**Motivational Interviewing In Supervision & Coaching**

**Lesson 3: Giving MI Adherent Verbal Feedback**

**Topic: Practice Giving MI Adherent Verbal & Written Feedback**

This week we are going to build on last week’s lesson on giving feedback in MI adherent ways. You will work with a partner IN THIS GROUP to have a brief MI feedback conversation.

Let’s start with a reminder; a main goal in giving feedback is to develop confidence. As we know from our MI training and practice, if someone doesn’t feel confident in their abilities, they will likely not try new things. This applies to learning new skills as well! As you go through the process outlined below, keep this in mind. We are not looking to find the areas where a conversation is NOT good. We are looking for areas where the person did well, so that we can build on those strengths. We will help people think about how to grow, but our language about this needs to build confidence, not break people down. So we are looking for areas of strength and growth! We also know that concrete examples are most helpful. So when you are making a suggestion about how someone might try something different, make sure to give a concrete example of how that might be done. Give an exact “quote” of a reflection or open question that might be used AND what effect that skill may have on the conversation. Explaining Why is just as important as explaining How! Ok, let’s get started!

1. Read through all instructions before you begin! Then you can go back to move through them step by step. If something doesn’t make sense, feel free to email us at the addresses at the end of the instructions.
2. To start, find someone in the group to work with. You will record this conversation for coding. You can do this verbally using a call recording app or a video conference app like Zoom or Google Hangouts.
3. You will have two conversations with your partner; one where you are the speaker and one where you are the listener giving MI feedback.
4. When you are the **speaker**: You will review the session that you coded last week with your listener. You will talk about your MI work on that conversation.
5. When you are the **listener**: you will practice following the five steps to giving MI feedback that we learned this week.
   1. Ask for permission to give feedback
   2. Ask them what they thought they did well
      1. Reflect
   3. Tell them 1 or 2 things you thought they did well (think 8 Stages)
   4. Ask them if they could do it again, what would they do differently?
      1. Reflect
   5. Ask them what they think they will do next?
      1. Reflect
6. One goal in this conversation is to help the speaker find the one next thing they will work on. This should come from them, though you will use your MI skills to guide them to a concrete task to work on that is aligned with the 8 stages of learning MI.
7. Once the conversation is complete (try for at least 8 minutes), you will code the conversation into the MITI 4 just as you did last month. This time coding yourself as the interviewer/MI Coach.
8. You will listen to the conversation at least twice.
   1. The first time you will listen to the skills the interviewer (you!) is using and code those. In the MITI form, these are the behavior counts:
      1. Giving Information (GI) – This is when the Interviewer gives factual information about the topic WITH PERMISSION.
      2. Persuade (P) – this is when the interviewer attempts to persuade the speaker by, giving information without permission, using logic to ‘convince’ the speaker to change, etc.
      3. Persuade with Permission (PwP) – this is when the interviewer does any of the above but first asks for permission.
      4. Question (Q) – any question including Open, Closed and sneaky questions ex) “tell me about…” or “I’m wondering if…”
      5. Simple Reflection (SR) – Restates what the speaker said (usually using different words), but DOES NOT add any guesses about what the person might mean by what they said.
      6. Complex Reflection (CR) – Any reflection that goes beyond the spoken words, such as taking guesses at what some one means, putting two spoken ideas together to compare, feelings reflections etc. The thing to think about here is ‘did the interviewer ADD anything that was not in the speaker’s original statement.
      7. Affirm (Af) – These are statements that directly highlight the speaker’s strengths, resources or positive steps. They will often begin with “you.” Be careful here not to include positive judgments!
      8. Seeking Collaboration (Sk) – any statements that are directly asking for partnership, ex) asking for permission, asking the speaker what they want to do/talk about etc.
      9. Emphasizing Autonomy (EA) – these are statements that directly tell the speaker that they are in charge, that they get to make the decision, that the decision is theirs.
      10. Confront (Co) – These are statements that push back against what the speaker has said, calling into question the person’s thinking, beliefs, world view.
   2. Listen to your conversation and tally each statement the interviewer (you) makes, classifying them as one of the above behaviors.
   3. Once you have finished tallying all behaviors (skills) used, add up the total count of each type and put that number in the form below. Find the A. on the chart to indicate where you will record your behavior count totals.
   4. Next you will start the summary scores. Look for the Letter B. in the chart below.
      1. Ignore the 2 global scores right now.
      2. Middle left = Total MIA (Af + Sk + EA). This is the Total MI Adherent behaviors. That is, add up the numbers you have in the boxes for Affirmations + Seeking Collaboration + Emphasizing Autonomy = MIA. Put the total in the box.
      3. Middle Right = Total MIN (C0 + P). This is the Total MI Non-adherent behaviors. That is, add up the numbers you have in the boxes for Confront + Persuade = MIN. Put this total in the box.
      4. Lower Left = R to Q Ratio. This is the ratio of reflections to questions. Here you want to present this ration in this format 2:1 where there are 2 reflections to each question. So in your chart you have 12 reflections and 10 questions you ratio would be 12:10 (or 3:2.5 reduced). If you have 6 reflections and 12 questions it would be 6:12 (or 3:2 reduced).
         1. Calculate your ratio and put it in the box.
      5. Lower Right = Complex R %. This is your percentage of Complex reflections compares to Simple reflections. So, if you had 10 Simple reflections and 6 complex reflections you would divide the # of complex by the total # of reflections (in this case 16). That would be 6/16=.375 which would be 37.5% complex. This is the number you would put in the box.
         1. If you had SR = 10 and CR = 14 for a total of 24 reflections, you would divide 14/24 = .583 or 58% complex reflections.
   5. Under C. you will find the Global Ratings. Here you will give and overall score for:
      1. Global Scores
         1. Cultivating Change Talk
         2. Softening Sustain Talk
         3. Partnership
         4. Empathy
      2. These are 1-5 scores based on the explanations listed at the end of this document. Read through what each score means and examples of what a particular number indicates.
      3. Now listen to your recording again with these things in mind.
      4. Once finished, give scores of 1-5 for each of the 4 global scores.
      5. Keep a few things in mind here:
         1. This is not clear cut. There is some subjective evaluation involved.
         2. **We always err on the side of building confidence**, so if your score is, say, between a 3 and a 4, we would go up to the 4.
         3. Only whole numbers. No fractions.
      6. Now you can go back to B. and complete the summary scores.
         1. Top Left = Technical Global. That is the total of the Change Talk and Sustain Talk scores added together and divided by 2.
            1. For example- if CT = 3 + ST = 2 total = 5 divided by 2. Your Technical Global would be 2.5.
         2. Top Right = Relational Global. That is the total of the Partnership and Empathy scores added together and divided by 2.
            1. For example – if P = 4 and E= 5 total = 9 divided by 2. Your Relational Global would be 4.5.
         3. Now you will develop a written narrative to give feedback. Remember this is the place to build confidence! So think about strength based language. Your Narrative need not be long, but should include
            1. Two strengths the listener exhibited with examples. Be as concrete as possible.

Think about the following ‘equation,’ “when the speaker said \_\_\_, you used the \_\_\_\_ skill to respond, The effect it had on the conversation was \_\_\_\_. One way you might build on this strength in the future might be to \_\_\_”

* + - * 1. One area for growth.

This is the most important area to consider confidence building language. Consider things like “next step in your learning” or “an area to build,” etc.

It is even more important to be concrete here.

“when the speaker said \_\_\_, you used \_\_\_\_ skill to respond. The effect this had on the conversation was \_\_\_\_. “

This should be followed up an example of how they might try something else next time AND the effect that new skill might have on the conversation.

Be sure to include a quote, not just say “use a complex reflection,” and indicate how that specific reflection (or other skill) might change the course of the conversation.

1. Now breathe. You did it!
2. Underneath your narrative, take a moment to write a couple of sentences about what you may have learned through this process.
3. Then save the complete document and upload it to the Send Me page online. If you have trouble with that you can also send to Debbie and Angela at the addresses below.
   1. [Debbie@DeborahJRice.com](mailto:Debbie@DeborahJRice.com)
   2. [Angela.Cooper@InsightOnDemand.com](mailto:Angela.Cooper@InsightOnDemand.com)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Motivational Interviewing** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **MITI 4.2.1 Summary Sheet** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Worker/Interviewer |  | | Recording #: | | | 1 | Coder: |  | | Date: |  | |
| **Global Ratings C.** | | Low High 1 2 3 4 5 | | Target Change: | | | | | | | | |
| **Technical Components** | | | |  | | | | | | | | |
| Cultivating Change Talk | |  | |
| Softening Sustain Talk | |  | | **B**. Summary Scores | | | | | | | | |
| **Relational Components** | | | | Technical Global  (CCT + SST)/2 | | | |  | Relational Global  (P + E)/2 | | |  |
| Partnership | |  | | Total MIA (Af + Sk + EA) | | | |  | Total MIN (C0 + P) | | |  |
| Empathy | |  | | R to Q Ratio | | | |  | Complex R % | | |  |
| 1. Behavior  Counts | | | | **N** | **Examples** | | | | | | | |
| Giving Information (GI) | | | |  |  | | | | | | | |
| Persuade (P) | | | |  |  | | | | | | | |
| Persuade with Permission (PwP) | | | |  |  | | | | | | | |
| Question (Q) | | | |  |  | | | | | | | |
| Simple Reflection (SR) | | | |  |  | | | | | | | |
| Complex Reflection (CR) | | | |  |  | | | | | | | |
| Affirm (Af) | | | |  |  | | | | | | | |
| Seeking Collaboration (Sk) | | | |  |  | | | | | | | |
| Emphasizing Autonomy (EA) | | | |  |  | | | | | | | |
| Confront (Co) | | | |  |  | | | | | | | |

Narrative:

**MITI 4.2.2 Behavior Code Glossary.**

**Giving Information (GI).** This category is used when the interviewer gives information, educates, provides feedback, or expresses a professional opinion without persuading, advising, or warning.

**Persuade (P).** The clinician makes overt attempts to change the client’s opinions, attitudes, or behavior using tools such as logic, compelling arguments, self-disclosure, or facts (and the explicit linking of these tools with an overt message to change). Persuasion is also coded if the clinician gives biased information, advice, suggestions, tips, opinions, or solutions to problems *without* an explicit statement or strong contextual cue emphasizing the client’s autonomy in receiving the recommendation.

**Persuade with Permission (PwP).** Persuade with Permission is assigned when the interviewer includes an emphasis on collaboration or autonomy support while persuading.

**Question (Q).** All questions from clinicians (open, closed, evocative, fact-finding, etc.) receive the Question code.

**Reflection Simple (SR).** Simple reflections typically convey understanding or facilitate client–clinician exchanges. These reflections add little or no meaning (or emphasis) to what clients have said. Simple reflections may mark very important or intense client emotions, but do not go far beyond the client’s original statement.

**Reflection Complex (CR).** Complex reflections typically add substantial meaning or emphasis to what the client has said. These reflections serve the purpose of conveying a deeper or more complex picture of what the client has said. Sometimes the clinician may choose to emphasize a particular part of what the client has said to make a point or take the conversation in a different direction. Clinicians may add subtle or very obvious content to the client’s words, or they may combine statements from the client to form summaries that are directional in nature.

**Affirm (AF).** An affirmation (AF) is a clinician utterance that accentuates something positive about the client. To be considered an Affirm, the utterance must be about client’s strengths, efforts, intentions, or worth. The utterance must be given in a genuine manner and reflect something genuine about the client.

**Seeking Collaboration (Seek).** This code is assigned when a clinician explicitly attempts to share power or acknowledge the expertise of the client. It can occur when the clinician genuinely seeks consensus with the client regarding tasks, goals or directions of the session. Seeking collaboration may be assigned when the clinician asks what the client thinks about information provided. When permission to give information or advice is sought, Seeking Collaboration is typically assigned.

**Emphasizing Autonomy (Emphasize).** These are utterances that clearly focus the responsibility with the client for decisions about and actions pertaining to change. They highlight clients’ sense of control, freedom of choice, personal autonomy, or ability or obligation to decide about their attitudes and actions.

**Confront (Confront).** This code is used when the clinician confronts the client by directly and unambiguously disagreeing, arguing, correcting, shaming, blaming, criticizing, labeling, warning, moralizing, ridiculing, or questioning the client’s honesty. Such interactions will have the quality of uneven power sharing, accompanied by disapproval or negativity. Included here are instances where the interviewer uses a question or even a reflection, but the voice tone clearly indicates a confrontation.

**Explanation of Global Ratings**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Technical Global Ratings** | |
| ***Cultivating Change Talk***  “the extent to which the [helper] actively encourages the [person]’s own language in favor of the change goal, and confidence for making that change… the change goal must be obvious in the session and the conversation must be largely focused on change, with the [helper] actively cultivating change talk when possible.” | 1. Helper shows no explicit attention to, or preference for, the person’s language in favor of changing.  2. Helper sporadically attends to language in favor of change – frequently misses opportunities to encourage change talk  3. Helper often attends to the [person]’s language in favor of change, but misses some opportunities to encourage change talk  4. Helper consistently attends to the [person]’s language about change and makes efforts to encourage it.  5. Helper shows a marked and consistent effort to increase the depth, strength, or momentum of the person’s language in favor of change. |
| ***Softening Sustain Talk***  “…the extent that the clinician avoids a focus on the reasons against changing or for maintaining the status quo… [helpers] should avoid lingering in discussions concerning the difficulty or undesirability of change.” | 1. Helper consistently responds to the [person’s] language in a manner that facilitates the frequency or depth of arguments in favor of the status quo.  2. Helper usually chooses to explore, focus on, or respond to the [person’s] language in favor of the status quo.  3. Helper gives preference to the [person’s] language in favor of the status quo, but may show some instances of shifting the focus away from sustain talk.  4. Helper typically avoids an emphasis on [person’s] language favoring the status quo.  5. Helper shows a marked and consistent effort to decrease the depth, strength, or momentum of the [person’s] language in favor of the status quo. |
| **Relational Global Ratings** | |
| **Partnership**  “…the extent to which the [helper] conveys an understanding that expertise and wisdom about change reside mostly within the [person]...[Helpers] high on this scale behave as if the interview is occurring between two equal partners, both of whom have knowledge that might be useful in solving the change under consideration.” | 1. Helper actively assumes the expert role for the majority of the interaction with the person. Collaboration or partnership is absent.  2. Helper superficially responds to opportunities to collaborate.  3. Helper incorporates the person’s goals, ideas and values but does so in a lukewarm or erratic fashion.  4. Helper fosters collaboration and power sharing so that the person’s contributions impact the session in ways that they otherwise would not.  5. Helper actively fosters and encourages power sharing in the interaction in such a way that the person’s contributions substantially influence the nature of the session. |
| **Empathy**  “…the extent to which the [helper] understands or makes an effort to grasp the [person’s] perspective and experience (i.e., how much the [helper] attempts to ‘try on’ what the [person] feels or thinks.” | 1. Helper gives little or no attention to the person’s perspective.  2. Helper makes sporadic efforts to explore the person’s perspective. Helper’s understanding may be inaccurate or may detract from the person’s true meaning.  3. Helper is actively trying to understand the person’s perspective, with modest success.  4. Helper makes active and repeated efforts to understand the client’s point of view. Shows evidence of accurate understanding of the client’s worldview, although mostly limited to explicit content.  5. Helper shows evidence of deep understanding of the person’s point of view, not just for what has been explicitly stated but what the person means but has not yet said. |

Adapted from MITI 4.2.1, as developed by Moyers, Ernst, & Manuel