



ATSA

Creating Willing Partners: Meaningful Engagement of Offenders in Change

David S. Prescott, LICSW

Editor's note: This article is excerpted and modified from a chapter forthcoming in Calder, M.C. (2011). *Contemporary practice with young people who sexually abuse*. Lyme Regis, Dorset, UK: Russell House Publishing.

Knowledge is just a rumor until it's in the muscle.

-- New Guinea proverb



*Introduction*¹

Much of the inspiration for this article came from a strange experience. Upon taking a new job, a colleague showed me around the facility where I would be working. When a client complained that he didn't like the program, her response was to smile and say, "You put yourself here." The client looked down to the floor and walked away. It was clearly not a helpful response. After further discussion, it turned out that at some time in the past the entire staff had been trained to respond this way to client complaints.

Before reading further, it may be helpful to engage in a brief self-assessment. Closing your eyes for a moment, ask yourself whether there is a change you want to make in your life. Please take a moment to picture this change in your mind. It could be losing weight, stopping smoking, drinking less alcohol, reading more, calling friends and family more often, etc. Now consider: For how long have you been thinking about making this change? What would be some of the good things about making this change? And, honestly, what would be some of the less desirable things about making this change? What part of you might object to making this change? If you are like many others who have asked themselves these questions, you might smile and admit you have been thinking about this change for many years. Yet you still have not made it.

The circumstances that convicted sexual offenders find themselves in are, of course, very different from yours. However, this exercise points out that there are many people who desire

to change and are able to change, but don't. Many intelligent people have gone to their graves without having made necessary lifestyle changes that would have provided them a longer life.

Next, imagine some negative experience in your life that you would not want to discuss with anyone under any circumstances. It could be something that you did to someone, or something that happened to you. Now imagine that the legal system wants you to work on it in treatment, and that failure to do so could result in significant time spent incarcerated. Imagine that you have no choice of where to go to obtain treatment related to this issue, and that the only accepted modality is group treatment. Now, imagine yourself in a group session, surrounded by men with Antisocial Personality Disorder. There are two therapists, each taking notes as you talk. You know that these therapists aren't perfect and that some of their notes will be incorrect. Keep in mind that all of these notes will be visible to the forces of the legal system that have taken away your liberty. It's important that you know that the disclosure of this negative experience could take several weeks, as your antisocial associates ask questions aimed at getting you to be completely honest about an experience that you don't want to talk about. Depending on the program, you may also be required to demonstrate aspects of this experience in role play.

Again, readers of this article probably don't have much in common with sexual offenders. Research has shown that sexual offenders themselves are clear about the need to be accountable for their actions (Levenson & Prescott, 2009; Levenson, Prescott, & D'Amora, 2010). However, it is vital to remember that no matter how important it may be, being open and honest in group therapy is not easy for any human being. It can be easy for professionals treating sexual offenders to lose sight of the client's experience of treatment (Beech & Fordham, 1997).

Historical considerations

Many elements of sexual offender treatment remain controversial. In a recent review, Glaser (2010) described it as "a form of punishment" generally (p. 261). Elsewhere in the literature, seasoned professionals (e.g., Chaffin, in press; Vess, in press) have expressed concern about the best and most ethical use of actuarial measures and polygraph examinations. Although there are plausible responses to the argument that sexual offender treatment is inherently punitive (Prescott & Levenson, 2010; Ward, 2010), there is no remaining question that entering and participating in a sexual offender treatment program can be a highly challenging experience.

The controversies do not end there. Many professionals continue to wonder whether treatment actually works. Many cite the highly respected SOTEP study as cause for concern (Marques, Wiederanders, Day, Nelson, & van Ommeren, 2005). This study, which met a very high degree of scientific rigor, found no difference in re-offense rates between treated and untreated offenders. However, the authors were clear that the offenders who "got it" and meaningfully completed their treatment goals did, indeed, demonstrate lower re-offense rates. To the present, no further analysis of this sub-group has occurred. Elsewhere, although meta-analyses of the past decade have provided cause for optimism (e.g., Hanson, Gordon, Harris, Marques, Murphy, Quinsey, & Seto, 2002; Lösel & Schmucker, 2005), many professionals remain concerned that these studies do not adequately account for individuals who drop out or otherwise fail to complete treatment.

Further, newcomers to the field often encounter a divergence of opinions as to the best treatment style to adopt. Much of the original literature in the field was based on populations of incarcerated adult males, and many of the first texts appeared to advocate a harsh and confrontational approach to treatment. It wasn't until within the past ten years that research has shown what is already clear in other areas of psychotherapy research: the most effective treatment provider style is warm, empathic, rewarding, and directive (Marshall, 2005). In fact, decades of psychotherapy research shows that the most successful treatment regimes share a few vital elements. These include the therapeutic alliance, hope and expectancy, and the client's own strengths and positive attributes (Hubble, Duncan, & Miller, 1999; Prescott & Levenson, 2009).

Taken together, it seems that professionals treating sexual offenders have an obligation to recognize the ethical dilemmas inherent in this work, and - to the greatest extent possible - use therapy to invite clients to be willing partners in change, and not simply the recipients of services. Providing services is one matter; having clients "get it" is something else. Although critics make important points about the ethical concerns and limitations of treatment programs, the research continues to show that sexual offenders who are motivated to change can use treatment programs build healthier lives and contribute to safer communities. The real question becomes how best to awaken the internal motivations of sexual offenders in this direction.

Getting the context right for change

Recently, Mann (2009) observed that it is also vital for programs to consider and address the context in which sexual offender treatment occurs. Describing prison-based treatment programs, she points out several obstacles to establishing an environment that is conducive to change. These include:

Being uninformed about treatment/believing that treatment is ineffective. In one study, Mann and her colleagues found that about half of those interviewed after refusing treatment were uninformed about the aims of treatment and had drawn unhelpful conclusions. In contrast, most of those who accepted treatment believed that the aim of treatment was to prevent future offending.

Competing priorities. Both Ward (2002) and Jones (2002) have commented that offenders often refuse treatment because they have more pressing concerns to attend to, such as starting, maintaining, or grieving relationships (Jones, 2002). Jones also cites a study surveying North American offenders' views about their most pressing needs. Two-thirds of those surveyed indicated that they felt that their main needs were in the areas of education or work.

Concerns about poor individual responsivity of the program. For example, offenders who are intellectually disabled may fear that treatment will be like school, and that they will not be able to understand what they will be taught. It is easy to forget that for many clients, treatment programs can appear to be like schools where they didn't learn, with clinicians similar to teachers or mentors who somehow failed them in the past.

Distrust of key professionals. It is well established in the medical literature that patients often refuse medical treatment because they do not trust their doctors. It is easy to see the

potential parallel with sexual offenders. Fortunately, recent studies (e.g., Levenson & Prescott, 2009; Levenson, Prescott, & D'Amora, 2010) have found that sexual offenders often perceive their treatment providers in a more favorable light than they do their legal circumstances. Similar findings have appeared in the intimate partner violence literature (e.g., Shamaï & Buchbinder, 2010).

Expectation of hostile responses from others. Typically, sexual offenders are reviled in prison, just as they are in the wider community. They face danger of physical and verbal assault because of the nature of their conviction. For this reason, it is all the more important to maintain an environment in which clients experience psychological as well as physical safety.

Fear of stigma. Finally, Mann observes that in most situations in the western world, engaging in treatment regimens, whether medical or psychological, raises the risk of the client feeling stigmatized by his illness or condition. Sexual offender treatment is no different, even in a program that specializes in treating those who have abused.

The role of the client

The single most important factor in treatment is the client and his or her willingness to change. Although this may appear obvious at first, it is particularly important to consider within inpatient settings. Programs for lower risk offenders frequently emphasize psychoeducational aspects and/or afford limited opportunities for clients to demonstrate change over a sufficient period of time. Although these programs may adhere to the principles of risk, need, and responsivity for the clientele they serve, it is important to note that programs treating clients with higher levels of risk and need (as well as the tendency of higher risk offenders to present with responsivity concerns) require a more comprehensive approach. There are many reasons for this.

Bem (1972) called attention to the fact that how clients perceive themselves throughout the change process is critical to the success of treatment efforts, and that people develop and come to "know" their attitudes by observing their behavior and concluding what attitudes must have caused them. His research demonstrated that people are often more convinced by what they hear themselves say than by what others say to them. Likewise, new beliefs and attitudes can result by practicing new behaviors. This is an important consideration in the treatment of sexual offenders: it is very often not enough to simply provide education or a venue for self-exploration. Rather, the client must make his own case for change within the context established by the therapist and the program beyond.

Likewise, Ryan and Deci (2000) have examined the change process extensively, noting that motivation to change often begins with outside forces, which can become internalized over time. Internalized ("intrinsic") motivation refers to engaging in activities for their own sake because it is interesting and satisfying in itself, as opposed to doing an activity to obtain an external goal (extrinsic motivation). Internalization refers to the active attempt to transform an extrinsic motive into personally endorsed values and thus assimilate behavioral regulations that were originally external. Also of note, Deci and Ryan (2002) contend there are three psychological needs that motivate people to initiate behavior, and are essential for psychological health and well-being. They argue that these needs are universal, innate, and psychological, and include the need for competence, need for autonomy, and the need for

relatedness (Deci & Ryan, 2002). Treatment that enables clients to make progress towards these goals will therefore have a greater chance of being personally relevant and meaningful to the client.

Another easily overlooked element in motivating sexual offenders to change is in understanding hope. Moulden and Marshall (2009) highlight the importance of transmitting to sexual offenders a belief in the usefulness of change and a sense of ownership of that change. Snyder, Michael, and Cheavens (1999) emphasized the importance of hope as a psychotherapeutic foundation, and described it as consisting of agency thinking (believing that a goal is attainable) and pathways thinking (having ideas about how to attain it). They further emphasized that “therapists who are burned out or otherwise fail to convey hopefulness implicitly model low agency and pathways thinking” (p. 182). Given the importance of therapists within the therapeutic relationship, it is surprising that the use of hopefulness in sexual offender treatment has not received wider attention.

These are crucial considerations in the treatment of sexual offenders. It is common for outside stakeholders, the lay public, and clients themselves to view treatment programs as being entirely responsible for client change. In this mindset, treatment is something that therapists do “to” their clients. The findings above show that although providing a sound treatment program is the responsibility of clinicians, the ultimate responsibility for committing to and maintaining change lies with the client. In this case, a metaphor for the change process may be treatment following a heart attack. For most adults, this treatment will involve losing weight, proper exercise, and eating appropriately.

Skill acquisition, rehearsal, and enactment

Some programs for lower risk criminal offenders emphasize the acquisition and even rehearsal of skills. Because being able to maintain change is so vital to long-term risk reduction, skill *enactment* becomes particularly important in the treatment of sexual offenders. In a study of enhancing treatment fidelity in health behavior change, researchers from the National Institute for Health (Bellg et al., 2004) state that enactment of treatment skills involves self-monitoring and improving one’s ability to perform treatment-related behavioral skills and cognitive strategies in relevant real-life settings.

Some principles for engaging offenders meaningfully in change

To summarize to this point, programs treating sexual offenders will likely be most effective when they attend to the contextual factors that make change more difficult. For larger programs, this can involve administrators ensuring that the culture of the work environment is conducive to growth and change for their clinical staff (e.g., Miller, 2006). Programs can also adopt a perspective that they are building willing partnership with participants who will view themselves as responsible for their own change and maintain a hopeful approach towards it. Clinicians who consistently employ a warm, empathic, rewarding, and directive (in the sense of guiding) approach are also more likely to engage their clients meaningfully. With that, the following ideas can also help professionals build willing partners in change:

Willingness to change is different from willingness to enter a treatment program. Although clinicians can understand the expectations of their treatment program from the outset, clients

often do not. Clients can often appear more ready for change than they actually are. The client does not necessarily share the clinician's view of what is important in change. Likewise, some clients are more willing to change than they are to enter a treatment program where they have to work collaboratively with others. For these reasons, it can be useful to separate treatment from change conceptually.

Focus more on awakening internal motivation to change than on imparting it. There is a time and a place for encouraging those who are attempting to change. However, active attempts to motivate others to change (e.g., persuasion, cajoling, and making the case why another person should consider changing) rarely work. In fact, making the case for why clients should change can create resistance. Even when clients appear to respond well to therapists leading the cheer for change, this extrinsic motivation is rarely enough to keep another person's internal motivation going, particularly in therapeutic circumstances where the treatment is one of many experiences in the client's lifetime. Both self-perception and self-determination theory (as well as the research underpinning them) illustrate the importance of the client's ability to make his or her own case for change. Likewise, a recent study (Amrhein, Miller, Yahne, Palmer, & Fulcher, 2003) found that client verbalizations regarding change were predictive of whether or not change occurred.

Setting the stage for someone to make their own case for change can come in many forms. The skills, principles, and mindset of motivational interviewing (Miller & Rollnick, 2002) present several stars for the clinician to steer by. A helpful strategy among these is the double-sided reflection, in which the therapist verbalizes both sides of the client's ambivalence to change. Very often, these reflective statements involve "on the one hand..." formats. For example, "This is a dilemma for you. On the one hand, you would really like to complete the treatment program, and on the other hand you're not sure you can trust that others have your best interests at heart. What do you think about that? What do you think you might do?" These kinds of statements are often much more difficult to formulate than it seems. They require that the clinician have an accurate knowledge of the client's internal world. It helps to be able to use the client's own internal lexicon when making them. For example, if the client has earlier said that he doesn't want to "take treatment," it can be useful to use this same terminology. The exception is when by doing so the therapist appears unnatural, disingenuous, or abusive.

Another method for exploring the client's internal motivation to change is to draw a single vertical line on a chalkboard or piece of paper and ask the client first to list all the good things that making a change in a given area might bring, and writing these down on one side of the line. The clinician can next ask about what sorts of less desirable things might happen if they were to change. A variation on this involves dividing the paper or chalkboard into quadrants and exploring good and not-so-good things about change, as well as good and not-so-good things about *not* changing. In all of these activities the clinician must be careful not to impose their own agenda on the client.

Seek out "change talk" and explore it with clients. Amrhein et al. (2003) have highlighted the importance of client verbalizations of commitment to change. These statements can be predictive of client success at change efforts. Often, change talk appears as statements indicating a desire, ability, reason, or need to change. It can also come in the form of "commitment talk", which involves statements related to explicitly planning for change, taking steps to initiate change, or beginning a change process. One method for eliciting change talk is

the use of scaling questions related to change. Two useful questions are “On a scale of zero to ten, how important is it to you to make a change in this area?” and “On the same scale, how confident are you that you can make a change in this area?” When the client answers, the clinician can then explore the number provided. After some discussion, the clinician next inquires as to why the client did not choose a lower number. Typically, the answer to this “backwards question” involves some form of desire, ability, reason, or need to change. The clinician can then explore this change talk with the client.

In eliciting and exploring change talk, a key skill involves remaining focused on these self-motivating statements and less so on the resistance statements that may accompany them. There is always time to explore the reasons why a client might feel unready, unwilling, or unable to change.

Beware the righting reflex. When awakening internal motivation and eliciting change talk, it is vital to remember that expressions of each frequently occur against a backdrop of resistance. This can be a frustrating experience for clinicians who may feel they must redouble their efforts to enforce change or somehow set the record straight with their clients (Miller & Rollnick, 2002). Under these conditions, it can be easy to return to harsh and confrontational approaches that—research shows—are less effective. This reflexive response to make things right can serve the end of short-term compliance. However, it frequently comes at the expense of long-term change. It can be helpful for clinicians to establish ground rules for themselves to simply notice this reflex without acting on it. After all, it is a byproduct of their best wishes for the client. There is always time to provide respectful feedback later. An awareness, acceptance, and expectation of resistance can keep clinicians grounded. When working with resistant clients, it can be useful to remember the saying that very often “the slower we go, the faster we get where we’re going”.

Remember that therapeutic engagement is vital throughout the treatment experience. It can be easy to think that developing rapport takes place at the start of treatment, while forgetting how important it is to maintain that rapport. Miller, Hubble, and Duncan (2008) have demonstrated the importance of the therapeutic alliance throughout treatment, and have highlighted the importance of soliciting feedback from clients in order to make sure that they actually have the alliance in treatment that they believe is there. Like Beech and Fordham’s (1997) classic study of sexual offender treatment providers, Miller, Hubble, and Duncan illustrate how psychotherapists typically view themselves as more helpful than their clients do. A therapeutic alliance is not like painkillers that prevent the patient from feeling the unpleasant effects of recovery. It is the context in which genuine change takes place.

“Treatment is just the roadmap; meaningful personal change is the goal.” These words, uttered by a civilly committed sexual offender in the Midwestern United States, are helpful to remember. Although research shows the success of cognitive-behavioral and community-based interventions in reducing sexual re-offense, more important is the actual change of cognition and behavior, preferably within the context where the client will enact new skills. Although research highlights the importance of treatment completion, it can be easy to focus too narrowly on service provision and not on the changes that the client is actually making. An unforgettable example from popular culture is in the lyrics of the song “Rehab” by Amy Winehouse. In it, she offers roughly three minutes of repeated reasons why she does not want to enter treatment. Buried within the resistance is her internal motivation for change (“I don’t

ever want to drink again. I just need a friend.”). Even within trainings of sexual offender treatment providers, many professionals miss these most important lyrics.

Focus on approach goals. There is a body of literature showing the importance of desirable “approach goals” (i.e., goals that one can work towards rather than avoid; Emmons, 1999). Unfortunately, traditional treatment approaches have not always paid adequate attention to what offenders seek to attain or achieve through offending so that they can develop ways to achieve these ends in healthy, safe ways (Yates, Prescott, & Ward, 2010). The development of approach goals is vital to building willing partners in change and a meaningful shared vision of the future. Very often, a specific choreography takes place between the client and therapist in order to develop these goals. For example, the client may enter treatment not wanting to let little things irritate her. This avoidance of irritation focuses only on the problem itself. The clinician can then work with the client to re-cast this into an approach goal of being able to stay calm at all times. Likewise, an avoidance goal of not wanting to feel inadequate all the time can be more effective when broadened to a goal of feeling competent within relationships. Ultimately, the approach goal of building a happier and healthier life that involves satisfying relationships is likely to be more appealing than simply to stop offending.

Engage in collaborative treatment planning. In the author’s experience, it is common for treatment programs to engage in a treatment planning style in which a clinician or treatment team imposes goals on the client. In inpatient settings, this can occur when representatives from each department (clinical, residential, health services, educational recreational and occupational therapy, etc.) state their goal on behalf of the client. Very often these goals are avoidance-based (e.g., “John will not be belligerent about taking medication” as opposed to “John will follow through on plans he establishes with others, including the psychiatrist and other service providers”).

A more effective approach may be to listen to what the client wants from treatment, collaborate with him on crafting it into an approach goal, considering how this goal serves the purposes of meeting criminogenic needs along the way (Andrews & Bonta, 2010). Recent research has demonstrated that sexual offender treatment programs that are matched to Andrews and Bonta’s principles of risk, need, and responsivity are more effective than those that are not (Hanson, Bourgon, Helmus, & Hodgson, 2009). For example, a client goal of not feeling angry might better be re-cast as developing inner peace, which in turn can be one component of the criminogenic need/dynamic risk factor of emotional regulation.

Shift the balance from command to leadership. Leadership has been defined in many ways, and for purposes of this article, it is most helpful to think of it as a guiding influence (Maxwell, 2007). Many professionals have viewed treatment provision as something done to clients (Glaser, 2010; Jenkins, 2006; Ward, 2010). This kind of command mentality may be less helpful than establishing a confident role of guiding influence.

All treatment providers would like nothing more than to stop offending quickly. However, the research cited throughout this article suggests that clinicians will be more effective in creating long-term change by amending their view of themselves from that of a commander (or perhaps a lion tamer) to that of a wilderness guide who helps a client explore how and why they might change. This requires a different perspective, away from visions akin to a surgeon who does the work so that a patient can heal. Rather, clinicians may be at their best when they view

themselves as being akin to a wellness consultant. From this perspective, the clinician can help guide the client in the healthiest direction, and ultimately it is the client's responsibility to invest in their future health and well-being. It is noteworthy that this approach is not necessarily easier for the client. Moving the responsibility for change away from a commanding presence to the client him- or herself can be an entirely new experience for sexual offenders.

In the author's experience, it is all too common for professionals working with sexual offenders to confuse leadership with command. Just as employees respond poorly to supervisors directing them about in a heavy-handed fashion, a more guiding approach can build longer-lasting voluntary change. Short-term compliance is not the same thing as long-term change for either professionals or their clients.

Focus on research rather than media accounts of sexual abuse. It is easy to find pessimistic media accounts implying that treatment does not work. Sample and Kadleck (2008), for example, found that lawmakers were more likely to follow media portrayals than research in establishing policies related to sexual offenders. Elsewhere, Wilson, Leaver, and Rathjen (2008) likened media portrayals of sex crimes to news items about airplane accidents. Each account seems to negate the fact that thousands of other airplanes landed safely that day. Under these circumstances it can be easy for clinicians to lose faith in the ability of their clients to change. This, in turn, can lead to the modeling of low levels of hopefulness that can be detrimental to clients.

Keep that focused sparkle in your eye. Sexual offenders, like any other clients, are quick to notice when a professional's heart and mind are somewhere else. Just as clinicians who model low agency and pathways thinking can reduce client hopefulness, it is easy for professionals to underestimate the amount of influence they have on their clients. Although it is clear that in many jurisdictions a clinician's report can mean the difference between incarceration and community placement, it is easy for professionals to forget that often they are among the first pro-social models the client has ever known. If we are not respectful of our clients, who will be?

¹The author is grateful to many colleagues in developing these examples, including Allan Zuckoff, Yolanda Fernandez, and Ruth Mann.

References

- Amrhein, P.C., Miller, W.R., Yahne, C.E., Palmer, M., & Fulcher, L. (2003). Client commitment language during motivational interviewing predicts drug use outcomes. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 71*, 862-78.
- Andrews, D.A., & Bonta, J. (2010). *The psychology of criminal conduct, 5th Edition*. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.
- Beech, A.R., & Fordham, A.S.. 1997. Therapeutic climate of sexual offender treatment programs. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 9*, 219-237.

- Bellg, A.J., Borrelli, B., Resnick, B., Hecht, J., Miniucci, D.S., Ory, M., Ogedegbe, G., Orwig, D., Ernst, D., & Czajkowski, S. (2004). Enhancing treatment fidelity in health behavior change studies: Best practices and recommendations from the NIH Behavior Change Consortium. *Health Psychology, 23*, 443-451.
- Bem, D.J. (1972). Self-perception theory. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology, Volume 6*, 2-62. New York: Academic Press.
- Chaffin, M. (in press). The case of juvenile polygraphy as a clinical ethics dilemma. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*.
- Deci, E., & Ryan, R. (Eds.), (2002). *Handbook of self-determination research*. Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press.
- Emmons, R.A. (1999). *The psychology of ultimate concerns*. New York: Guilford.
- Glaser, W. (2010). Sex offender programmes: New technology coping with old ethics. *Journal of Sexual Aggression, 16*, 261-274.
- Hanson, R.K., Bourgon, G. Helmus, L., & Hodgson, S. (2009). The principles of effective correctional treatment also apply to sexual offenders: A meta-analysis. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 36*, 865-891.
- Hanson, R.K., Gordon, A., Harris, A.J.R., Marques, J.K., Murphy, W., Quinsey, V.L., & Seto, M.C. (2002). First report of the collaborative outcome data project on the effectiveness of treatment for sex offenders. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 14*, 169-194.
- Hubble, M., Duncan, B., & Miller, S. (1999). *The heart and soul of change: What works in therapy*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Jenkins, A. (2006). The politics of intervention: Fairness and ethics. In R. E. Longo & D.S. Prescott (Eds.), *Current perspectives: Working with sexually aggressive youth and youth with sexual behavior problems* (pp. 143-166). Holyoke, MA: NEARI Press.
- Jones, L. (2002). An individual case formulation approach to the assessment of motivation. In M. McMurrin (Ed), *Motivating offenders to change* (pp. 31-54). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Levenson, J.S., & Prescott, D.S. (2009). Treatment experiences of civilly committed sex offenders: A consumer satisfaction survey. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 21*, 6-20.
- Levenson, J.S., Prescott, D.S., & D'Amora, D.A. (2010). Sex offender treatment: Consumer satisfaction and engagement in therapy. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 54*, 307-326.
- Lösel, F., & Schmucker, M. (2005). The effectiveness of treatment for sexual offenders: A comprehensive meta-analysis. *Journal of Experimental Criminology, 1*, 117-146.
- Mann, R.E. (2009). Getting the context right for sexual offender treatment. In D.S. Prescott (Ed.), *Building motivation to change in sexual offenders*. Brandon, VT: Safer Society Press.
- Marques, J.K., Wiederanders, M., Day, D.M., Nelson, C., & van Ommeren, A. (2005). Effects of a relapse prevention program on sexual recidivism: Final results from California's Sex

- Offender Treatment and Evaluation Project (SOTEP). *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research & Treatment*, 17, 79-107.
- Marshall, W.L. (2005). Therapist style in sexual offender treatment: Influence on indices of change. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research & Treatment*, 17, 109-116.
- Maxwell, J.C. (2007). *The 21 irrefutable laws of leadership*, 10th edition. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson.
- Miller, S.D., Hubble, M., & Duncan, B. (2008). Supershrinks: What is the secret of their success? *Psychotherapy in Australia*, 14, 14-22.
- Miller, W.R. (2006). Can organizations be MINTy? *MINT Bulletin*, 13, 1-4. Retrieved November 14, 2010 from <http://newsmanager.commpartners.com/linktrack.php?url=http%3A%2F%2Fmotivationalinterview.org%2Fmint%2FMINT13.2.pdf>.
- Miller, W.R., & Rollnick, S. (2002). *Motivational interviewing: Preparing people for change*. New York: Guilford.
- Moulden, H.M., & Marshall, W.L. (2009). A hopeful approach to motivating sexual offenders for change. In D.S. Prescott (Ed.), *Building motivation to change in sexual offenders* (pp. 139-159). Brandon, VT: Safer Society Press.
- Prescott, D.S., & Levenson, J.S. (2009, summer). To treat or not to treat: What are the questions? *ATSA Forum*, 21, 19-28.
- Prescott, D.S., & Levenson, J.S. (2010). Sex offender treatment is not punishment. *Journal of Sexual Aggression*, 16, 275-285.
- Prochaska, J.O. (1999). How do people change, and how can we change to help many more people? In M.A. Hubble, B.L. Duncan, & S.D. Miller (Eds.), *The heart and soul of change: What works in therapy* (pp. 227-255). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Prochaska, J.O., & DiClemente, C.C. (1992). *Stages of change in the modification of problem behaviors*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Prochaska, J.O., DiClemente, C.C., & Norcross, J.C. (1992). In search of how people change: Applications to addictive behaviors. *American Psychologist*, 47, 1102-1114.
- Ryan, R.M., & Deci, E.L. (2000). Self-determination and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55, 68-78.
- Sample, L.L., & Kadleck, C. (2008). Sex offender laws: Legislators' accounts of the need for policy. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 19, 40-62.
- Shamai, M., & Buchbinder, E. (2010). Control of the self: Partner-violent men's experience of therapy. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 25, 1338-1362.
- Snyder, C.R., Michael, S.T., & Cheavens, J.S. (1999). Hope as a psychotherapeutic foundation of common factors, placebos, and expectancies. In M.A. Hubble, B.L. Duncan, & S.D. Miller (Eds.), *The heart and soul of change: What works in therapy* (pp. 179-200). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Vess, J. (in press). Ethical practice in sexual offender assessment: Consideration of actuarial and polygraph methods. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*.

- Ward, T. (2002). Good lives and the rehabilitation of sex offenders. In T. Ward and S. Hudson (Eds.), *Sexual deviance: Issues and controversies*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Ward, T. (2010). Punishment or therapy? The ethics of sexual offending treatment *Journal of Sexual Aggression, 16*, 1-10, iFirst article.
- Wilson, R.J., Leaver, W., & Rathjen, L. (2008, October). *Calm in the eye of the storm: Circles of Support & Accountability*. Plenary address delivered at the 27th Annual Conference of the Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers, Atlanta, GA.
- Yates, P.M., Prescott, D.S., & Ward, T. (2010). *Applying the good lives and self-regulation models to sex offender treatment: A practical guide for clinicians*. Brandon, VT: Safer Society.