ADVANCING CORRECTIONS
Journal of the International Corrections and Prisons Association

UNDERSTANDING RISK

ASSESSING MANAGING REDUCING

ICPA
International Corrections & Prisons Association

Understanding, Assessing, Managing and Reducing Risk

Edition #10 - 2020

www.icpa.org

EMPOWERING RISK REDUCTION: INCREASING RESPONSIVITY WITH MOTIVATIONAL INTERVIEWING

Michael D. Clark, MSW
Director, Center for Strength-Based Strategies

Abstract

The Risk-Need-Responsivity (RNR) model provides an empirically validated approach for reducing risk and lowering recidivism. Through considerable research over time, the first two principles of Risk and Need have been well developed and expanded. The third core principle of Responsivity has been overlooked and has lagged behind, even though it encompasses offender engagement and motivation. The good news for correctional treatment is the focus on the responsivity principle has been increasing—and expanding. Understanding the value of engagement and motivation has sparked an expansion of specific responsivity to include the provider-offender relationship. Numerous studies on this relationship find the best reductions in recidivism come from blending control and alliance to establish a synthetic or hybrid approach—one that calls supervision staff to establish a "dual relationship." This paper will point out the RNR model authors' endorsements and recommendations for the use of Motivational Interviewing (MI) in correctional settings. MI's ability to increase an offender's readiness to change while offering direct practice methods for establishing dual relationships are explored. That MI represents the largest share of what the responsivity principle seeks to accomplish has led MI to be labeled a "natural fit" for community corrections. Several benefits that MI offers the rehabilitation process are detailed.

Keywords:
Motivational Interviewing, Probation, Parole, Corrections, Community Corrections, Risk-Need-Responsivity, Dual Relationship, Working Alliance, Responsivity, Specific Responsivity

The Risk-Need-Responsivity (RNR) Model

The Risk-Need-Responsivity model (Bonta & Andrews, 2017) is currently the premier approach in offender rehabilitation, providing empirically validated methods for reducing recidivism. Willis and Ward (2013) state, "Inherent in this model is the supposition that offenders are bearers of risk for recidivism, and the primary aim of offender rehabilitation is to reduce this recidivism risk through adherence to the RNR principles" (p. 305). A brief description of the three "core principles" of the Risk-Need-Responsivity (RNR) model include:

1. **Risk Principle.**
   Risk assessment tools are used to determine a person's level of risk for reoffending so that the dosage or intensity of treatment can be favorably matched to them. (Known as determining the "who" should be assigned to this continuum/intensity of services.) If an offender's assessment of risk is low, they might need little or no treatment. But if the assessment classifies them as high risk, then research suggests an increase in programming. These assessments of risk use a spectrum of low, medium and high to suggest the necessary level of treatment response—all to reduce or eliminate future criminal activities.

2. **Need Principle.**
   Treatment goals should be focused on criminogenic needs, or those offender situations that are functionally related to criminal behavior. (Known as the "what" for issues to be targeted or worked on.) What offenders "need" to work on are causal issues that have been shown to influence reoffending. These are "dynamic risk factors" that are changeable, for example, negative peer associations and substance abuse —as opposed to static factors that are fixed (and cannot be changed), such as criminal record, family history or age.

3. **Responsivity Principle.**
   This principle suggests we base programs and services on what will effect change for the individual in front of you. (Known as the "how" to design and deliver services that will sync to the individual, including relationships, motivations and styles of learning). This involves the actual delivery of services to maximize their efficacy.

While the RNR model has expanded its list of principles, these three RNR principles remain at the "core." There has been extensive outcome research, showing a reduction in recidivism, that leads the model originators (Andrews, Bonta & Wormith, 2011) to sum-up, "With respect to offender treatment, interventions that adhere to the RNR principles are associated with significant reductions in recidivism, whereas treatments that fail to follow the principles yield minimal reductions in recidivism and, in some cases, even increase recidivism" (p. 736).

In light of the important gains made with this model, it was encouraging that the model originators conceded their RNR approach was neither finished nor perfected, inviting investigation and critique. This article seeks to explore the third principle of responsivity and will expand on previous calls by the model's authors to use Motivational Interviewing to better empower the RNR model.

Responsivity – "Missing in Action" (MIA)?

The responsivity principle suggests that programming should be tailored to the strengths, abilities, motivation and the learning styles of individuals. Yet of RNR's three core principles, it is responsivity that has been relatively passed over, being labeled the "neglected R" (Duwe & Kim, 2018) and also called an "afterthought" (Taylor, 2016). Even the model developers acknowledge the research into responsivity has been lacking—Bourgon & Bonta (2014) calling responsivity the "poor cousin" to risk and need. Don Andrews (2011) noted the "lack of evidence" regarding specific responsivity to be a weakness in the RNR approach. Duwe & Kim (2018) continue by warning that without a true focus on all three principles, fidelity can tumble and outcomes can suffer.

To better explain responsivity, the RNR model breaks this principle into two categories:

> *General responsivity,* is how we respond at the program level. This category suggests staff should deliver treatment services for the individual using relevant models that effects change. RNR suggests cognitive-behavioral techniques (CBT), as the effectiveness of this model of intervention with offenders has been demonstrated in a number of meta-analytic reviews (Bourgon & Bonta, 2014).
>
> *Specific responsivity,* is how we respond at the individual level. When the model was first launched, this category was focused on the offender, attentive to issues of offender motivation for treatment, gender, ethnicity, and race. However, more current investigations have expanded this principle to also look at provider characteristics as well as the provider-offender relationship. Responsivity now considers what engenders high quality relationships while it seeks to create an optimal learning environment with engagement and motivation.

There is good news—the neglect that responsivity suffered is changing. Understanding the value of engagement and motivation has sparked an expansion of specific responsivity to examine the provider-offender relationship (Skeem et al., 2007; Viglione, 2017; Grattet, et al., 2018). I have stated before, "Even the best approaches will fail if the offender is disinterested and does not want to participate. Start with client engagement, or forget starting at all" (Stinson & Clark, 2017, p. 6). Considering the volume of findings for how a quality relationship can lend to a reduction in recidivism, this adage seems to resonate with many across the field. Increasing responsivity, accessing the "how to's" for developing quality relationships and building "buy-in" is the venue of Motivational Interviewing.

MI Syncs with the RNR Model

Models of direct practice are both technical and relational. In the drive to build effective approaches, models can concentrate too much on strategies and techniques and the relational aspects can be left wanting. Speaking to this issue, Austin et al., (2011) states, "The reconceptualization of motivation as an interpersonal process and the correctional principle of responsivity have fueled interest in motivational interventions, particularly Motivational Interviewing as an intervention method for offenders" (p. 55). The RNR model authors have displayed a keen interest for MI and recommend its use. These endorsements are both numerous and compelling:

- "We are very encouraged by the advancement of Motivational Interviewing (MI; Miller & Rollnick, 1991, 2002) over the past decade and its application to correctional clientele. Its techniques are very applicable to RNR-based interventions. Some RNR training programs have incorporated MI for years..." (Andrews, Bonta & Wormith, 2011, p. 743).

- The successful implementation of MI skills, techniques and spirit creates an "environment" that increases treatment engagement. There is also supporting evidence that MI enhances learning that takes place during treatment (Bourgon & Bonta, 2014).

- The Good Lives Model reminds proponents of RNR to renew their efforts to address issues of ... relationship skills, client input, consumer satisfaction, advocacy, brokerage, *and Motivational Interviewing* [emphasis added] (Andrews, Bonta & Wormith, 2011, p. 751).

- The effectiveness of interventions is enhanced when delivered by staff with high quality relationship skills in combination with high quality structuring skills... Motivational Interviewing skills include both relationship and structuring aspects of effective practice (Andrews, 2011).

- MI is about creating a "responsive" environment to enhance treatment engagement behaviors... There is ample empirical work on MI demonstrating that MI does enhance treatment engagement with non-offenders and offenders (Bourgon & Bonta, 2014).

- What we like about MI is that it is prescriptive about what to do to create an optimal learning environment, specifying the helpers behaviors and informing them of what to do and how to do it while interacting with the client (Bourgon & Bonta, 2014).

It would seem the road to risk reduction runs through responsivity, and responsivity can be empowered by MI. Why Motivational Interviewing? What is it about MI that brings such attention and approval from the proponents of RNR and the rehabilitation field in general?

What Is Motivational Interviewing?

Motivational Interviewing (MI) has spread rapidly across the field of Corrections since William R. Miller initially presented it as an alternative to working with problem drinkers—particularly those individuals who may have been perceived as being resistant or in denial (Miller, 1983). MI is known as a way of communicating with people to help them find their own reasons for change (Miller & Rollnick, 1991; 2002; 2013).

Even though it started in the field of addictions, MI has since widened its reach, becoming a favored approach for use with populations in a variety of settings (Burke, Arkowitz, & Dunn, 2002), including criminal justice agencies (Birgden, 2004; McMurran, 2009; Farrall, 2002), probation and parole (Clark, 2005; Clark, 2006; Walters, Clark, Gingerich, & Meltzer, 2007), reentry (Stinson & Clark, 2017) and corrections/prisons (Clark, 2013; Stinson & Clark, 2017; Forsberg, et al., 2011; Antiss, Polaschek & Wilson, 2011). The tremendous growth of this approach in criminology is due, in part, to a drive to move beyond a sole focus on compliance and supervision to engage in the "business of behavior change" (Clark, 2006).

MI is not a specialty skill reserved only for professional counselors. It is quite general and fundamental to how you listen, support, and communicate with a guiding style. In corrections, it is used by probation and parole officers as well as prison staff working inside facilities. The main goal of MI is to enhance intrinsic motivation for change. There are several steps to increasing an offender's readiness to change.

The first step focuses on engagement and establishing a good working alliance. You work to become a person to trust by extending warmth and working hard to understand their point of view. Building this type of relationship does not mean you indulge or condone, it simply means you treat them as a whole person who is worthy of respect. You realize that "all change is self-change" and nothing much is going to happen if one disregards the relationship. Ward & Maruna (2007) were quick to forward this idea, "...all forms of rehabilitation require the active acceptance and willing participation of intervention participants in order to work" (pp. 17-18).

The second step involves negotiating ambivalence. The MI approach believes the vast majority of offenders enter our correctional system feeling two ways about their problem behavior(s). Ambivalence occurs when the offender has equal pressure between wanting to change and wanting to stay the same. There are two sides to the argument which may be felt by the offender as a tug-of-war. Exercising pressure or giving advice to resolve ambivalence is unlikely to result in successful behavior change. The core of MI approach is the use of a guiding style to navigate this ambivalence towards healthy change.

Discrepancy is the next step to help navigate and resolve this ambivalence. Here, the officer helps the offender to reflect on their current situation—being under supervision, being incarcerated or hospitalized, or subject to the orders of one or more agencies—where the goal is for the person to see a future that is somehow different, as well as desired. This involves listening for and evoking the person's values, and to explore how their current behavior fits (or more importantly, does not fit) within the context of their deeply-held values. When you understand what people value, you're in touch with what motivates them. What MI wants is to facilitate a confrontation *within the offender*—between their values and their actual behavior. Discrepancy creates an "appetite for change" when there is a gap, or disconnect, between their values and actions. The most effective confrontation lies within the offender, not *between* the officer and offender. The client's own internal dilemma provides the momentum needed for the breaking-free and movement to begin one's readiness to change.

The Benefits of Motivational Interviewing for the RNR Model

There are many advantages when the RNR model employs MI. A listing of several benefits include:

1. MI is complementary to both the RNR model and Cognitive Behavioral Treatment
2. MI empowers the principle of responsivity.
3. MI assists the dual-role relationship.
4. MI can stand the heat. It has effective methods for probationers/parolees who are reluctant or resistant.
5. MI is suited for busy caseloads. It can make an impact in brief interventions - even single sessions or within compressed time frames.
6. MI crosses cultures well.

7. MI is learnable and has safe and responsible procedures for the pandemic-distancing era.

Benefit #1: MI is complementary to the RNR model and Cognitive Behavioral Treatment.
Research finds MI to be complementary to other evidence-based practices (EBP). That is, studies found that when MI is added to another evidence-based practice, *both become more effective* - and the effect size is sustained over a longer period of time (Miller, 2018). Combining MI with an RNR approach is more effective for two reasons: first, with MI in place, offenders are more responsive to participate, and second, they are more likely to complete what is intended by the tandem EBP treatment. MI has been studied as a prelude to treatment but many in corrections view it as a "base" approach (a "way of being") to be used throughout initial offender contact, assessment and ongoing programming (Stinson & Clark, 2017).

This complimentary help also extends to Cognitive Behavioral Treatment (CBT). Polaschek (2011) states that CBT rehabilitation programs have little capacity to respond to differences in client readiness and are often positioned for offenders who walk in prepared to engage with what the program offers, ready to begin change almost immediately. This idea is echoed by Arkowitz and Westra (2004) who find CBT does not formally address ambivalence about change, which prompts a recommendation that MI be used to enhance the readiness to change and prepare clients for effective utilization of CBT.

Benefit #2: MI Empowers the Principle of Responsivity.
Conditions that give power to offender treatment are well-known; engagement, intrinsic motivation (values, needs, wants, confidence), responsivity, readiness for change and readiness for treatment. These conditions are the yields of MI practice. A new study conducted with offenders noted that motivation is central to responsiveness and that attitudes towards treatment influenced behavioral outcomes, including disciplinary infractions and future criminal behavior (Lester, 2020). Without motivation and the buy-in from those meant to participate in programming, participation is mere wishful thinking.

Motivation and buy-in are better captured by terms that originate from stage models. The Stages of Change Model (Prochaska, DiClimente & Norcross, 1992) also called the Transtheoretical Model (TTM) list five stages that includes; precontemplation, contemplation, preparation, action and maintenance. The six pre-treatment stages of change (De Leon, 1996) includes, denial, ambivalence, extrinsic motivation, intrinsic motivation, readiness for change, and treatment readiness. Czuchry, Sia and Dansereau (2006), in an article entitled, "Improving Early Engagement and Treatment Readiness of Probationers" adds more specificity by noting, "Research on motivating clients has rightfully focused on the early stages of precontemplation and contemplation (considered more globally as readiness for change) and contemplation to preparation and action stages (considered more globally as treatment readiness)" (p. 57).

It is important to note that readiness for change and particularly readiness for treatment have both been shown to reliably predict treatment effectiveness (Czuchry, et al., 2006). This phrase "readiness to change" is so deeply aligned with MI that it's often used to characterize one of the outcomes that Motivational Interviewing strives for (Clark, 2005; Clark, 2019; Grimolizzi-Jensen, 2018; Zalmanowitz, et al., 2013). That MI represents the largest share of what this responsivity principle seeks to

accomplish has led to MI being labeled a "natural fit" for corrections (Iarussi & Powers, 2018).

Benefit #3: MI Assists the Dual-Role Relationship.
Punishment or rehabilitation. Law enforcement or social work. Hard or soft. There is no intent to provoke a polarized debate. This dualism has grown stale, as research now points to a combination—or a best mix—of these opposing values. What is recommended is a middle ground which represents a "Goldilocks principle" of "just the right amount" of both control and a working alliance (Clark, in press). This blend of control and connections has been found to be predictive of success on supervision. (Lovins et al, 2018). Descriptions from research are plentiful:

- The "synthetic" officer – surveillance and rehabilitation to establish a "working alliance" (Polaschek, 2016; Viglione, 2017; Skeem & Manchak, 2008; Klockars, 1972)
- Firm, fair and caring–respectful, valuing of personal autonomy (Kennealy et al., 2012)
- "Hybrid" or "synthetic" approach to probation, combining a strong emphasis of both social work and law enforcement. (Grattet, Nguyen, Bird and Goss, 2018)
- Motivational communication strategies and Motivational Interviewing (Viglione, Rudes and Taxman, 2017)
- Open, warm, enthusiastic communication, mutual respect (Dowden & Andrews, 2004)
- Blending care with control through a "dual relationship" (Skeem, Lounden, Polaschek and Camp, 2007)

This call for a dual relationship raises a "good news" / "bad news" contrast. The good news is that multiple studies find the quality of the officer-offender relationship predicts success on supervision and determines whether programs actually reduce new crimes (Keannealy, et al, 2012; Lovins, et al., 2018). The bad news is that many researchers worry about the difficulty that line-officers will encounter in balancing the dual roles of law enforcement with alliance (Paparozzi & Guy, 2018; Skeem, et al., 2017; Kennealy, et al., 2012).

Here lies another reason that MI has been called a "natural fit" for corrections—MI offers the "how to's" for negotiating this blending of control with a working alliance. These relational skills emerge from the MI community—informing supervising officers how to carry out these dual roles. The methods and strategies are available and within reach for probation and parole staff who seek to negotiate control with alliance. Consider the titles of various subsections in a new publication that focuses on the application of MI to community corrections (Stinson & Clark, 2017):

- Addressing Violations and Sanctions
- Explaining the Dual Role
- When Goals Don't Match—Clarifying your role
- Adherence to Core Correctional Practices
- Muscle vs. meekness
- Understanding control vs. influence
- "Power with" vs. "force over" to facilitate change

Here is a "deep-dive" into negotiating this dual role. Administrators and researchers alike have found that Motivational Interviewing can transform mechanical and depersonalized offender models and

add important core counselling skills, realizing all the while that offender engagement is a critical first-step. As a result, some of the most widely accepted RNR programs within the last decade, EPICS, STARR and The Carey Guides, have all recommended and/or taught Motivational Interviewing as an important component to better facilitate a climate of behavior change (e.g., EPICS, University of Cincinnati Correctional Institute; STARR, Robinson, Vanbenschoten, Alexander and Lowenkamp, 2011; see Gliecher, Manchek and Cullen, 2013, The Carey Guides, Carey & Carter, 2019). Note that the Carey Guides trains MI and refers to it as "...a communication style that *provides the groundwork for the professional alliance* [emphasis added] that is so critical to helping offenders address skill deficits and implement risk reduction strategies" (Cary & Carter, 2019).

Learning the dual relationship with the help of MI does not mean the removal of consequences that the court has already assessed, nor do they suggest suspending future penalties for non-compliance or re-offending. In some way, contingent problems, penalties, or simple hassles can certainly increase discrepancy. It is not, however, the officer's role to create problems in order to foster change. It is likely that these contingencies are already in place. MI seeks to change the behavior that led to punishment: not to work hard to inflict further punishment. MI teaches officers they can carry through with consequences while still keeping a working alliance.

Benefit #4: MI can stand the heat. It has effective methods for probationers/parolees who are reluctant or resistant.

Would it be helpful for community correction departments to know that Motivational Interviewing was originally developed for those who are more resistant, angry or reluctant to change (Stinson & Clark, 2017)? MI has been found to be a particularly effective approach for working with people who are angry and defensive *at first contact* (Miller & Rollnick, 2013).

How about the complexity of dual diagnosis where a new supervisee may enter a community corrections department with both a mental health disorder and a substance use disorder? Results from a 2018 study indicated that MI was associated with increased self-efficacy and treatment completion of dually diagnosed clients (Moore, Flamez & Szirony, 2018). Now add the heat of post-traumatic stress disorders (PTSD). Studies have shown that people with a higher reactance level have a better response to MI than more directive styles (Miller & Rollnick, 2013). The term "reactance" can mean oversensitive, touchy or even volatile. Consider how defendants entering community correction caseloads might suffer from PTSD and these elevated reactance levels so prevalent to this condition. Research from the field of trauma-informed work sites, "MI enables service providers to carry out the intentions and goals of trauma-informed practice" (Anonymous, 2010).

Another issue about MI being able to "stand the heat" is to convey to community corrections that there is simply a limit to coercion. Research is clear that approaches which favor confrontation or pressured compliance, fail to produce lasting and meaningful change (Walters, et. al., 2007). Even in the most extreme situations, new research finds the application of MI has proved helpful. Research has found that neither torture (O'Mara, 2017) nor other aggressive interrogation methods (Alison, et al., 2014) are as successful as interventions based on development of a working alliance.. MI has also recently been applied to counter-terrorism policing and deradicalization efforts (Clark, 2019) as well as improving interrogation techniques with detainees (Surmon-Böhr, et al., 2020). Ramping up coercion and toughness is paradoxical—the more you do it, the worse it gets.

Benefit #5: MI is suited for busy caseloads. It can make an impact in brief interventions—even single sessions or within compressed time frames.
MI has been designated as an evidence-based practice for increasing both engagement and retention in treatment (NREPP, 2013). This type of engagement is as rapid as it is durable. MI has been called an "effective tool" for use within compressed time frames (Forman & Moyers, 2019). Multiple randomized clinical trials have shown reliable outcomes when used in just a single session (McCambridge & Strang, 2004; Diskin & Hodgins, 2009). A multisite effectiveness study found that participants who received a single-session of MI had significantly better retention in outpatient substance use treatment at 28 days when compared with controls (Carroll, Sheehan & Hyland, 2001).

Many trainees ask the question, "But, I have a large caseload—can I 'do' MI in 5 minutes?" I answer this question with a rebound, "Can you ruin motivation in 5 minutes?" Of course you can. Little time to intervene means little room for error. Training in MI can improve the likelihood that short interactions will prove helpful. You can confront and try to work through the ensuing tangle of arguments or excuses, or you can use a guiding style to move more efficiently to productive conversations. Miller & Rollnick (2013) were the first to position this idea, "Perhaps the underlying question is whether it is possible to make a difference with a few minutes of MI. Not only is it possible, but if you have only a few minutes to discuss behavior change, MI is likely to be more effective than finger-wagging warnings" (p. 343).

Benefit #6: MI crosses cultures well.
Some treatments do not cross cultures well—yet MI does. The great benefit from its use with minorities is the effect size of MI *is doubled* when used with minority clients. This was determined by 11 controlled clinical trials examining the cross-cultural applications of MI (Miller, 2019). A finding from one meta-analysis is significant. Hettema, Steele & Miller (2005) published a meta-analysis of 72 studies, 37 of which looked at racial/ethnic composition. These researchers found the effects of MI were significantly larger for minority samples.

So why does MI work better cross-culturally – especially when one would hope for "no difference" between differing ethnic or cultural groups? William Miller, co-originator of this approach, offered a narrative that is thought-provoking: "MI seems to be particularly useful with people who are least respected. It is for people who are the most marginalized and who are the most despised and rejected members of our society. If you're a minority member, you may not be familiar with being treated respectfully" (Miller, 2018).

Benefit #7: MI is learnable and has safe and responsible procedures for the pandemic-distancing era.
A helpful research finding is that one's ability to learn MI is not contingent on experience, education or professional field. You don't have to have years of seniority or advanced degrees (Miller, et al., 2013). MI is now being taught and practiced in over 54 languages and literally spans the globe. Here in the United States it's been taught, in varying degrees, to courts, prisons, drug courts and community corrections groups, in all 50 states (Clark, 2018). A considerable number of Department of Corrections (DOC's), across multiple states, have implemented MI to the point of utilizing training-of-trainers sessions to enable "in-house" sustainability (Clark, 2020).

This approach also has well-established fidelity measures to determine if this practice is being used correctly by officers in the field (competency) and to what quality and extent (proficiency). Miller & Rollnick (2013) found that even when trainee's couldn't reach competency levels, it often was enough for them to stop using several confrontive or overly-directive responses that damage relationships — an indirect benefit even when attaining high competency levels proves elusive (p. 381).

The Covid-19 pandemic (Carlos, 2020) has sent training environments into flux and seemingly stalled learning initiatives. Many management teams easily embrace technology and internet-based learning options, while others have been reluctant and seem only to trust on-site classroom training (Clark, 2020). Consider that empirical comparisons of classroom and distance learning often find that both modalities enjoy similar rates of learning, and both can be equally motivating (e.g., Bernard et al., 2004; Clark, Bewley, & O'Neil, 2006). Anyone can readily recall an in-person (onsite) training that was painfully boring, or held little value. The same can be said for internet-based distance education. If there are differences in learning outcomes, the discrepancies can be traced to engagement with the audience and accuracy of the content—not the medium used to deliver the instruction. In simple terms, it's not the medium that carries the message, it's the way the message is crafted (Clark, 1994, 1999; Clark & Mayer, 2007; Mayer, 2005).

MI is well-suited to respond to the changes in training mediums by way of options for safe and responsible internet-based training. The MI field has extensive "on-demand" web-courses, where the course work is followed by using skill-building resources to convene small groups via web-conferencing tools. The web courses allow learning transfer and small group meetings enable skill-building. Webinars and web-coaching are readily available for sustainability and continued skill building.

Concluding Thoughts

It was no accident that MI moved into the field of criminology after several decades of muscle and punishment which only made things worse. This left offender service programs overwhelmed by roadblocks that many now realize were self-imposed (Bogue, et al., 2004; McMurran, 2002). There are over one thousand research studies demonstrating that positive relationships are one of the strongest and most consistent predictors of outcomes across human service approaches (Orlinsky, Ronnestad & Willutzki, 2004). Holding fast to the idea that offender work is any different is simply being resistant to change oneself. Thankfully, new correctional research is starting to investigate the working alliance between officer and offender. The benefits already attributed to MI are cause for optimism (Polascheck, 2016).

One point of confluence is offered: "No matter what population you work with, the mechanisms that propel behavior change remain the same. This is the reason that Motivational Interviewing has such broad applicability to such seemingly different groups." (Stinson & Clark. 2017, p. 241). MI seems to take hold in systems that have relied too heavily on the "killer D's" of degrading, directing, demanding and domination.

For cynics to say that MI cannot work within probation and parole—after it has been shown to work even in extremely challenging situations such as in improving interrogation outcomes with terrorists labelled "high-value detainees" (Clark, 2019)—is simply to render the field "terminally unique." MI

can offer the know-how and techniques for probation and parole to deliver services with a non-adversarial, non-punitive approach. When problems do occur (and they will), they can be addressed by using "intelligent flexibility" (Gunnison & Helfgott, 2013) rather than pushing for revocation upon first breach. Strategies for line staff, to be used during stressful situations when breaks or noncompliance occur, are important options for reducing violations and revocations. Stop them before they start, or negotiate them in more effective ways when consequences become necessary. This approach demonstrates the working alliance does not have to be abandoned when the road gets rough. MI has been a leader in developing and delivering non-coercive methods to increase the readiness to change across several decades. MI reminds us that while you may not be responsible for the offender's starting point, you have considerable influence over what happens next.

LIST OF REFERENCES

Alison, L., Alison, E., Noone, G., Elntib, S., Waring, S., & Christiansen, P. (2014). The efficacy of rapport-based techniques for minimizing counter-interrogation tactics amongst a field sample of terrorists. Psychology, Public Policy, and Law, 20(4), 421-430. doi:http://dx.doi.org.proxy1.cl.msu.edu/10.1037/law0000021

Andrews, D.A. (2011), The impact of nonprogrammatic factors on criminal□justice interventions. Legal and Criminological Psychology, 16: 1-23. doi:10.1348/135532510X521485

Bonta, J., & Andrews, D. A. (2017). The Psychology of Criminal Conduct (sixth ed.) New York, NY: Routledge.

Andrews, D. A., Bonta, J., & Wormith, J. S. (2006). The Recent Past and Near Future of Risk and/or Need Assessment. Crime & Delinquency, 52(1), 7–27. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128705281756

Andrews, D. A., Bonta, J., & Wormith, J. S. (2011). The Risk-Need-Responsivity (RNR) model: Does adding the good lives model contribute to effective crime prevention? Criminal Justice and Behavior, 38(7), 735–755. https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854811406356

Anonymous.(2010). Guiding as Practice: Motivational Interviewing and Trauma-Informed Work with Survivors of Intimate Partner Violence." Partner Abuse 1.1. 92-104. ProQuest. Web. 30 May 2020.

Anstiss, B., Polaschek, D. L., & Wilson, M. (2010). A Brief Motivational Interviewing Intervention With Prisoners: When you lead a horse to water, can it drink for itself? Psychology, Crime & Law, 17(8), 689-710.

Arkowitz, H., & Westra, H. A. (2004). Integrating motivational interviewing and cognitive behavioral therapy in the treatment of depression and anxiety. Journal of Cognitive Psychotherapy: An International Quarterly. 18(4). 337-350. doi:10.1891/jcop.18.4.337.63998

Austin, K. P., Williams, M. W. M., & Kilgour, G. (2011). The effectiveness of motivational interviewing with offenders: An outcome evaluation. New Zealand Journal of Psychology (Online), 40(1), 55-67. Retrieved from http://ezproxy.msu.edu/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.proxy1.cl.msu.edu/docview/1026650826?accountid=12598

Bernard, R.M., Abrami, P.C., Lou, Y., Borokhovski, E., Wade, A., Wozney, L., Wallet, P.A., Fixet, M., & Huant, B. (2004). How does distance education compare with classroom instruction? A meta-analysis of the empirical literature. Review of Educational Research, 74, 379–439.

Birgden, A. (2004). Therapeutic jurisprudence and responsivity: Finding the will and the way in offender rehabilitation. Psychology, Crime and Law, 10(3), 283-295.

Bonta, J., Andrews, D. A. (2017). The psychology of criminal conduct.

Bogue, B., Campbell, N., Carey, M., Clawson, E., Faust, D., Florio, K., ... Woodward, W. (2004).

Implementing evidence-based practice in community corrections: The principles of effective intervention. Washington, DC: National Institute of Corrections.

Bourgon, G., & Bonta, J. (2014). Reconsidering the responsivity principle: A way to move forward. Federal Probation, 78(2), 3-10,78. Retrieved from http://ezproxy.msu.edu/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.proxy2.cl.msu.edu/docview/1618956463?accountid=12598

Burke, B. L., Arkowitz, H., & Dunn, C. (2002). The efficacy of motivational interviewing and its adaptations: What we know so far. In W. R. Miller & S. Rollnick (Eds.), Motivational interviewing: Preparing people for change (2nd ed., pp. 217-250). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Carey, M. and Carter, M. (2019). The Carey Group Training Information. Retrieved from The Carey Group website: https://thecareygroup.com/documents/Training-Sequence-and-Curricula-Descriptions-2019.pdf

Carlos, R.C., (2020). Pandemic. Journal of the American College of Radiology, 17(6), 691-692.

Carroll, K. M., Libby, B., Sheehan, J., & Hyland, N. (2001). "Motivational Interviewing to Enhance Treatment Initiation in Substance Abusers: An effectiveness study." The American Journal on Addictions, 10, 335–339. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1521-0391.2001.tb00523.x

Clark, M. D. (2005). Motivational interviewing for probation staff: Increasing the readiness to change. Federal Probation, 69(2), 22-28.

Clark, M. D. (2006). Entering the business of behavior change: Motivational interviewing for probation staff. Perspectives, 30(1), 38-45.

Clark, M. D. (2013). "Moving from compliance to behavior change: Motivational Interviewing and the field of corrections. The IACFP Newsletter (International Association of Correctional & Forensic Psychology), Vol. 45 (3) 1-4.

Clark, M.D. (2018). [Research gathered at the 2018 International meeting of the Motivational Interviewing Network of Trainers - MINT Forum. New Orleans, Louisiana, USA]. Unpublished raw data.

Clark, M.D. (2019). Motivational Interviewing for Deradicalization: Increasing the readiness to change. Journal for Deradicalization. 20. 47-73.

Clark, M.D. (2020). [Great Lakes Training, Inc.- Technical Assistance records]. Unpublished raw data

Clark, M.D. (in press). Community corrections, heal thyself. The case for motivational interviewing to improve probation and parole. Journal for Advancing Justice.

Clark, R.E. (1994). Media will never influence learning. Educational Technology Research and Development, 42(2), 21–30.

Clark, R.E. (1999), Yin and Yang Cognitive Motivational Processes Operating in Multimedia Learning Environments. In van Merrienböer, J. (Ed.) Cognition and Multimedia Design. Herleen, Netherlands: Open University Press. 73 – 107.

Clark, R.C. & Mayer, R. E. (2007). e-Learning and the science of instruction. San Francisco: Pfeiffer .

Clark, R.E., Bewley, W. L., & O'Neil, H. (2006). Heuristics for selecting distance or classroom settings for courses. In H. O'Neil & R. Perez (Eds), Web- based learning: Theory, research and practice (pp. 133-142). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Czuchry, M., Sia, T. L., & Dansereau, D. F. (2006). Improving early engagement and treatment readiness of probationers: Gender differences. The Prison Journal, 86(1), 56–74. https://doi.org/10.1177/0032885505283877

De Leon, G. (1996) Integrative recovery: a stage paradigm, Substance Abuse, 17, 51-63.

Diskin, K. M., Hodgins, D.C., (2009). A Randomized Controlled Trial of a Single Session Motivational Intervention for Concerned Gamblers. Behavior Research and Therapy, 47, 382 – 388.

Dowden, C., & Andrews, D. A. (2004). The Importance of staff practice in delivering effective correctional treatment: A meta-analytic review of core correctional practice. International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 48(2), 203–214. https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X03257765

Duwe, G., Kim, K. (2018). The neglected 'r' in the Risk-Needs-Responsivity model: A new approach for assessing responsivity to correctional interventions. Justice Evaluation Journal, 1(2), 130-150.

Farrall, S. (2002). Rethinking what works with offenders: Probation, social context, and desistance from crime. Portland, Oregon: Willan Publishing.

Forman, D.P., & Moyers, T.P., (2019). "With Odds of a Single Session, Motivational interviewing is a good bet." Psychotherapy 56(1). 62-66. ProQuest. Web. 26 Dec. 2019.

Forsberg, L., Ernst, D., & Farbring, C. Å. (2011). Learning motivational interviewing in a real□life setting: A randomised controlled trial in the Swedish Prison Service. Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health, 21(3), 177-188.

Gleicher, L., Manchak, S. M., & Cullen, F. T. (2013). Creating a supervision tool kit: How to improve probation and parole. Federal Probation, 77(1), 22. Administrative Office of the United States Courts.

Grattet, R., Nguyen, V., Bird, M., & Goss, J. (2018). Probation's Changing Role In California:: Challenges and opportunities for hybrid supervision. Federal Probation, 82(1), 20-25, 60. Retrieved from http://ezproxy.msu.edu/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.proxy1.cl.msu.edu/docview/2113734068?accountid=12598

Grimolizzi-Jensen, C. J. (2018). Organizational change: Effect of motivational interviewing on readiness to change. Journal of Change Management, 18(1), 54–69. https://doi.org/10.1080/14697017.2017.1349162

Gunnison, E., & Helfgott, J.B. (2013). Offender re-entry: Beyond crime & punishment. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

Hettema, J., Steele, J., & Miller, W. R. (2005). Motivational Interviewing. Annual Review of Clinical Psychology, 1, 91-111.

Iarussi, M. M., & Powers, D. F. (2018). Outcomes of motivational interviewing training with probation and parole officers: Findings and lessons learned. Federal Probation, 82(3), 28-35,44. Retrieved from http://ezproxy.msu.edu/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.proxy2.cl.msu.edu/docview/2228575960?accountid=12598

Kennealy, P. J., Skeem, J. L., Manchak, S. M., & Eno Louden, J. (2012). Firm, Fair, And Caring Officer-Offender Relationships Protect Against Supervision Failure. Law and Human Behavior, 36(6), 496-505. doi:http://dx.doi.org.proxy2.cl.msu.edu/10.1037/h0093935

Klockars, C. (1972). A theory of probation supervision. The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science. 63(4), 550-557. https://doi.org/10.2307/1141809

Lester, M. E., Batastini, A. B., Davis, R., & Bourgon, G. (2020). Is risk-need-responsivity enough? Examining differences in treatment response among male incarcerated persons. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 47(7), 829–847. https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854820915740

Lovins, B. K., Cullen, F. T., Latessa, E. J., & Jonson, C. L. (2018). Probation officer as a Coach: Building a new professional identity. Federal Probation, 82(1), 13-19,60. Retrieved from http://ezproxy.msu.edu/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.proxy1.cl.msu.edu/docview/2113734196?accountid=12598

Mayer, R.E. (Ed.). (2005). The Cambridge handbook of multimedia learning. New York: Cambridge University Press.

McCambridge, J., Strang, J., (2004). The efficacy of single-session motivational interviewing in reducing drug consumption and perceptions of drug-related risk and harm among young people: Results from a multi—site cluster randomized trial." Addiction, 99, 39-52.

McMurran, M. (2002). Motivating offenders to change: A guide to enhancing engagement in therapy. West Sussex, England: Wiley.

McMurran, M. (2009). Motivational interviewing with offenders: A systematic review. Legal and Criminological Psychology, 14(1), 83-100.

Miller, W. R. (1983). Motivational interviewing with problem drinkers. Behavioural Psychotherapy, 11, 147-172.

Miller, W. R. (2018) Conference Plenary – Motivational Interviewing: A metamorphosis. Symposium conducted at the 2018 International meeting of the Motivational Interviewing Network of Trainers - MINT Forum. New Orleans, Louisiana, USA.

Miller, W. R., & Rollnick, S. (1991). Motivational interviewing: Preparing people to change addictive behavior. New York: Guilford Press.

Miller, W. R., & Rollnick, S. (2002). Motivational interviewing: Preparing people for change (2nd ed.). New York: Guilford Press.

Miller, W. R., & Rollnick, S. (2013). Motivational interviewing: Helping people change (3rd ed.). New York: Guilford Press.

Miller, W. R., Moyers, T.B. and Rollnick, S. (2013). Motivational Interviewing: Helping People Change. [DVD]. Available from http//www.changecompanies.net/products/motivatioanal-intervieiwng-video/

Moore, M., Flamez, B., Szirony, G. M. (2018). "Motivational interviewing and Dual Diagnosis Clients: Enhancing self-efficacy and treatment completion." Journal of Substance Use, 232:3. 247–253.

NREPP. Motivational Interviewing. Intervention summary retrieved on April 15, 2013, from the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration's National Registry of Evidence-based Programs and Practices, http://www.nrepp.samhsa.gov/ViewIntervention.aspx?id=130

O'Mara, S. (2018). The Captive Brain: Torture and the Neuroscience of Humane Interrogation, QJM: An International Journal of Medicine, 111(2). 73–78, https://doi.org/10.1093/qjmed/hcx252

Orlinsky, D. E., Ronnestad, M. H., & Willutzki, U. (2004). Fifty years of psychotherapy process-outcome research: Continuity and change. In Bergin and Garfield's handbook of psychotherapy and behavior change, 5, 307-389.

Paparozzi, M. A., & Guy, R. (2018). Everything that is old is new again—old again—new again . . . Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice, 34(1), 5–12. https://doi.org/10.1177/1043986217752160

Polaschek, D. L. (2011). "Many sizes fit all: A preliminary framework for conceptualizing the development and provision of cognitive–behavioral rehabilitation programs for offenders." Aggression and Violent Behavior, 16(1), Pages 20-35. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2010.10.002.

Polsachek, D. L. (2016). Do Relationships Matter? Examining the Quality of Probation Officers' Interactions With Parolees In Preventing Recidivism. The New Zealand Corrections Journal. 4(1). 1-12.

Prochaska, J.O., DiClemente, C.C., & Norcross, J.C. (1992). In search of how people change: Applications to addictive behaviors. American Psychologist, 47(9), 1102-1114.

Skeem, J. L., Manchak, S. (2008). Back to the Future: From Klockars' model of effective supervision to evidence-based practice in probation. Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 47(3), 220-247. https://doi.org/10.1080/10509670802134069

Skeem, J. L., Louden, J. E., Polaschek, D., & Camp, J. (2007). Assessing Relationship Quality In Mandated

Community Treatment: Blending care with control. Psychological Assessment, 19(4), 397-410. doi:http://dx.doi.org.proxy2.cl.msu.edu/10.1037/1040-3590.19.4.397

Robinson, C.R., Vanbenschoten, S., Alexander, M. & Lowenkamp, C.T. (2011). A random (almost) study of staff training aimed at reducing re-arrest (STARR): Reducing recidivism through intentional design. Federal Probation, 75, 57-63. Administrative Office of the United States Courts.

Stinson, J., Clark, M.D. (2017). Motivational Interviewing with Offenders: Engagement, rehabilitation, and reentry. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Surmon-Böhr, F., Alison, L., Christiansen, P., & Alison, E. (2020). The Right to Silence and the Permission to Talk: Motivational interviewing and high-value detainees. American Psychologist, https://doi:org/dx.doi.org.proxy1.cl.msu.edu/10.1037/amp0000588

Taylor, L. R. (2016). General responsivity adherence in juvenile drug treatment court: Examining the impact on substance-use outcome. Journal of Drug Issues, 46(1), 24-40. doi:http://dx.doi.org.proxy2.cl.msu.edu/10.1177/0022042615610618.

University of Cincinnati Corrections Institute. (n.d.). The EPICS model. Retrieved from http://www.uc.edu.

Viglione, J. (2017). Street-Level Decision Making: Acceptability, feasibility, and use of evidence-based practices in adult probation. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 44(10), 1356–1381. https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854817718583

Viglione, J. Rudes, D.S. & Taxman, F.S (2017) Probation Officer use of client-centered communication strategies in adult probation settings. Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 56:1, 38-60. http://doi.org/10.1080/10509674.2016.1257534

Walters, S. T., Clark, M. D., Gingerich, R., & Meltzer, M. L. (2007). Motivating offenders to change: A guide for probation and parole. Washington DC: National Institute of Corrections, U.S. Dept. of Justice.

Ward, T. & Maruna, S. (2007). Rehabilitation: Beyond the risk paradigm. New York: Routledge.

Willis, G. M., Ward, T. (2013). The good lives model: Does it work? preliminary evidence. In L.A. Craig, L. Dixon and T. Gannon (Eds.), What Works in Offender Rehabilitation: An Evidence-Based Approach to Assessment and Treatment. (pp. 305-317). Somerset: Wiley.

Zalmanowitz, S. J., Babins-Wagner, R., Rodger, S., Corbett, B. A., & Leschied, A. (2013). The Association of Readiness to Change and Motivational Interviewing with Treatment Outcomes in Males involved in Domestic Violence Group Therapy. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 28(5), 956–974. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260512459381

About the Author

Michael D. Clark, MSW has served as a probation officer and Magistrate in Lansing, Michigan (USA) and is currently the Director for the Center for Strength-Based Strategies, a training and technical assistance group. Mr. Clark is a member of the Motivational Interviewing Network of Trainers (MINT) and is the co-author of the book, Motivational Interviewing with Offenders: Engagement, Rehabilitation, and Re-entry published by Guilford Press (2017). Michael has also served as a contractual consultant for the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crimes (UNODC) in Vienna, Austria. Author contact: 872 Eaton Drive, Mason, Michigan 48854 (USA). Email: mike.clark.mi@gmail.com

ISSN 2517-9233