



---

# Annotated Bibliography



## Thinking for a Change and Cognitive-Behavioral Programs

---

# Thinking for a Change and Cognitive-Behavioral Programs Annotated Bibliography

Prepared by the NIC Information Center  
December 2011  
Accession No. 025533

An electronic copy of this document can be found at: [www.nicic.gov/Library/025533](http://www.nicic.gov/Library/025533)

## Contents

Introduction.....	2
Thinking for a Change.....	3
Cognitive Behavioral Programs (some include T4C).....	5

---

## Introduction

This brief bibliography contains research supporting *Thinking for a Change* as well as CBT programs for offenders generally. Some of these resources are available through the NIC Information Center: (800) 877-1461, the online Help Desk at <http://nicic.gov/helpdesk>.

The *Thinking for a Change: An Integrated Approach to Changing Offender Behavior* (T4C) curriculum, developed by Barry Glick, Jack Bush, and Juliana Taymans in cooperation with NIC, “uses a combination of approaches to increase offenders’ awareness of themselves and others. It integrates cognitive restructuring, social skills, and problem solving. The program begins by teaching offenders an introspective process for examining their ways of thinking and their feelings, beliefs, and attitudes. The process is reinforced throughout the program. Social-skills training is provided as an alternative to antisocial behaviors. The program culminates by integrating the skills offenders have learned into steps for problem solving. Problem solving becomes the central approach offenders learn that enables them to work through difficult situations without engaging in criminal behavior” (Milkman & Wanberg, 2007).

---

## Thinking for a Change

Center for Evidence-Based Practice. *Effectiveness of Community Corrections in the State of Indiana*. CEBP/University of Indiana: Bloomington, 2011.

“The purpose of this study was to determine who is served by Indiana Community Corrections, and to evaluate the effectiveness of the community corrections program, and its components and services” (p. 37). Results are organized according to who is served in Indiana community corrections, what the effectiveness of community corrections is, what the effectiveness of the required components of community corrections is, what the effectiveness of services is, what combinations of components do offenders participate in, and what the outcomes of those combinations are. The National Institute of Corrections offender training program “Thinking for a Change” is the most common service provided while also having the highest completion rate of 60%.

<http://cebp.indiana.edu/Portals/461/CEBP%20long%20report%5B1%5D.pdf>

Golden, Lori Suzanne, Robert J. Gatcheland, and Melissa Ann Cahill. “Evaluating the Effectiveness of the National Institute of Corrections' "Thinking for a Change" Program among Probationers.” *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation* 43, no.2 (2006): 55-73.

This study evaluates the effectiveness of Thinking for a Change, a cognitive-behavioral program for adult offenders. Results are given according to recidivism for new offenses, recidivism for technical violations, predictors of technical violations, jail time and revocations, Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (MC-SDS), Social Problem Solving Inventory-Revised (SPSI-R), and the Interpersonal Problem Solving Skills Assessment (IPSSA). While Thinking for a Change reduces the recidivism of participants who completed the program by 33%, it also “significantly improves problem-solving skills ... and provides at least a modest encouragement that those acquired skills may then help curb criminal activity” (p. 70).

Golden, Lori. *Evaluation of the Efficacy of a Cognitive Behavioral Program for Offenders on Probation: Thinking for a Change*. 2002.

The effectiveness of "Thinking for a Change" -- a cognitive behavioral program for adult probationers -- is investigated. Following an abstract, this dissertation contains these chapters: introduction; literature review; study purpose and major aims; method; results; and discussion. While "results for changes and improvements in criminal sentiments found in the present study [are] disappointing and counter to expectation," there are significant positive changes in social skills and social problem-solving (p. 90). More importantly, new criminal offense rates for group completers dropped 33%.

<http://www.nicic.gov/library/018190>

Lowenkamp, Christopher T., Dana Hubbard, Matthew D. Makarios, and Edward J. Latessa. "A Quasi-Experimental Evaluation of Thinking for a Change: A 'Real-World' Application." *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 36, no. 2 (2009): 137-146.

Due to the popularity of cognitive behavioral interventions, programs that follow this model are often assumed to be effective. Yet evaluations of specific programs have been slow in coming. The current investigation seeks to bridge this gap by evaluating the effectiveness of Thinking for a Change, a widely used cognitive behavioral curriculum for offenders. Furthermore, this evaluation provides a "real-world" test of T4C, because it was implemented by line staff in a community corrections agency as opposed to being a pilot project implemented by program developers. The results of the analyses indicate that offenders participating in the TFAC program had a significantly lower recidivism rate than similar offenders that were not exposed to the program. In this study, the authors compared the recidivism rates of 121 offenders on probation that received T4C to 97 offenders on probation supervision that did **not** receive T4C. Offenders participating in T4C and those not participating in T4C were drawn from a similar time period and from the same jurisdiction. The follow-up time period ranged from 6 to 64 months with the average follow up being 26 months. Other measures included a risk score (summed score of prior arrests, prior prison, prior community supervision violations, history of drug use, history of alcohol problems, highest grade completed, employment status at arrest), age, sex, and race. The outcome measure was new arrest for any new criminal behavior during the follow up period.

Two statistical models were used. The first compared all the T4C participants to the non-participants. The second model compared only those offenders that successfully completed T4C to those offenders that did not participate in T4C. The findings of these models revealed significant and substantive differences in the likelihood of arrest between the groups of offenders. The 121 offenders that received some exposure to the T4C program but didn't necessarily successfully complete T4C had an adjusted recidivism rate of 23%. Those offenders that successfully completed T4C (n = 90) had an adjusted recidivism rate of 18%. Finally, those offenders that did not participate in T4C programming (n = 97) had an adjusted recidivism rate of 35%. These differences are net the effects of other control variables such as race, age, sex, and risk level. [JOURNAL ABSTRACT]

---

## Cognitive Behavioral Programs (some include T4C)

Aos, Steve, Marna Miller, and Elizabeth Drake. *Evidence-based Adult Corrections Programs: What Works and What Does Not*. Olympia: Washington State Institute for Public Policy, 2006.

A systematic review of evidence-based programs for adult offenders, looking at 291 evaluations previously conducted in the U.S. and other English-speaking countries. Regarding Cognitive-behavioral Treatment, the researchers found “25 rigorous evaluations of program for the general offender population that employ CBT.... On average, we found these programs significantly reduce recidivism by 8.2 percent. We identified three well-defined programs that provide manuals and staff training regimens: *Reasoning and Rehabilitation (R&R)*, *Moral Reconciliation Therapy (MRT)*, and *Thinking for a Change (T4C)*.” The results of this study also indicate reductions in recidivism of low-risk sex offenders on probation, as well sex offenders in prison. <http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/rptfiles/06-01-1201.pdf>

Clark, Patrick M. “Cognitive Behavioral Therapy: An Evidence-based Intervention for Offenders.” *Corrections Today* 73, no. 1 (2011): 62-64.

This short article is a revision of “*Preventing Future Crime with Cognitive Behavioral Therapy*,” originally published in the National Institute of Justice Journal (Issue No. 265) and explains the CBT has been found to be effective with juvenile and adult offenders (low- and high-risk), sex offenders, and in a variety of correctional settings in the community and in institutions.

Gehring, Krista S., Patricia Van Voorhis, and Valerie R. Bell. “What Works for Female Probationers? An Evaluation of the Moving On Program.” *Women, Girls, and Criminal Justice* 11, no. 1 (2010): 1,6-10.

The effectiveness of the Moving On program is evaluated. Moving On is a gender-responsive, cognitive behavioral program for women probationers. Sections of this report include: program description; data and study design; sample; outcome measures; results for rearrests, convictions, incarcerations, and technical violations; effects of program completion on rearrests, convictions, incarcerations, and technical violations; and implications of the findings. “The findings from this study indicate the Moving On program would be a good fit for agencies looking for an evidence based gender-responsive program (p. 12). <http://www.uc.edu/content/dam/uc/womenoffenders/docs/MOVING%20ON.pdf>

Glick, Barry. *Cognitive Behavioral Interventions for At-Risk Youth*. Kingston, NJ: Civic Research Institute, 2006.

The foundations, program development and implementation, program models, and research and evaluation regarding successful cognitive behavioral interventions are explained. Chapters contained in this volume are: “History and Development of Cognitive Behavioral Interventions” by Barry Glick; “Cognitive Restructuring Interventions—Basic Models and Techniques” by Glick; “Cognitive Skills Interventions” by Glick; “Implementation and Management Issues” by Glick; “Developing Model Cognitive Intervention Programs for At-Risk Youth --The Boys & Girls Club of America Approach” by Carter Julian Savage; “The

Cognitive Self Change Program” by Jack Bush; “Rites of Passage—A Practical Guide for Program Implementation” by Gloria Rosaline Preudhomme and Leonard G. Dunston; “Interpersonal Problem-Solving Skills -- A Step-by-Step Process to Enhance Prosocial Information Processing” by Juliana M. Taymans; “Project Learn” by Savage; “ART: A Comprehensive Intervention for Aggressive Youth” by Glick; “The Thinking for a Change Intervention” by Glick; “Youth Alternatives -- A Multimodal Community-Based System Intervention in Sweden” by Mikael Kalt; “Effectiveness of Cognitive-Behavioral Interventions for Youthful Offenders—Review of the Research” by Edward J. Latessa; “Comprehensive Evaluation of Cognitive Behavioral Programs in Corrections—Guidelines and Approaches” by Patricia Van Voorhis; and “Technology Transfer—A Case Study in Implementing the Principles of Effective Cognitive Behavioral Interventions for At-Risk Juveniles” by Jennifer Pealer and Latessa. Also included is “Cognitive Behavioral Programs—A Resource Guide to Existing Services” by Marilyn Van Dieten (prepared for the National Institute of Corrections). <http://www.civicresearchinstitute.com/cby.html>

Landenberger, Nana A. and Mark W. Lipsey. “The Positive Effects of Cognitive-Behavioral Programs for Offenders: A Meta-Analysis of Factors Associated with Effective Treatment.” *Journal of Experimental Criminology* 1 (2005): 451-476.

A meta-analysis of 58 experimental and quasi-experimental studies of the effects of cognitive-behavioral therapy (CBT) on the recidivism of adult and juvenile offenders confirmed prior positive findings and explored a range of potential moderators to identify factors associated with variation in treatment effects. With method variables controlled, the factors independently associated with larger recidivism reductions were treatment of higher risk offenders, high quality treatment implementation, and a CBT program that included anger control and interpersonal problem solving but not victim impact or behavior modification components. With these factors accounted for, there was no difference in the effectiveness of different brand name CBT programs or generic forms of CBT. [AUTHOR ABSTRACT] [http://restorativejustice.pbworks.com/f/Landenberger\\_Lipsey.pdf](http://restorativejustice.pbworks.com/f/Landenberger_Lipsey.pdf)

Latessa, Edward, Paula Smith, and Myrinda Schweitzer. *Evaluation of Selected Institutional Offender Treatment Programs for the Pennsylvania Department of Corrections: Final Report*. University of Cincinnati, 2009.

The University of Cincinnati’s Center for Criminal Justice Research conducted evaluation of five treatment programs in 24 institutions within the Pennsylvania Department of Corrections to identify strengths and areas for improvement. The programs—Thinking for a Change (T4C), Batterer’s Intervention, Violence Prevention, and two Sex Offender programs—were evaluated using the Correctional Program Checklist (CPC) and CPC-Group Assessment (CPC-GA) and examined the extent to which the programs adhered to the principles of effective intervention. Numerous components must be in place in order for evidence-based group interventions to maintain program integrity. Indicators of Program Integrity on the CPC-GA include: an individual dedicated to oversee and manage the group, and select and supervise group facilitators; facilitators must meet specific qualifications; formal training should be conducted regularly, along with formal meetings about the

program; ethical guidelines need to be honored; and support must exist from key stakeholders. CPC Indicators include having an engaged program coordinator with the necessary skills and experience to work with staff and offenders, and ground work must be done in advance, such as literature reviews and piloting of the program. Stable and adequate funding for the program helps to ensure effectiveness, along with involvement and input from the staff and ongoing clinical supervision and service delivery skills training/coaching.

Quality Assurance indicators require observation of the groups with feedback, along with satisfaction levels of the participants, pre/post-tests, and clear criteria for successful program completion. A discharge summary should be completed for each offender that has completed the treatment group. Assessment indicators require programs to apply rational exclusionary criteria for acceptance into the program. Participants should be assessed by agency personnel to identify risk level, areas of need (criminogenic and non-criminogenic), and responsivity considerations (e.g., participant may require assistance in writing a Thinking Report in T4C).

“The Thinking for a Change results in the area of treatment program integrity indicators were consistent with the overall results of the agency with two exceptions. The first is that Thinking for a Change is considered an evidence-based curriculum as it integrates key cognitive-behavioral techniques and the principles of social learning theories consistently throughout the manual. The second and related difference is that the... curriculum regularly integrates modeling and role-playing with corrective feedback into group sessions” (p. 38). [http://www.uc.edu/content/dam/uc/ccjr/docs/reports/project\\_reports/PA\\_Institutions\\_Final\\_Report.pdf](http://www.uc.edu/content/dam/uc/ccjr/docs/reports/project_reports/PA_Institutions_Final_Report.pdf)

Lipsey, Mark. W., Gabrielle L, Chapman, and Nana A. Landenberger. Cognitive behavioral programs for offenders. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 578: (2001): 144-157.

A systematic review using meta-analysis techniques was conducted with 14 studies selected to provide the best evidence on the effectiveness of cognitive-behavioral programs for reducing re-offense recidivism of criminal offenders. The results indicated that, overall, cognitive-behavioral programs are effective, and the best of them are capable of producing sizable reductions in recidivism. Many of the available studies, however, investigate research-oriented demonstration programs; the effectiveness found for routine practical program were notably smaller. Moreover, the research coverage of both juvenile and adult programs in institutional and non-institutional settings is uneven and leaves troublesome gaps in evidence. [JOURNAL ABSTRACT]

Milkman, Harvey and Kenneth Wanberg. *Cognitive-Behavioral Treatment: A Review and Discussion for Corrections Professionals*. Washington: National Institute of Corrections, 2007.

Detailed information regarding the use and benefits of cognitive-behavioral therapy (CBT) in prisons and jails is provided. Chapters comprising this address: the increasing need for effective treatment services; what cognitive-behavioral therapy is; prominent CBT programs for offenders; measuring the effectiveness of rehabilitation programs; evaluating



specific CBT curricula; and “real-world” program applications.  
<http://nicic.gov/Downloads/PDF/Library/021657.pdf>

Wilson, David B., Leana Allen Bouffard, and Doris L. Mackenzie. “A Quantitative Review of Structured, Group-oriented, Cognitive-Behavioral Programs for Offenders.” *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 32, no. 2 (2005): 172-204.

Prior reviews and meta-analyses have supported the hypothesis that offender rehabilitation programs based on cognitive-behavioral principles reduce recidivism. This article quantitatively synthesizes the extant empirical evidence on the effectiveness of structured cognitive-behavioral programs delivered to groups of offenders. The evidence summarized supports the claim that these treatments are effective at reducing criminal behavior among convicted offenders. All higher quality studies reported positive effects favoring the cognitive-behavioral treatment program. Specifically, positive reductions in recidivism were observed for moral reconnection therapy, reasoning and rehabilitation, and various cognitive-restructuring programs. The evidence suggests the effectiveness of cognitive skills and cognitive restructuring approaches as well as programs that emphasize moral teachings and reasoning. [JOURNAL ABSTRACT]

<http://www.moral-reconnection-therapy.com/Resources/ReviewOfCognitiveBeh.pdf>