Scoring the Stages of Recovery Instrument (STORI)

Structure of the STORI

The STORI consists of 50 items, presented in 10 groups of five. Each group represents one of the four process components of recovery (see Andresen et al, 2003):
- Hope
- Identity
- Meaning
- Responsibility

There is more than one group for each process - either 2 or 3 groups depending on the process.

Individual items within each group represent the stage of recovery.

The 1st item in each group represents a process (e.g. ‘Hope’) at Stage 1 (Moratorium),
The 2nd item represents this process at ………………………………Stage 2 (Awareness)
The 3rd item represents this process at ………………………………Stage 3 (Preparation),
The 4th item represents this process at ………………………………Stage 4 (Rebuilding)
The 5th item represents this process at ………………………………Stage 5 (Growth) etc.

Scoring

Totalling the first items of all the groups, gives a Stage 1 subscale score; the second items in the groups total a Stage 2 subscale score, etc. That is:

- Items 1, 6, 11, through to item 46 = Stage 1 subscale
- Items 2, 7, 12, ……………item 47 = Stage 2 subscale
- Items 3, 8, 13,…………..item 48 = Stage 3 subscale
- Items 4, 9, 14,…………..item 49 = Stage 2 subscale
- Items 5, 10, 15,…………..item 50 = Stage 5 subscale

In our research, we took the Stage with the highest total to be the person’s stage of recovery. Where the highest score was equal for two stages, we took the “highest” stage.

Note:
There is no “Total” score. The way the items are constructed does not allow for a “Total” by summing all the items from the different stages.

Similarly, the process components are not scored individually (i.e. there is no total “Hope” score).

Nor is there a “Stage” score for individual process components (i.e. no “Stage 1 Hope”), as there are insufficient items in each cell to give a reliable total.

Alternative Interpretation Method

To render the STORI more sensitive to change, it may be possible to look at change in individual Stage subscale scores, rather than simply movement from one Stage to another. For example, an individual may improve on “Stage 4” scores, but their highest score may not yet have moved to “Stage 5”.

This method has not been used by the researchers, but we think it would be a more sensitive measure of change and a fruitful line of enquiry.