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part I: what is MI? (a refresher)
“Motivational Interviewing is a collaborative conversation style for strengthening a person’s own motivation and commitment to change.”

(Miller & Rollnick, 2013)
“MI Spirit”

- **Acceptance**
  - accepting the person without judgment (without condoning their behavior)
  - avoiding confrontation

- **Compassion**
  - ≠ sympathy
  - advocating for the person
  - empathizing with the person

- **Evocation**
  - evoking change talk
  - eliciting the person’s reasons for change

- **Partnership**
  - collaborating
  - working as equals
  - remaining outside of the ‘expert’ role
part II: why MI?
MI is **2-3 times** as effective with ethnic minorities
the evidence (cont’d)

- large meta-analysis of 119 MI studies
- results:
  - 3/4’s of the sample (75%) demonstrated improvement
  - resulted in improvement across many change goals (treatment retention, reduced substance use, etc.)
  - MI took less time, but produced equivalent results to CBT, 12-Step, etc.
  - MI improved one’s intention to change
  - effects often maintained over time (up to two years after intervention)

(Lundahl, Kunz, Brownell, Tollefson, & Burke, 2010)
the evidence (cont’d)

• review of 13 peer-reviewed MI studies with offenders & 6 dissertations
  – 10 RCTs
• change goals: reducing substance abuse, DV, and/or recidivism
• results:
  – offenders improved their motivation/readiness to change in 8/10 studies that measured that variable
  – offenders reduced their substance use in 3/4 studies measuring that variable

(McMurran, 2009)
the evidence (cont’d)

- sample: male & female probationers, most with alcohol/drug-related charges
- compared officers using an MI style versus usual supervision style
- treatment group demonstrated significant improvements in attitudes around:
  - criminal thinking
  - anticipating rearrest/reincarceration
  - perceived personal/life problems
- significant reduction in alcohol/drug scores on problem inventory for MI group compared to control group

(Harper & Hardy, 2000)
“Is there reason to expect that offenders as a group would respond differently than other people to change interventions? One consideration is that, by virtue of being deprived of prior freedoms, a higher than usual level of reactance might be present and an oppositional response could be anticipated to confrontational approaches that further challenge autonomy.”

-Bill Miller
key MI factors

{ }

increased change talk
improved working relationship
change factors

- Person: 40%
- Relationship: 30%
- Placebo/hope: 15%
- Model/technique: 15%

(Asay & Lambert, 1999)
change factors (cont’d)

• large meta-analysis completed by Orlinsky, Grawe & Parks (1994)
• 1,000+ research findings
• 40 years of research
• predictors of a person’s success/change (in order of impact):
  1) their factors (e.g. hope, motivation)
  2) therapeutic alliance/working relationship
• key take-aways:
  – The person’s engagement will be vital during the change process (we want to involve them in it)
  – ensure the working alliance is established and retained
there is evidence that reflective listening alone is insufficient to produce change
change talk

anything the person says that indicates they’re moving \underline{toward} the behavior we want them to engage in...

examples:

+ I don’t want to use anymore.
+ I can’t go back to prison.
+ I need to get a job.
+ I could probably manage to take my meds for the next 2 weeks.
anything the person says that indicates they’re moving away from the change goal…

examples:

– This is so hard. Everyone expects too much out of me.
– I don’t know why I can’t do it.
– I haven’t succeeded at anything in the past.
– No one will hire me.
interviewer style predicts change talk

change talk is strongly correlated with change
reducing sustain talk

reducing sustain talk makes your job easier!

you can avoid **power struggles** and reduce **burnout** by reducing sustain talk
Reducing Recidivism Through Probation Supervision: What We Know and Don’t Know From Four Decades of Research

Chris Trotter
Monash University, Australia
“All of the studies that could be located which examined the practices of probation officers, whether through examining file notes or audiotapes of interviews or by direct observation, have found that when probation officers use evidence-based practice skills their clients have lower recidivism.”

Trotter - Federal Probation Journal, September 2013
“Six of the eight studies examined in this review show that clients supervised by workers with more skills have lower recidivism than clients supervised by workers with less developed skills. The differences were between 20 percent and 55 percent.”

Trotter - Federal Probation Journal, September 2013
A Quasi-Experimental Evaluation of a Model of Community Supervision

Ryan M. Labrecque
Portland State University
Paula Smith
University of Cincinnati
Jennifer D. Luther
Washington State Department of Corrections
“First, I think that many probation departments have spent a lot of money on MI training without understanding that it is designed to target a responsivity factor – not a criminogenic need.”

-Ed Latessa, University of Cincinnati
Labrecque, Smith, Luther (Fed Prob J 12-2015)

- 10 officers selected randomly
  - from a group trained for 3 days in CCP
  - Prior MI workshop
- 102 people on supervision from the 10 caseloads
  - 52% assessed HIGH Risk
  - 48% assessed MODERATE Risk
- Officers attended monthly boosters for 2 years
- Submitted recordings
  - CCP/CBT skill level assessed (5)
  - MI skill level assessed (MITI) (5)
- Re-arrest (excluded revocations) (avg about 1 year)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent Recidivism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low-CBT/Low-MI</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-CBT/High-MI</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-CBT/Low-MI</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-CBT/High-MI</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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part III: fidelity & measurement
average number of years for an innovation to be disseminated into practice?

17
the problem

{lack of measurement
lack of coaching/feedback
both}
MI coaching

Without feedback, it’s natural to think we’re doing a good job.

Studies show people rate their MI skills higher than they really are.

Practice and feedback provides the benefit of improving one’s skills.
AZ probation officer coding program

- initial full day coding training
- monthly individual assignments
- web-based monthly group coding (debriefing on assignments coded individually)
- individual coaching via email (and phone when necessary)
- inter-rater reliability checks against Center’s MINT members
- in-person booster session

(n=51)
MITI 4.2

• pronounced ‘mighty’

• developed by Terri Moyers & Bill Miller

• validated tool

• available at:
  http://casaa.unm.edu/download/miti4_2.pdf
The MITI:

- is a treatment integrity measure and a means to provide feedback
- gauges helper’s behavior, *not* the person being interviewed
- the tool measures:
  1. global scores (e.g. empathy)
  2. behavior counts (e.g. complex reflections)
global ratings

cultivating change
softening sustain talk
partnership empathy
behavior counts

Neutral codes:
- Giving Information
- Persuade w/Permission
- Question
- Simple Reflection
- Complex Reflection

MI adherent codes:
- Affirm
- Seeking Collaboration
- Emphasizing Autonomy

MI non-adherent codes:
- Persuade
- Confront
Probationer says: “My wife says she’s going to leave me if I go back to jail.”

PO says: “If you don’t make some changes you may lose your family.” (simple reflection)
**Probationer says:** “I’ve been out here a long time.”

**PO says:** “This has been a way of life for a long time, but you’re starting to think you don’t want this to be your legacy.” (complex reflection)
Inmate says: “I know I can’t get any more tickets, but he disrespected me.”

CO says: “Respect is something you really value, but you don’t want to get any more tickets and lose your visitation.” (double-sided reflection)
part IV: what have we found?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Assessment (Rubel, Rhode)</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Response Questionnaire (ORQ)</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1-5; 1=low, 5=high; 3=open question)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MITI Technical Rating (Change Talk)</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1-5; 1=low, 5=high; 3=fair, 4=good)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MITI Relational Rating (Empathy; Partnership)</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1-5; 1=low, 5=high; 3.5=fair, 4=good)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Complex Reflections</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(40%=fair; 50%=good)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflections to Questions Ratio</td>
<td>1:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(fair=1:1; good 2:1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How has the use of these skills, helped you in your work?

“Use of these skills have made my contacts with offenders more meaningful and goal oriented. It has allowed me to develop better working relationships with the people on my caseload. It has made it easier for me to address behavior without lecturing or feeling like I'm the one doing all the work.”
“I go back to two valuable concepts: making your interactions with offenders meaningful and purposeful. Anyone can go into a home, walk around the residence and ask the offender closed-ended questions and collect a BA. Wouldn't it be better to ask questions that elicit more information, give the officer a better understanding of the clients goals, what motivates this offender?”
Describe a situation where you used a skill effectively.

“Out in the field recently a field partner had an offender on transition supervision who did not want us to enter his residence. It would have been easy to threaten we could contact the RRC, have him sent back etc. which would have had a very negative impact on the officer offender relationship long term. Instead I was able to use OARS to keep him talking, determine what he was concerned about, answer his questions, assure him that we understood his concerns etc. which led to him letting us into the residence. The officer I was with was impressed by the skills and very grateful for the outcome.”
Practice makes progress, not perfect.