Motivational interviewing outline

Objectives:

* Participants will understand the key aspects of the motivational interviewing framework
* Participants will use the motivational interviewing framework in order to have more effective conversations with neighbors

Pre-work:

* Three myths of behavior change: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=l5d8GW6GdR0>
* Optional: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oUAArxykCoc>
* Politico: <https://www.politico.com/story/2017/10/05/poll-americans-divided-party-lines-243466>

Session plan:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Time**  | **Activity**  |
| 00- :10 | OPENING* Welcome group & thank them for joining the call
* Introduce facilitator
* Introduce OFA & our work
* Plug #OFAction on twitter to share insights
* To get people comfortable in the chat box, facilitator says, “Last call in the series, we had people from all over the US on our call. To get comfortable using the chat box, type into the chat box what you are hoping for with tonight’s call”.

True or false: * The average gap between self-identified Democrats and Republicans on these questions in 1994? Fifteen points.
* Today, it’s 36 points, up from 33 percent in 2014.
 |
| :10- :20  | INTRODUCING CONTENT * Research: Politics have become an *identity* -
	+ The sociologist Ziad Munson [has found](http://press.uchicago.edu/ucp/books/book/chicago/M/bo5186375.html) that almost half of the activists on the front lines of the anti-abortion movement — those who protest outside abortion clinics — were not anti-abortion when they attended their first event. They **attended because a friend asked them, they had just joined a new church, or they retired and had more free time. They stayed, however, because at these events, they found things we all want: friends, responsibility, a sense that what they are doing matters.** By finding fellowship and responsibility, these people changed not only their views on abortion but also their commitment to act
	+ Politics = identity
	+ This can play out in two ways:
		- It affects actions (identity shift → e.g. NRA)
			* "The gun-rights groups were not just persuading them to support gun rights; they were also helping my friends rearticulate their own lives in terms of a broader vision of the future. They were no longer just hunters. They were protectors of a way of life. That is why the N.R.A.’s version of gun rights is so intimately tied to questions of race and identity"
			* <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/10/04/opinion/gun-control-nra-vegas.html>
		- But not necessarily. (e.g. waste)
	+ However, studies have also found that people with polarized views also concede the nuance of their beliefs after a few questions, much more than they initially let on
	+ We know this intuitively - there are many beliefs that we hold that go against our actions- for instance, I deeply believe in doing everything I can to combat excessive waste.. However, I bought a drink today and it came with a straw, and I know that straws are polluting the ocean.
	+ As human beings, we walk around in conflict all the time. But we don’t constantly point out to ourselves every example of cognitive dissonance or discrepancy.
* Theory:
	+ Because politics has become an identity, our actions don’t always align and we don’t always see that connection. We live in contradiction all the time → cognitive dissonance. We need people to bring that up for us.
	+ Motivational interviewing is a way for people to state, on their own, how their actions don’t always align with their beliefs.
	+ ***Key concept 1:*** In order to have effective conversations, we have to be good listeners, **as well as ask questions that reveal biases and beliefs in a nonjudgmental way*.***
		- ***(link back to effective listening)***
			* Last time, we did foundations of effective listening, which you will need for today’s session -- motivational interviewing
				+ Reflecting
				+ Probing
				+ Ask Questions
		- One way to do this is through a framework called, ‘Motivational Interviewing’
		- Something used during deep canvassing or with friends--not something we do at all times. It is a tool.
		- What motivational interviewing IS:
			* Motivational Interviewing is a counseling style typically used to treat addictions
			* It is defined as *“a person centered method of guiding to elicit and strengthen personal motivation for change”*
			* It encourages individuals to work through their discrepancy between their current behavior and broader life goals and values
			* Practitioners generally **make no direct attempt to dismantle denial or confront irrational** or inappropriate beliefs. Instead they may subtly help people detect possible contradictions in their thoughts and actions; to **experience discrepancy between their current actions and who they ideally want to be**.
			* So, we’re NOT trying to win an argument here or get this person to agree with our system of beliefs. We’re attempting to build trust through listening a guide the other person to talk through their own belief system so as to confront any conflicts or discrepancy.
			* Through motivational interviewing, people are able to voice assumptions they are making that were previously unexamined, clarify their beliefs, and make a choice to change their behavior
			* It is more effective for people to verbally express their own contradictions than for you to tell them → leads to longer lasting behavior change
		- What motivational interviewing is NOT:
			* Judgmental, forcing people to think a certain way, manipulation, “gotcha”, clap-back, persuasive
			* Online
			* PERSON DESTROYED
	+ ***Key concept 2***: Connection from counseling to politics
		- We are not counselors (most of us- shout out to counselors that are on the call). And the people we’re trying to have effective conversations with aren’t addicts, generally. This framework isn’t taking the place of professional counseling, nor is it saying that we should act as counselors when we talk to people. *However, most of us here on this call are seeking deep change in our country- to bridge a divide, to see more people voting, more people civically engaged in their communities, communities being able to have more respectful and fruitful discussions*  and the reality is, we have to use all the tools of effective conversations that we can to begin to see the behavioral changes we seek. We need to try to overcome the tribalistic barriers people are putting up. And this type of listening is just one way to begin to do that.
	+ ***Key concept 3:*** Here is the motivational interviewing framework for an effective conversation that helps to lead someone towards behavior change :
		- EXPLORING - listen to story, build rapport, obtain history — listening, reflections (think anthropologist) - example
		- GUIDING - values clarification exercise, summarizing, putting assumptions on the surface
		- CHOOSING- ask them to join in further conversation, join a group
 |
| :20- :45 | APPLICATION* Let’s go through the framework step by step, and have a chance to practice what this conversation could look like
* **Exploring**:
	+ In this beginning phase of the framework, you are establishing rapport with the person you are speaking with, is a form of ‘hypothesis testing’
	+ You are nonjudgmental in tone, and you may start with a question such as, “What is the first experience you have had with government?”
	+ As you listen to their response, you offer ***reflective responses***:
		- Content reflection: “Given what you said, it sounds like you…”
		- Feeling/meaning reflections: “It seems that you felt… is that right?”
	+ **Note: Even when reflections are inaccurate, through the act of correcting the listener, people clarify their thoughts and feelings and move the discussion forward**
	+ TRAPS: responding with questions/ premature advice, questions are biased in what the person is interested in hearing about and not what the person sharing is saying
	+ EXAMPLE: This can be used to talk to folks don’t believe voting will have an impact.
		- Can be used to explore conversations with folks who believe parties are all the same, or even fellows progressives/democrats that are not living their identity
	+ APPLICATION: **Stop video at (time when women says something controversial)**
		- <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_tdjtFRdbAo>
		- Type in the chatbox -- what would you say or ask this woman at this point?
		-
* **Guiding:**
	+ In this middle stage, you have had the chance to build rapport and state a few reflective responses and are now pushing to areas of conversation that they feel ambivalent about
	+ As you enter this part of the discussion, you are **rolling with resistance**
		- confronting people can cause them to shut down - therefore, you must ‘pull up alongside’ them; Even if the statement is factually incorrect or places blame unfairly on others
		- Two techniques:
			* Double sided reflection “On one hand you feel X, and on the other hand, you feel Y”
			* Invert barrier: “Sounds like, in order to move forward, you might want to address barriers A, B, C”
	+ Goal of this phase: Be listening for values, be listening for how values are contradicting with actions, and begin surfacing them for people
	+ TRAPS: Letting your biases creep in, putting value on the statements people are giving
	+ APPLICATION: Type into the chat box what double-sided reflective response or invert barrier you would be giving in this conversation
* **Choosing**:
	+ Individuals are more likely to accept and act upon opinions that they voice themselves
	+ Goal of this phase: after you have surfaced values and contradictions, it is time to ask them if they would like to do anything to change to be closer to their values
		- Techniques: Questions: on a scale of 1-10, how important is it to you that you change XYZ? What would it take to get you to a higher number? Why did you not choose a lower number?
			* EX -- “On a scale of 1-10, what do you think of restricting access to guns?”
			* “In light of this, would you say that it depends on the circumstance that we should restrict access to guns?”
		- Ask: Invite them to take certain steps that you have thought about during the conversation; ask to join in further conversation, Join a group
			* “If a vote came up about this issue, would you choose to vote any differently?”
	+ TRAPS: Moving to this stage too soon!
	+ APPLICATION: What types of ‘asks’ do you think would be appropriate for this conversation?
* Putting it altogether: recap slide & resources for next steps
* **Troubleshooting:** When people get entrenched, how do we handle it? Usually people get entrenched when their historic thinking is challenged. Easier to retreat to position than change it.
	+ Connect on shared values
 |
| :45- 55 | SYNTHESIS* What is your biggest takeaway from this training? Which phase of the framework comes easily to you? Which trap do you fall into?
* What situation do you think this motivational listening framework would work best in? Who do you commit to trying this with?
* Q & A
 |
| :55- 1:00 | CLOSING, SURVEY, TEASER FOR NEXT TIME* Chat box: What is one thing you are taking away from this training?
* Teaser for next training:
	+ ‘Knowing your ‘WHY’’
* Survey
* Express gratitude and appreciation
 |