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Program

• Scientific evidence
• Why involve significant others?
• What is your experience in involving significant others?
• What difficulties have you faced?
• Solutions
Theoretical rational

« CSOs represent one form of natural support that can facilitate patient intrinsic movement toward change »

Miller & Rollnick, 2002

« CSO should be encouraged to participate and be actively engaged in the treatment whenever possible »

Miller, 1995
Scientific evidence

80 – 90’s years

• Engagement in the treatment process or treatment retention:
  
  – Zweben et al., 1983
  
  – Longabaugh et al. 1995, 2011
  
  – Szapocznik and his colleagues 1983, 1986
The four processes of MI

- Engaging
- Focusing
- Evoking
- Planning

Magill, Mastroleo, Apodaca, Barnett, Colby and Monti (2010) suggest it is possible to include a significant other in MI sessions and maintain a high level of patient engagement and satisfaction.
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Magill et al. (2010) also suggest that involving a CSO in the treatment permits the CSO to provide input and feedback in the development and implementation of treatment goals.
The four processes of MI
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Reviews of the literature suggest that CSO-involved interventions increase the probability that an alcohol user will initiate change (O’Farrell & Fals-Stewart; 2003, 2012); It permits to elicit feedback from the CSO that might help motivate the patient to change (Meyers & Smith, 2003).
The four processes of MI

- Engaging
- Focusing
- Evoking
- Planning

Useful to strengthen the CSO's commitment to remain an adequate support to the patient in planning how to face and overcome the substance use problem. Including partners in alcohol treatment can result in increasing abstinence (O’Farrell, 2003, 2012)
On the other hand, a drinker’s social network may include other drinkers, which can negatively influence treatment engagement (Havassy, Hall, & Wasserman, 1991; Mohr, Averna, Kenny, & DelBoca, 2001) or increase risk of relapse (Havassy, Hall, & Wasserman, 1991; McCrady, 2004).
Why involve significant others?

• Their needs
• Partner
• Relapse prevention
Objectives of the interview

• That each one can hear the experiences of the other
• That each one can understand the needs and expectations of the other
• Increase motivation to change and to be a support for the other
Your experiences?
Difficulties

• Resistance to coming to the session
• Negative focus (criticism, hopelessness, anger, faults, absence of motivational statements)
• Whose side am I on?
• It’s too important to ignore…
• Propose or impose?
• Lack of confidence
Confidence
Solutions

- Productive invitations
- Framework
- Constructive focus
- Return to framework
- Propose!!!!
- Young couple metaphor
- Right to stop
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