance, a STO stated that he wanted to stop reoffending. However, the rating scale asks: ‘How will reoffending in the future affect you being able to achieve this goal (i.e., stopping reoffending)?’ Thus, simpler language and clearer sentence construction needs to be used. Other problems with the administration of PACIO, which was also pointed out by Campbell (2009), was a rating scale’ when will it happen’ was changed to ‘short-term’, ‘intermediate’ and ‘long-term’. STOs in this study had similar problems with ‘when will it happen’ scale as they were not sure if ‘short-term’ meant that they would resolve their concerns in prison or after their release.
7.7 Limitations and Strengths

This study was a feasibility study for a full-scale RCT. Feasibility studies are not in themselves powered to detect an effect. Rather, one aim of a feasibility study is to collect information that will permit the calculation of the sample size needed for a full-scale study (Craig et al., 2013). Therefore, sample size in this study was too small to detect a reliable effect. Thus, the results should be interpreted with caution.

The PACIO was administered as a one-off treatment before education entry. However, in order to investigate AM (PACIO) Index and LH/P score, repeated measures design would be beneficial in the future. For instance a comparison of offenders’ PACIO motivation scores collected at the start and at the end of offenders’ sentences may shed light on the course of offenders’ motivation to engage in pro-social activities such as education and behaviour. The current version of the PACIO needs to be revised and designed especially for the assessment of education participation with STOs as the aim of the PACIO would be to assess STOs’ motivation to participate in educational activities.

It is important to note that the STOs’ adaptive motivation and LH/P were investigated with a research design containing no control group. This was since the non-intervention (NI) group in this study received no PACIO treatment. Therefore, it was not possible to collect data regarding STOs’ motivational structure as assessed on the PACIO rating scales. This design makes it difficult to draw conclusion about the effect of the PACIO. Research design that would include a NI group would be beneficial in the future. The difference in adaptive motivation and LH/P between the NI and the experimental group in a follow up would provide evidence of the
effectiveness of the PACIO which was administered prior intervention (or no intervention) in terms of motivation scores.

Participation in education was measured in Proportion of Education Participation (PEP). This was to investigate for instance relationship between the sentence length and education participation. Moreover, there was a binary measurement (whether offenders participated or not) as STO who participated in education were learners and those who did not participate were non-offenders. This distinction was necessary as learners and non-learners were for instance assessed on the level of adaptive motivation (AM) and learned helplessness/powerlessness (LH/P). However, the number of STOs’ application forms to education department, including applications to academic classes and also vocational and non-vocational workshops should be included. This is since STOs’ applications may be evidence of STOs’ motivation to enter education in custody. From a practical point of view, this should be achievable as education department should report number of application forms received on daily basis. This measure should be implemented in the future studies.

Further, education should be clearly defined. In this study, academic programmes and non-vocational workshops were included as education. This was done since some offenders have to go to education to improve their English and maths skills before attending non-vocational workshops. This is done in order to ensure that an offender is able to understand instruction in the workshops and also ability to comply with Health and Safety regulations. Some STOs also had completed the Health and Safety Certificate before attending the non-vocational workshops. As for the link between academic skills and workshops, STOs in academic classes and in
workshops were included. In retrospect, this is an issue that needs to be addressed in
the future research. STOs education should be divided into academic education and
workshop participation and engagement. This is since there is a need to generate
knowledge and causal links between effectiveness of different types of educational
activities and recidivism. The effect of vocational workshops is also important to
investigate, however, STOs do not normally participate in vocational workshops due
to the lengths of their sentences. Moreover, the number of application forms to
academic and non-/vocational courses should be monitored since application forms
can be indicative of the STOs motivation to participate in education.

Most studies available for this study were conducted in the USA. This is
problematic, as criminal and judiciary systems in the USA are different to the UK
systems. For instance, demographics of the offenders participating in research was
different regarding their cultural background. Offenders’ attitudes toward education
engagement, a level of coercion and sentence lengths were not reported. Therefore,
research regarding effectiveness of prison education need to be conducted in the UK.

There were several methodological issues identified such as employing
rigorous methodology in selecting a sample and group allocation. Some US studies
did not introduce control groups and or random allocation to experimental groups.
Furthermore, different educational activities were not distinguished which make it
unclear to say what type of education ‘worked’. Some offenders also participate in
more than one educational course which also makes drawing conclusions about
education effectiveness not straight forward. Such methodological weaknesses make
it difficult to draw inferences about effectiveness of custodial education on
reoffending.
In the future, education needs to be clearly defined and academic programmes and vocational programmes and non-vocational need to be distinguished. As discussed, offenders may participate in a number of courses and therefore these should be reported. However, the combination of participated courses during the sentence that was being served or during previous sentences can make it unclear to conclude about what type of education work to reduce reoffending.

One of the exclusion criteria was offenders’ participation in education. At the time of the recruitment, no STOs participated in education. However, retrospectively, STO who were sentenced for less than 14 days should have been excluded from the study as it appeared to be challenging to apply for the one-day courses and be accepted on them immediately. Thus, future studies conducting research into offenders’ motivation to participate in education, should only include offenders who were sentenced to a minimum of 14 days in custody. This is to allow time to process an application to education department.

In this feasibility study, the recruitment rate was considered to be feasible if the project recruitment rate was at least 80%. Despite the uptake of the intervention in the active arm and collection of education and reoffending data was met above target, recruitment of STOs was 13% lower than hypothesised. However, undertaking research and recruiting offenders in prison can be challenging. For instance, six STOs had been released before they were approached by the researcher and 18 STOs stated not to be interested in participating in the research. This may be overcome by excluding offenders with sentences under 14 days in custody. Moreover, the STOs’ needs of the STOs who stated not to be interested should be addressed since this group of STOs may be ‘hard to change’ offenders. For instance, more attention should
be given to exploration to the reasons why the STOs did not want to participate and also to their education goals in custody and after release. However, extra attention for a particular group cannot be given when employing RCT methodology.

Another reason why the recruitment did not meet the target was prison service restructure. National Offender Management Service implemented changes in transfer of offenders to different prison establishment in England and Wales. This had severe impact on the numbers of offenders sentenced to less than 12 months held in HMP Cardiff. These changes were unforeseen and therefore could not have been accounted for. It may be that the current situation within the prison service is more stable and the RCT target in recruitment of STOs may be met. Therefore, an RCT methodology should be feasible in a larger scale study to improve and assess STOs’ motivation to education.

7.8 Future research

Research needs to be established whether a future version of the PACIO does have a potential to increase and assess motivation of STOs to participate in education. In order to achieve this, the PACIO needs to be specifically developed for education use. Underlying processes upon which education reduced reconviction and the number of offences needs to be explored in future research. Investigation of such factors may be beneficial in order to design short educational courses to support for short-term offenders’ goals in various life areas such as employability and relationship life area. Assessing STOs’ motivation to participate may, perhaps, not be as important as increasing STOs’ motivation to participate in education and making sure that there is suitable and meaningful education provision available for this group of offenders.
The STOs’ personal and environmental factors in all life areas should be explored to understand the STOs thoughts and circumstances upon which a decision not to participate in education was made (Ward et al., 2004; Howells & Day, 2007). In particular, it is important to attend to how external factors are internalised (Driescher et al., 2005) and its effect on STOs’ motivation to participate in education.

Future research with STOs and education could employ a more complex approach to education participation. Perhaps, offenders’ self-assessment, teachers’ assessment and final course achievements may be added to the research design to capture STOs’ motivation to engage in education. This could reveal circumstances of those offenders who dropped out and how this in turn influenced their motivation to change.

Further research may establish whether the PACIO can be used as an intervention to improve STOs’ motivation to education. Moreover, there is evidence that the PACIO can reduce impulsivity as Campbell (2009) study suggested that offenders who were administered the PACIO and participated in the ETS programme had lower impulsivity score than those who were not administered the PACIO prior ETS. Further, future research needs to be conducted into the effectiveness of the PACIO with STOs in terms of reduction of impulsivity. This may be useful as impulsivity may be one of the maladaptive behaviours that may threaten education participation and motivation to change.

Lastly, it may be of interest to conduct a longitudinal study on the effect of education in terms of change in behaviour after release. Especially, it would be interesting to investigate whether offenders after release have employment and whether they are involved in personal improvement such as participating in an
educational course or gaining qualifications. Moreover, reconviction rates at three and five year points after release may be of interest. This may show whether the effect of custodial education is long-lasting and what other factors may have contributed to crime-free life.

7.9 Conclusion

In conclusion, an exploratory study using qualitative methodology was conducted in order to explore STOs’ views on employment; attitudes and behaviour; and education. The main research employed a RCT design to investigate the PACIO as a preparatory motivational intervention and as an assessment of STOs’ motivation to participate in custodial education. The research also investigated the effect of added motivational interviewing and the effect of education on STOs’ reconviction 12 month after release. Currently, the PACIO does not seem to be suitable for use with STOs, either as a motivational intervention prior education or as an assessment of STOs’ motivation to participate in education. The added motivational interviewing did not appear to improve STOs’ education participation and reduce the number of reconvicted STOs. However, like past research, education reduced reconviction as learners were reconvicted less than non-learners 12 months after release.

This study contributed to the current knowledge on the PACIO as a motivational enhancer prior to education and also as an assessment of motivation to education for short-term offenders. This is providing that the PACIO is adapted for a specific use for education. The current feasibility
study cannot be recommended for a larger trial since one of the conditions for this RCT feasibility study has not been met. The recruitment procedure of the STOs needs to be addressed. Future studies should conduct a feasibility study to explore the amended PACIO prior to education. Particularly, the new PACIO’s validity and reliability needs to be established while adhering to the ‘gold standard’ methodology by employing an RCT.

Development of an effective motivation intervention prior to education to increase STOs’ participation in custodial education is vital in order to increase employability and reduce reconviction which in turn can reduce the number of victims.
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Appendix 1

Exploratory study – Semi-structured Interview schedule
1. PAST EXPERIENCE

Education

Can you tell me how school was for you? How old were you when you left school? Do you remember what exams did you take?

Qualifications (vocational, academic)

What are your qualifications? Why did you decide to qualify in…?

Previous job history

I understand that you came here from employment. Can you tell me about your job?

Have you ever been unemployed?

I understand you came to custody from unemployment. What was it like for you to be unemployed? Have you been employed?

Barriers to employment

What made it difficult for you to get a job?

Support

Was there support for you to get a job? (from school, JC+..)

If yes, in what way was the support helpful?

If not what support did you need?

Gaining employment

How did you get the job? (self-employed, through friends, JC+..)
2. PRESENT – IN THE PRISON

Motivation to work

Do you want to get a job? (Are you motivated to get a job?) What makes you motivated?

Barriers to employment

If unemployed: What stops you from getting a job?

If employed: What can stop people from getting a job?

Plans in prison

What can you do about it (barriers) in the prison?

Prison support

How can prison help you?

What is your message to the prison service regarding support of offenders to gaining employment?

3. FUTURE

Plans for future

When you are released what is you plan regarding employment? Have you got a job to go to? How are you feeling about having/ not having a job after release?

Job search

What job are you going to search for?
Is it what you would like to do? If not, please say what job you would like to do. Do you know how to achieve it?

How are you going to search for the job?

Are you going to register with JC+?

Would you mind if I contacted you or JC+ to find out whether you are employed? If yes – contact details

4. PERSONALITY

How would you describe yourself as a person?

What can you offer to a potential employer? What are your qualities? What are your negatives?

If you were an employer, who would you hire?
Appendix 2

Exploratory study – Information sheet
INFORMATION SHEET

You are invited to take part in research concerning peoples’ feelings and thoughts about getting a job. Before you decide whether or not to take part, it is important to understand what the research will be about.

Any time you feel unsure about the information please ask me to make it clear to you.

What is the study about?

There has been a lot of research in the past on issues related to offenders and employment. A number of difficulties have been suggested for offenders to get a job but very little is known about offenders’ support and offenders’ actions to get a job while in custody and after release, especially those on short-term sentences. The hope is that if we can understand barriers to employment and identify what support and help is available, this may help us to find better ways to help offenders to get back to work.

Why have I been chosen?

We are asking 6 individuals to take part in the study. Those individuals are short-term prisoners, i.e. sentenced for 12 months or less. You are being asked because you are serving a short sentenced in prison after being convicted of a crime.

Do I have to take part?

No – you only take part if you want to. If you decide to participate, you are able to withdraw any time during the study without giving a reason. Your decision to withdraw will not affect decisions that are made about you by others.

What do I have to do?
An appointment will be arranged within the next couple of days. During the interview you will be asked questions related to your thoughts and feelings and experience with getting a job. Your interview will be recorded and should take about an hour but it depends on you how much information you would like to share.

**Is the information I am going to give confidential?**

Any information you give, will be confidential and will leave the prison with no personal information attached to it so that you cannot be identified.

The only exception is if you say something about your safety or someone else’s safety such as if you said you were going to injure yourself or someone else. Also, if you choose to tell the researcher about any escape plan or any other act that would breach the security of the prison, I am obliged to inform the governor.

If you would like more information please contact Ken Price in HMP Cardiff Education Department
Appendix 3

Exploratory study – Consent form
CONSENT FORM

This is to confirm that I agree to participate in the study concerning prisoners’ employment issues.

The nature of the research has been explained to me.

I agree that the interview will be recorded.

I understand that all information from this study will be stored securely and not shared with any other party without my knowledge.

I understand that I have the right to withdraw from the research at any time without having to give reasons and affecting decisions that are made about me by others.

Prison number: __________________________

Research number _________________________

Signature _______________________________

For the researcher use:

I have explained the study to the participant and given information sheet. The participant agreed to take part in the research.

Signature of the researcher:_______________

Date: _________________________________

Comments:_________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________
Appendix 4

Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials

(CONSORT)
The CONSORT diagram showing the flow of participants through each stage of the Randomised Controlled Trial.

Excluded at recruitment (N=30)
- Not interested 10
- Not starting intervention 8
- Court 2
- Segregation 2
- Released 6
- Ill 2

Recruited participants (N=144)
- Non-intervention group (N=50)
- PACI-O group (PG) (N=49)
- PACI-o plus MI (PMI) (N=45)

Interviewed (n=127)
- Non-intervention group (N=46)
- PACI-O group (PG) (N=42)
- PACI-O plus MI (PMI) (N=39)

Analyses for PEP and AM and LH/ P and reconviction outcomes (N=117)
- Non-intervention group (N=43)
- PACI-O group (PG) (N=38)
- PACI-o plus MI (PMI) (N=36)

Excluded before and during interview (N=17)
- Walked out 2
- Did not start intervention 5
- Poor English 6
- Ill 2
- Interviewed previously 2

Missing data:
- Excluded as no PNC data (N=1)

Withdrawn after interview (N=1)

Missing data:
- Excluded due to transfer (N=8)
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PACIO pre-interview form
Pre-interview form

Research number:________________________

Name:________________________________

Prison Number:________________________

Sentence length:_______________________

Number of previous offences:___________

Employment status before entering custody: employed/unemployed/self-employed / other

______________________________________________________________

Current activities in prison:

_1.____________________________________________________________

_2.____________________________________________________________

_3.____________________________________________________________

Education/Qualifications:

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________
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PACIO Illustration Life Areas
Past, Current and Future Living Arrangements
Close Personal Relationships

Friends, Family, Partner, Love & Intimacy
Physical or Mental Health Issues
Health, Medical Matters & Substance Abuse

My physical well being!

Alcohol and drugs!
Recreation

Hobbies, Pastimes & Spiritual Matters
Self- Changes and Personal Improvement

Stopping offending!

Becoming the person I know I can be!
Changes to Yourself, Re-offending, Anger & Violence

Employment, Training and Financial Situation

Jobs, Training, Money & Education
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PACIO Information sheet
INFORMATION SHEET

You are invited to take part in research concerning peoples’ feelings and thoughts about people’s prison life. Before you decide whether or not to take part, it is important to understand what the research will be about. Any time you feel unsure about the information please ask me to make it clear to you.

What is the study about?

I am looking into the area of offenders’ change and what can motivate offenders to change their behaviour. I am also interested in offenders’ reoffending and how it links to motivation.

Why have I been chosen?

We are asking about 180 individuals to take part in the study. Those individuals are short-term prisoners, ie. sentenced for 12 months or less. You are being asked because you are serving a short sentence in prison after being convicted of a crime.

Do I have to take part?

No – you only take part if you want to. If you decide to participate, you are able to withdraw any time during the study without giving a reason. Your decision to withdraw will not affect decisions that are made about you by others.

What do I have to do?

Firstly, if you agree to participate in this study, you will be asked to sign a consent form. Secondly, I would like to ask you if you could answer a few questions relating who you are such as your DOB, how long you were sentenced for and what level of education you have achieved. Thirdly, after the initial interview, there are two possibilities. You will either
be thanked and you can leave or you will be asked to participate in an interview later this week. You will be informed at the end of this interview. During the interview you will be asked questions related to your thoughts and feelings and experience about your concerns and issues in different life areas such as housing, education, employment, health and family. Your interview should take about 30 - 60 minutes but it depends on you how much information you would like to share.

Is the information I am going to give confidential?

Any information you give, will be confidential and will leave the prison with no personal information attached to it so that you cannot be identified. The only exception is if you say something about your safety or someone else’s safety such as if you said you were going to injure yourself or someone else. Also, if you choose to tell the researcher about any escape plan or any other act that would breach the security of the prison, I am obliged to inform the governor. If you would like more information please contact Ken Price in HMP Cardiff Education Department.
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PACIO Consent form
CONSENT FORM

This is to confirm that I agree to participate in the study concerning offenders’ motivation.

I agree that will be interviewed by the researcher if needed.

The nature of the research has been explained to me.

This is to confirm that I agree that the researcher is allowed to access information about me regarding my re-offending behaviour.

I understand that all information from this study will be stored securely and not shared with any other party without my knowledge.

I understand that I have the right to withdraw from the research at any time without having to give reasons and affecting decisions that are made about me by others.

Prison number:________________________

Signature______________________________
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Guidelines for the PACIO administration

(as used by Campbell, 2009)
Personal Concerns and Aspirations

Inventory for

Offenders

W. Miles Cox

University of Wales, Bangor
United Kingdom

Eric Klinger

University of Minnesota
United States of America

Copyrighted 1999
W. Miles Cox and Eric Klinger
Introduction

Undoubtedly, you have concerns and goals you would like to achieve in different areas of your life. You might have concerns about unpleasant things that you want to ‘get rid of,’ ‘prevent,’ or ‘avoid.’ Or you may have aspirations about pleasant things that you want to ‘get,’ ‘obtain,’ or ‘accomplish’.

You may also have in mind things that you would like to change in order to resolve these concerns or achieve these goals.

I will read through a number of Areas of Life in which you may have important concerns or things that you would like to change or achieve. I need you to think carefully about each of the areas. In turn, I will pass you a sheet which will help highlight some of the possible topics of each area.

Next I will need you to tell me any concerns or aspirations you may have regarding that aspect of your life.

Each Area of Life has spaces for you to list a number of issues. In some of these Areas of Life, you might have only one issue (or no issues at all). In other Areas of Life, you might have two, three, or more issues.

Next I then need you to describe what you would like to happen. That is, how would you like for things to turn out?
Finally I will ask you to choose the numbers that best describe how you feel about each of
the goals and concerns that you have described. For example I will ask you to rate on a scale of 0 to
10 how important it is for things to turn out the way you wish.

I will be making a note of what you say on the Answer Sheet as we go along. Once you have
told me of a concern or aspiration and what you would like as the outcome, we will stop briefly
while I read to you what I have written. I will ask if what I have written is an accurate representation
of what you feel. You will have the opportunity to correct, change or add to anything you have said.

Please stop me at anytime if you want to ask questions or would like to stop for a break. Do
you have any questions before we begin?
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A brief PACIO user guide
The Personal Aspirations and Concerns Inventory

for Offenders (PACIO)

A Brief Users Guide
The PACIO is administered as a semi-structured interview on a one-to-one basis with the interviewer and client. The questions provide a foundation for the issues that can be discussed, but essentially, the concerns, aspirations and goals are idiographic to the client. The opportunity for the offender to discuss issues that are personally pertinent to them is paramount.

**Tips for Administration**

**Before the start of the interview –**

- It is helpful to familiarise yourself with the Administrators Rating Scales. These detail the wording and ordering of the rating scales. Some of the questions are reiterated on the PACIO answer sheet.

- Prepare in front of you the PACIO Instructions, Prisoner Rating Scales and Life Area Sheets

**During the interview -**

- To start, read the PACIO instructions to the client and clarify what is meant by ‘Concern’, ‘Aspiration’ and ‘Goal’. Then allow the client to ask questions regarding the process and check their understanding. Pass the Prisoner Rating Scales Sheet over for the client to refer to when necessary

- Work through each Life Area in turn, handing the client the corresponding Life Area Sheet as each Life Area is visited.
**Example dialogue........................**

**Interviewer** - “The first Area of Life we will discuss is your past, current and future living arrangements, this includes any home or household issues you may have. When you think of this area do any concerns or aspirations come to mind?”

**Client** – “Yeah I’m worried I’ll have nowhere to live on release”

*(Interviewer writes this on the Answer Sheet in the box titled ‘concern or aspiration’.*

Then once the offender has had chance to voice his concerns.....)

**Interviewer** – “ok, and what would you like to have happen?”

**Client** – “I’d like to get my own flat”

*(Again the interviewer makes a note of this goal, and proceeds to discuss this whilst working through the rating scales on the Answer Sheet)*

**Interviewer** – “ok so how important is it to you that things turn out the way you wish with regards to this goal? On a scale of 0-10, with 0 being not at all important and 10 being very important”

*(The interviewer then works through the scales. Sometimes I change the words around a little to stop it sounding too repetitive or to help personalise the scales for the offender.....e.g. “How important is it for you to achieve this goal?”......or...... “How important is it to you to be able to achieve this goal and get your own flat” etc etc)*
• The offender may have no concerns or aspirations in a particular area (in that case take back the Life Area Sheet and move on to the next) or they may have one, two, three or more. The current PACIO Answer Sheet has space for one concern per area; however there is an ‘overspill’ area at the back which can accommodate extra concerns and aspirations. Photocopy more as and when needed.

• The question exploring how the experience of prison affects goal achievement is really an opportunity for the offender to examine good and bad ways their incarceration affects each particular goal. I tend to listen and jot down one or two points on how they believe prison may help or interfere in their goal achievement before asking them to put a numerical figure to it. The same applies to the question regarding re-offending in the future.

**Supplementary additions to the PACIO -**

• For the purpose of my current study I have added a section on ‘obstacles and barriers to goal achievement’ and ‘conflicting and complementing goals’. However if you find it useful, feel free to include these also when you use the PACIO

• After each goal or concern I ask the client if they can think of any obstacles or barriers they will need to overcome before they can realise that particular goal. I then make a note of their response on the answer sheet.

• After all the Areas of Life have been explored and all concerns and aspirations noted, I write them all down on the Review Sheet. Then together with the offender we go through them and they rate whether they feel each goal either complements or conflicts with their other life goals.
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Prisoner Rating Scale Sheet
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Control</th>
<th>Complete Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Don’t Know What To Do</th>
<th>Know Exactly What to Do</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Unhappy</th>
<th>Very Happy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Commitment</th>
<th>Fully Committed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prison Interferes</th>
<th>Prison Helps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offending Will Interfere</th>
<th>Offending Will Help</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PACIO goal booklet
**Area #1: Past, Current and Future Living Arrangements. When you think of this area, what concerns or aspirations come to mind**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern or aspiration #1</th>
<th>What you would like to have happen is . . .</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ Importance:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ How likely:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ Control:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ What to do:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ Happiness:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ Commitment:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ When it will happen: Stm / Inter/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ltm / ?

| | ➔ Achieve in prison | Yes/No |

?
Can you think about and list any ways in which being here in prison may either interfere or help you with achieving this goal?

Prison Affects:

Can you think about and list any ways in which re-offending in the future may either interfere or help you with achieving this goal?

→ Offending Affects:

Can you think of any obstacles in the way of you achieving this goal?

1.

2.

3.
**Area #2: Close Personal Relationships**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern or aspiration #1</th>
<th>What you would like to have happen is . . .</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ Importance:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ How likely:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ Control:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ What to do:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ Happiness:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ Commitment:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ When it will happen: Stm /Inter/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ Achieve in prison: Yes/No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ltm / ?
Can you think about and list any ways in which being here in prison may either interfere or help you with achieving this goal?

⇒ Prison Affects: 

Can you think about and list any ways in which re-offending in the future may either interfere or help you with achieving this goal?

⇒ Offending Affects: 

Can you think of any obstacles in the way of you achieving this goal?

1.

2.

3.
### Area #3: Physical or Mental Health Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern or aspiration #1</th>
<th>What you would like to have happen is . . .</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ Importance:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ How likely:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ Control:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ What to do:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ Happiness:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ Commitment:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ When it will happen: Stm /Inter/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ Achieve in prison: Yes/No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ltm / ?

?
Can you think about and list any ways in which being here in prison may either interfere or help you with achieving this goal?

Prison Affects:  

Can you think about and list any ways in which re-offending in the future may either interfere or help you with achieving this goal?

Offending Affects:  

Can you think of any obstacles in the way of you achieving this goal?

1.  
2.  
3.
### Area #4: Recreation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern or aspiration #1</th>
<th>What you would like to have happen is . . .</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ Importance:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ How likely:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ Control:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ What to do:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ Happiness:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ Commitment:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ When it will happen: Stm /Inter/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ltm / ?</td>
<td>➔ Achieve in prison Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Can you think about and list any ways in which being here in prison may either interfere or help you with achieving this goal?

Prison Affects:

Can you think about and list any ways in which re-offending in the future may either interfere or help you with achieving this goal?

Offending Affects:

Can you think of any obstacles in the way of you achieving this goal?

1.

2.

3.
**Area #5: Self-Changes and Personal Improvement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern or aspiration #1</th>
<th>What you would like to have happen is . . .</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Important:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How likely:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What to do:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Happiness:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commitment:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When it will happen: Stm /Inter/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ltm / ?</td>
<td>Achieve in prison</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

?
Can you think about and list any ways in which being here in prison may either interfere or help you with achieving this goal?

\[\rightarrow \text{Prison Affects:} \]

Can you think about and list any ways in which re-offending in the future may either interfere or help you with achieving this goal?

\[\rightarrow \text{Offending Affects:} \]

*Can you think of any obstacles in the way of you achieving this goal?*

1.

2.

3.
Area #6: Employment, Training and Financial Situation.

Concern or aspiration #1

What you would like to have happen is . . .

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Importance:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How likely:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What to do:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Happiness:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commitment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When it will happen: Stm /Inter/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ltm / ?

?  

→ Achieve in prison   Yes/No
Can you think about and list any ways in which being here in prison may either interfere or help you with achieving this goal?

Prison Affects:

Can you think about and list any ways in which re-offending in the future may either interfere or help you with achieving this goal?

Offending Affects:

Can you think of any obstacles in the way of you achieving this goal?

1.

2.

3.
**Area #7: Other/Overspill**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern or aspiration #1</th>
<th>What you would like to have happen is . . .</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>→ Importance:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>→ How likely:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>→ Control:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>→ What to do:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>→ Happiness:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>→ Commitment:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>→ When it will happen: Stm /Inter/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>→ Achieve in prison: Yes/No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ltm / ?

?
Can you think about and list any ways in which being here in prison may either interfere or help you with achieving this goal?

\[ \Rightarrow \text{Prison Affects:} \]

Can you think about and list any ways in which re-offending in the future may either interfere or help you with achieving this goal?

\[ \Rightarrow \text{Offending Affects:} \]

---

Can you think of any obstacles in the way of you achieving this goal?

1.

2.

3.
Appendix 13 STOs interview examples

13a Example of a dialogue with a STO in PACI-O group

13b Example of a dialogue with a STO in PACI-O plus MI
Appendix 13a

_Interviewer:_ If you don’t mind, let’s talk about employment and training and also your financial situation. Have you got any concerns or aspirations in this area?

_Offender:_ Oh yeah, I don’t have a job after I get out of here…so it’s bothering me…you know no money and such…I don’t know where to go to get a job…I left school when I was 14 so I have no qualifications…

_Interviewer:_ OK. So what would you like to have happen?

_Offender:_ I need to get a job.

_Interviewer:_ OK. So how important it is for you to get a job? Here we have a scale ranging from 0-10 where 0 is not important at all and 10 is very important. Could you give the importance a score?

Appendix 13b

_Interviewer:_ If you don’t mind, let’s talk about employment and training and also your financial situation. Have you got any concerns or aspirations in this area?

_Offender:_ Oh yeah, I don’t have a job after I get out of here…so it’s bothering me…you know no money and such…I don’t know where to go to get a job…I left school when I was 14 so I have no qualifications…
Interviewer: It seems that you are worried what would happen after your release…

Offender: Yeah. You know it’s not easy to get a job when you have a criminal record and also no qualifications…I guess I’m staying here (in prison) for a bit so I could do something here…maybe a site safety certificate… and then look for a job…I need money you see…

Interviewer: You are saying that you’d like to do something while you are in prison…improving your qualifications…and also it seems that a job after you are out is important to you?

Offender: Yeah. What can I do here (in prison)?

Interviewer: (provides information on courses and qualifications)

Offender: OK. It would be good if I had something to offer….and then I could buy stuff for my daughter…I have to get a job.

Interviewer: It looks like getting a job would make you happy and is important to you.

Offender: Yeah. I’d like to get a job…

Interviewer: How easy, do you think it will be for you to get a job after release?

Offender: Not easy, ‘cause I have nothing to offer now…but if I work hard and learn, I have a chance…

Interviewer: OK. Let’s think about barriers you need to climb over to achieve your goal…