



Successfully Engaging Mandated Students into
University-Based Counseling Services

Russell E. Spieth, PhD, CRC
Senior Consultant/Trainer, Motivational Interviewing

ENGAGING MANDATED STUDENTS: LEARNING OBJECTIVES

- Appreciate how to use motivational interviewing (MI) and humor to establish the therapeutic alliance with mandated students
- Detail strategies to evoke change and commitment talk using individualized and normative feedback
- Understand the rationale for incorporating harm reduction into the planning process

DEFINITIONS

Motivational Interviewing (MI): Organizing conversations so people talk themselves into change based on their own goals and values (Miller and Rollnick, 2013)

Normative Feedback: An approach to substance misuse prevention that relies on raising awareness amongst students about their peers actual substance use behaviors (Dimeff, Baer, Kivlahan, & Marlatt, 1999)

Individualized Feedback: An approach to substance misuse prevention that relies on raising awareness amongst students about their drinking habits, risk factors, family history, degree of dependence, assessment results and attitudes (Dimeff, Baer, Kivlahan, & Marlatt, 1999).

Harm Reduction: A strategy to address substance misuse that constructs a hierarchy of goals, with the most accessible and genuine ones to be attained as first steps toward lower-risk use, or if suitable, abstinence (Marlatt, 1998).

MANDATED STUDENTS: ENGAGING

Partnership/Collaboration: Actively foster and encourage power sharing so that students' ideas substantially influence the direction and outcome of sessions

Acceptance: *Accurate Empathy* to understand another's internal perspective; *Absolute Worth* to see the potential of all people; *Autonomy Support* to appreciate another's right and capacity to self-direction, and *Affirmation* to seek and acknowledge person's strengths and efforts

Compassion: A deliberate commitment to pursue the welfare and best interests of another person; Do no harm

Evocation: Proactively evoke patient's own reasons for change and ideas about how to change

MANDATED STUDENTS: ENGAGING

Open-ended questions

Affirmations

Reflective Listening

Summaries

Informing



Miller & Rollnick (2013)

MANDATED STUDENTS: ENGAGING

Complex Reflection: a major restatement to add meaning or emphasis, and/or to infer feelings

MS) “I was just smoking weed in my dorm room, you all make too big of a deal about this stuff.”

MS) “I just had too much to drink, I never normally drink like that, I don’t have a problem with drinking.”

MANDATED STUDENTS: EVOCATION

- Provide students with **individualized** and **normative feedback** about patterns of substance use, associated risks, positive outcome expectancies, family history, and personal history in a **collaborative** manner.
- Increase students' awareness about the impact of substance use
- **Evoke** the student's desire, ability, reasons, need, and commitment to **not change and change** current risky behaviors with MI principles.

MANDATED STUDENTS: EVOCATION

Develop Discrepancy

Roll with Resistance

Boost Self Efficacy

Express Empathy



MANDATED STUDENTS: EVOCATION

- **Desire, ability, reason, need questions**
- **Ask for elaboration**
- **Ask for an examples**
- **Explore decisional balance**
- **Look back**
- **Look forward**
- **Query extremes**
- **Use importance/confidence rulers**

MANDATED STUDENTS: EVOCATION

“This is stupid, I don’t have an anger problem and I don’t need counseling.”

Amplified reflection: “You prefer to make no changes at this time.”

Coming Alongside: “You are frustrated and see little benefit to counseling.”

Emphasize Personal Choice: “You will decide when you are ready to discuss your drug use, if ever.”

MANDATED STUDENTS: PLANNING

Signs of Readiness for Planning:

- Increased change and commitment talk
- Taking steps (e.g., I drank less this week)
- Diminished sustain talk
- Resolve (e.g., sighs, tears, release)
- Envisioning (e.g., I could actually get more out of my workouts)
- Questions about change (e.g. what is it like?)

MANDATED STUDENTS: PLANNING

- Involves developing a specific plan based on students' ideas and solutions, including steps to reduce risk
- Attend to preferences, strengths, supports and obstacles
- Ongoing process to maintain and enhance commitment
- Write down and involve significant others
- Monitor, refine, reinforce and learn from plan

MANDATED STUDENTS: PLANNING

Strengthening Change Talk:

- Elaborating: *“What reasons do you want to cut down on your drinking?” “What makes it important to stop smoking weed in your dorm?”*
- Affirming: *“That was a great idea” “You were successful with drinking less in the past”*
- Reflecting: *“You have many more reasons to have a drinking buddy than to go out drinking alone”*
- Raising possible problems, challenges, and supports: Relapse Prevention: *“What are some things that worry you about this plan?” “What may get in your way?” “Who/What may help the process?”*
- Summarizing: *“You don’t want to change because of XYZ and you do want to change because of ABC. At this point, the ABCs outweigh the XYZs. So, you would like to explore on-going counseling”*

MANDATED STUDENTS: PLANNING

Specific: What is to be accomplished (e.g., do not use alcohol and marijuana together)

Measurable: Qualitative/Quantitative indicators of desired behavior (e.g., abstain from marijuana during drinking episode and abstain from drinking during marijuana use episode)

Achievable: Goal is challenging and within reach (e.g., person thinks this is a challenge but within reach)

Relevant: Goal aligns with patient preferences, goals, values (e.g., person believes that the combination of drugs leads to negative consequences)

Timed: Timeline for accomplishing the goal (e.g., Over the next week, student will abstain from marijuana during drinking episode and abstain from drinking during marijuana use episode)

REFERENCES

- Dimeff, L. A., Baer, J. S., Kivlahan, D. R., & Marlatt, G. A. (1999). *Brief alcohol screening and intervention for college students: A harm reduction approach*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Gollwitzer, P. M. (1999). Implementation intentions: Simple effects of simple plans. *American Psychologist*, *54*, 493-503.
- Hettema, J., Steele, J., & Miller, W. R. (2005). *Motivational interviewing*. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, *1*, 91-111.
- Lundahl, B. W., Kunz, C., Brownell, C., Tollefson, D., & Burke, B. L. (2010). A meta-analysis of motivational interviewing: Twenty-five years of empirical studies. *Research on Social Work Practice*, *20*, 137-160.
- Marlatt, G. A. (1998). *Harm Reduction: Pragmatic strategies for managing high-risk behaviors*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Miller, W. R., & Rollnick, S. (2013). *Motivational interviewing: helping people change* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Prochaska, J. O., & Diclemente, C. C. (1983). Stages and processes of self-change of smoking: Toward an integrative model of change. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *51*, 390-395.
- Rollnick, S., Miller, W. R., & Butler, C. C. (2008). *Motivational interviewing in health care*. New York, NY: the Guilford Press.