

Talking to Change: An MI Podcast

Glenn Hinds and Sebastian Kaplan



Episode 41: Ethical Considerations of MI, with Patrick Berthiaume

Sebastian Kaplan:

Hello everyone and welcome to another episode of Talking to Change, a Motivational Interviewing podcast. My name is Sebastian Kaplan, and I am based in Winston-Salem, North Carolina, USA. And as always I'm joined by my good friend Glenn Hinds from Derry, Northern Ireland. Hello there, Glenn.

Glenn Hinds:

Hello Seb, how's things?

Sebastian Kaplan:

Pretty good. We're a bit sunny and warm here in the winter. It survived an ice storm a couple of days ago, so we're hanging in there. How about you all?

Glenn Hinds:

We're good. Looking forward to this spring break now. The days are getting longer, the light's changing. We're still in COVID time, but what's fantastic is the vaccinations are rolling out really quickly here in Northern Ireland and I received my first one yesterday. That's almost like they're literally injecting hope into the environment, just the possibility that this could be the thing that changes it all for all of us and that, you know they just extended the lockdown for another month here in Northern Ireland.

Glenn Hinds:

And the message is, "Look, let's just push this a little bit further so that we don't ever get back to a lockdown situation." And there is a weariness. There definitely is a weariness to how a lot of people are thinking and behaving and just feeling. And I think it's a good thing that we're getting into spring now, because that in itself will be of support to our emotional, psychological health as well.

Sebastian Kaplan:

Sure. I love, as always, a nice image there, injecting hope through the vaccine. Yeah, a little bit of a rocky rollout here in the US. Lots of things are rocky here in the US, but anyway we won't go into that. So why don't you orient our audience to social media platforms and ways that people can contact us?

Glenn Hinds:

Of course. As always on Twitter we are @ChangeTalking, on Instagram it's Talking To Change Podcast, on Facebook it's Talking To Change. And for questions, feedback, ideas for future episodes, our email address is podcast@glennhinds.com.



Sebastian Kaplan:

Excellent. And of course rates and reviews are welcome. We've been getting actually recently a nice steady flow of suggestions and comments, both on our social media and directly on email and we really do appreciate it. The suggestions for episodes, we pretty much talk about every suggestion that comes through and many of them get put on our lists of future topics, so we do really appreciate that. We also want to recognize a couple of people that have been very helpful and supportive for us. The first is Brian Hartzler and his team out in Seattle, Washington with the Northwest Addiction Technology Transfer Center.

Sebastian Kaplan:

They've been very generous in supporting our project here and so we want to recognize them. And Tessa Hall as well has been our sound editor now for probably close to a year and she's been doing great work so we appreciate her efforts also. So with that said, we will meet our guest today who's Patrick Berthiaume. I hope I pronounced that okay or well enough maybe, Patrick?

Patrick Berthiaume:

Well enough, yes.

Sebastian Kaplan:

Well enough. Okay. Well I'm happy to learn better. I took French in high school so I'm a bit shaky on it. So, Patrick is joining us from Montreal, and we'll be talking about ethics in Motivational Interviewing today. Patrick, we welcome you and as always we'd like to hear, before we get into the topic itself we'd love to hear a bit about you, a bit about what you do and what we've come to call the early MI story, how you got into MI, and off we go.

Patrick Berthiaume:

Well first, thank you very much for the invitation. I'm very honored to be there with you, and thank you so much guys for all you're doing for the world, but also for the MI community. It's really appreciated. So I'm Patrick Berthiaume, I'm a French Canadian. Live in Montreal. I'm from a little small town which is the most French speaking city in North America. So I came to Montreal when I was around 18 years old, and I was only be able to say yes, no and toaster, I think at that time. And Montreal gave me the opportunity to improve my English. So I really appreciate the experience right now.

Patrick Berthiaume:

I already appreciate your indulgence of my English. And I studied in sexology, and I first was working on the street with sex workers to help them mainly for HIV prevention. But here in Quebec we integrate born blood and sexual transmitted infection in the same group. So at the same time that I was working for sexual transmitted infection I was also working for addiction prevention. And that's mainly where I started learning about MI because the Public Health National Institute in Quebec asked me to develop a training to how we can approach the youth about prevention of sexual transmitted infection and also for addiction.



Patrick Berthiaume:

And they asked me to put into the training a best practice. So, I start looking for a best practice and it's where I've learned about Motivational Interviewing. And when I first attended a conference I so fall in love with the approach. I start try to learn to get this in my practice. I first went in Paris to get my first training. I was passionate, close to be obsessive but it's more passionate, about MI. And then so I did my TNT. It was an endorsed TNT training, the new trainers in France in 2008. And I've been very lucky. When I came back of that training I've been hired to be part of a big research for people who inject drugs, who've been randomized to see me for a one time consultation in MI, or see my colleague for more an educational consultation.

Patrick Berthiaume:

And they want to look if there is any effect of Motivational Interviewing being compared to an educational consultation. So during three years, all my interview have been code and I've been supervised to making sure that I was doing MI, and I'm very grateful for my supervisors who really improve my practice of MI. And since that time I am very into MI. Well, MI really changed my personal life but also changed a lot of my professional life also. During the year after, I've been involved in many projects. I've been involved in the International Advisory Committee.

Patrick Berthiaume:

At that time, we were called IAC and now we're Motivational Interviewing, a cross culture group. I've been on the board of the MINT during three years. There as many things that I've been involved. I translate the MT with the group in Switzerland. I'm very passionate about the Motivational Interviewing. And since six years now, I decide to be a full-time trainers and supervisor. I do mainly training and supervision mostly all the time. I still have a private practice for mainly peoples who are struggle with addiction issues.

Patrick Berthiaume:

And I came back on the board, so I'm still on the board of the MINT but mainly because it's my passion and I'm very devoted of what MI brings in my life and it's very important for me to give back. That's where and why I am there.

Glenn Hinds:

Yeah, quite the journey you're describing from an individual who only spoke French and then that transition to learning English and then being introduced to Motivational Interviewing as part of your work. And, as often is the case, you described something happened that tapped into a passion, or you became passionate about what you were learning. And I'm always intrigued, what was that for you? Because you actually said MI changed my life, MI changed my personal life.

Glenn Hinds:

So, it sounds like there was something quite significant about what you discovered in Motivational Interviewing that has essentially changed what you do and how you do it, and it's such a big part of your life now.



Patrick Berthiaume:

I think first of all it's more as a human being, it's the importance are really expressed the way that you understand the others, which is empathy. But MI really learned me how to be closer to a really accurate empathy, which personally it's given what I've learned from my training in sexology. So this is the importance of empathy, the important of autonomy, really believe in the potential of others and believe that the person have all the tools within themselves to doing the best choice that they are able to do.

Patrick Berthiaume:

I remember the time that I was working on the street and really feeling the fear. I wanted so to save people and doing so many things and always trying to resolve the problem and looking for things like this, that MI really learned me to have the positive regards and really believe up to others. And this is some things that I would say that it mainly really changed my life. So as I said, it changed my life as personal, but also as a professional person. And finally maybe with the link that we are doing right now it's very being more conscious of what we say and the way that we interact with others.

Patrick Berthiaume:

We are not always conscious of the impact and the influence that we have to others. And that's where I'm very grateful to the authors and to MI to really brings me to being more conscious. I remember a few years ago I attend to a conference from Eckhart Tolle, and the way that he described the way of seeing life, I was like, "Well, this is a quite close definition of MI." It's being conscious of the way that you interact with others. So that's why I'm very grateful, and I think it's one of the reasons that I very being passionate about ethics.

Patrick Berthiaume:

Because more that you are conscious of the impact and the influence and the interaction you have others, more you should be aware of the ethics and the way that you influence the interaction or the discussion with others.

Sebastian Kaplan:

Yeah. It's so interesting with these conversations that we do that the truly global experience of, first of all, the resonance or the connection with the empathic nature of MI and other elements of the MI spirit. But also, you didn't use the phrase of the righting reflex, but it's a concept that we use a lot in MI, and it certainly seemed to be coming up for you and something where I imagine there may even be like a really heightened level of urgency. You're working with people who are at really high risk for a lot of negative outcomes, shall we say?

Sebastian Kaplan:

And it seemed like MI both connected you to this, again, these empathic qualities that you probably had just naturally within you, but then also provided maybe some structure or some way to channel that care for others in a way that wasn't you just solving their problems, which in some ways was something you probably wanted to do, but you were



able to channel that energy, conversationally anyway, to then ultimately more helpful as a provider. And so I wonder how that starts folding into your interest specifically around ethics, and if you could tell us a bit more about that.

Patrick Berthiaume:

The way that you frame it Sebastian, it's just bring me to the importance of doubt. And it's very funny because for some people doubt are not seen as a good thing and some people doubt too much and some others would gain to doubt more. But the way that MI learned me in ethics, it just the importance to just a little bit step back and just making sure to be more conscious of what you say and the way that you interact with others. There is many reason that I come up to my passion about ethics. First of all, it's just for me with the four processes which has come up with the last version of MI, I really saw the link between what...

Patrick Berthiaume:

For me there are three main reason why MI is so efficient. One of it for me it's the complex reflection. So, it's accurate empathy, to be able to have a little **bit** step forward. Just to be the underline of the meaning of the person I think would help to be a little bit more efficient than something else, but also to be able to focus on the main reason that the person come to interact you. I think the blend of the accurate empathy and the focus, and then the evocation, because that's the reason of MI, the specific thing of MI for me it's quite the change talk and the way that we try to improve the direction of the discussion.

Patrick Berthiaume:

And I think it's the three components with, of course, the spirit, but those three components create the efficiency of MI. During the training I have so many peoples who express to myself, "Oh well, this is something that's great because you put word of what I do from the last 10 years." Or, "Oh, this is what I do with ... I practice with my family," and things like this which make me aware of well, do I am sure that my attendees really capture what is MI? And also the other part to really make me going further on focusing and ethics, it's also that in supervision that when people didn't bring any tapes with client, they decide to bring some tape with their family.

Patrick Berthiaume:

And where the subject that they decide to discuss I was like, "Well, I don't think it's really ethical to use MI in the discussion." And I'm very grateful for all the attendees attend to my training to always bring some questions that will make me further and really more precise my way of seeing and the importance of ethics. So that's the main reason that I decide to. And maybe one other thing, it's some people during training said, "Oh well, MI it's a manipulation way of conversation." And I was like, "Well, there is some things going on." Because people doesn't totally understand the meaning of the MI and the use of it. And that's where I really decide to improve those concepts towards it.

Glenn Hinds:



As you're describing this what's coming up for me is, is that by inviting us to think about the ethical considerations at different points along the helping conversation, even the decision to get into helping, really just invites us to step... As you say, you step back and ask the question, 'why am I doing this and for what purpose and what is the goal I'm trying to achieve?' And what you're describing as well around the idea of using the accurate empathy and effective ethical practices, that it's taken into account the other person's experience of us doing what we're doing.

Glenn Hinds:

And do they find that helpful? Do they find that supportive? Do they find that meaningful? And trying to strike that balance between, well you may have an outcome that your organization wants to achieve, what you've got to do is strike this balance where the person must come ask them for help from you. And I suppose, again, from what you're saying it was the righting reflex, my own experience of that is how easy it will be for us to lose sight of that balance when we start just wanting to fix or make things better.

Glenn Hinds:

And again, even just considering that desire to make someone well in our own image almost is itself an ethical challenge for us to reflect upon. That what makes you think the way you live your life is any better than how I'm currently living my life? So can you maybe go even more into that, how you help us as practitioners have... What questions are you inviting us to consider, or how do you want us to become more ethically conscious in our practice?

Patrick Berthiaume:

I developed with the time, I called it the four condition to do MI, and that's the way I, if it's okay with you I will just introduce how I introduce it during my training. It's depend if it's the momentum during the training where I will do it, or I usually introduce it just before the focusing, but I really stop the training and ask to my attendees, there is four condition to do MI, what do you think it's the four condition of doing it? And I always said don't go too far because it could be quite simple. So, I let them discuss in small group to think about the condition, to how to fix the limit of where I can, as Terri Moyers said, to put the MI caps or not.

Patrick Berthiaume:

Which is kind of easy but the first one it's to have the target of change, which is quite simple as a condition. But I remember being a supervisor during a group discussion and the person bringing a tape of a discussion that he had with her client, but the client just discussed about how was his day, what he's doing during the day. And she did a lot of really good reflection and most of the spirit was there, but there was no target of change. So it not can be MI. And I've heard sometimes that only being in the spirit and having a humanistic way of being, it's MI.

Patrick Berthiaume:



And for me that's where that personally I don't see MI just because for me it's mainly a person-centered approach, but that's the difference with MI. And I've heard a lot of, so with the EPE provide elicit way of the giving information. That's an illustration of MI. And always I was like, "Well, not totally because there is no change talk, there is no... So my first condition, it's having a target of change. And during the training it's very helpful because it's helped me to really make the difference between many ways of consultation or interaction and MI. So this is my first condition.

Patrick Berthiaume:

The second condition is that the person has to be ambivalent. So for me, as I said, the first condition it's quite simple, it's a target of change. But it's not only adding a target of change, the person has to be in some ambivalent. And it's really helped me with the change talk because if the person are not ambivalent, they usually naturally have a lot of change stock, so we don't really need to improve that. We can be there to making sure to arise more the part of the discourse.

Patrick Berthiaume:

And I really realize sometimes in training that people don't always keep in mind the importance of ambivalence. So for me that's the second condition, it's the person has to be ambivalent. And before going further in my third condition, I share one which I'm very grateful about, one experience that I had when I was working to help the peoples who were doing prostitutions. And I remember a 19 years old, she was in some prostitution reality and she was also in some drugs-use reality.

Patrick Berthiaume:

And she came to me and she said, "Well, I just found out that I'm pregnant and I don't know what should I do though. So do you think I should have an abortion or should I keep it?" And she said, "What should I do?" I stopped there and I asked my attendees to go back into their small group and ask them, "Do you think I can do MI or not with her questions?" And it's fantastic how people, usually the majority of the group say yes, you can. MI, you're there to help others. There is a target of change. She's ambivalent, so there is no problem to do MI.

Patrick Berthiaume:

And that's where I start falling into ethics. And it's very fantastic to have this discussion, because of course for me in that situation you cannot. And it's really a good example because I remember to do with her more an equipoise discussion and really more doing the pro and cons and let her making her own choice. And if I'm authentic with you in myself I was more thinking to encourage her to get an abortion. And I said to her, "Well, if you want to really have a kid, a baby, maybe think first of quitting what are you doing, making change in your drugs."

Patrick Berthiaume:

That, within me, was the first intention. But as I said, I just mainly do equipoise and maintain the pro and cons and don't give my own opinion on that. And she decided by



herself to keep the baby and she went back to her mother and she went back to her hometown and she decided to really stop everything. And I remember I saw her maybe five years after with her baby and she was so happy. I was in my mind, "Well, if I took the..." And it could be very tricky sometimes to hold your own opinion and way of thinking to others.

Patrick Berthiaume:

And that's really good example to me, that's where it's very important to step back and really ask yourself. I didn't want the responsibility of her abortion, and I don't want to get any responsibility in that choice. So that was for me a really good example. And when I asked my attendees about this example, many of my attendees, or mostly, to say, "Well, you can do MI." And it's with that example that I just realized the importance to discuss about ethics during training.

Patrick Berthiaume:

And I have a lot of few others example and I can go deeper in the subject for sure, but just to finish my four condition. But the fourth one, it's that we can relate to compassion, but I like speaking also to benevolent. So for me, compassion and benevolent it's quite similar. And to be honest, when I start thinking about those condition, the fourth one was not there and it just, with other example that it's make me precise that we need the fourth one, which is benevolent. And the way that I called maybe that third condition, usually my attendees really be surprised.

Patrick Berthiaume:

It's to have a lack of neutrality. Or we can call it having a professional position. But I like speaking of having a lack of neutrality. It just that, for me, the way to balance MI, it's having a discussion towards a change to the person who are ambivalent, but towards a target which as professional or as a person I have a lack of neutrality about the subject. But I have to keep myself to be neutral towards the outcomes of the discussion. So it's finding the balance between having a discussion with MI on some things that I have a lack of a neutrality, but maintain an attitude and a way of being with others which I'm neutral towards the outcome.

Patrick Berthiaume:

And it's finding the balance between the two of it, which is not always easy, but that's where I see it.

Sebastian Kaplan:

Wow Patrick, there's so much really interesting information there, both with your breakdown of the conditions. The example, really it just hit me right away to think about it as an example of an ethical dilemma. I just wanted to highlight a couple of other things too. You mentioned a few times there I guess the impression that some learners will have, and I will count myself as someone, when I was first learning MI, as someone who started to believe this, that everything that I was doing was MI. I was so completely bought in and it felt like, great, this is what I can do with everyone in every context, in every situation.



Sebastian Kaplan:

And actually Terri Moyers, our colleague in the MINT, who's at the University of New Mexico, she pointed it out to me in a training actually quite directly as Terri often does, is it was just this wonderful way of saying, "Actually what you're talking about isn't MI. You're not doing MI there." It really took me aback. And I think what I was tapping into was more so the MI spirit. I think I've come to conclude that really any conversation that I have with someone, certainly professionally maybe even personally, I could strive to uphold the elements of the MI spirit in any conversation.

Sebastian Kaplan:

But we cross over into the specific world of MI when we... And the way you're breaking it down with these four conditions, if we're meeting these four conditions, then that is MI. So just doing reflective listening and just upholding the MI spirit is wonderful and is helpful and is empathic and all of those things. And it could lead to some outcomes that you might want to see clinically, but we wouldn't call it MI unless we have these conditions that you're describing. So it's really helpful to have it broken down in that way.

Sebastian Kaplan:

And the example you used about a discussion around abortion, another thing that I imagine would be really hard for people in that moment is abortion and there's probably a few other specific topics, that elicit really strong personal positions, either for or against.

Patrick Berthiaume:

Yeah, exactly.

Sebastian Kaplan:

And so you're describing this professional position, right? And it's really perhaps even an intense challenge in the moment to be asked this question for which you have a really strong personal position about, but then having to catch it and adjust and then really settle into this decision point of, is this something for which I have a professional position about, or is this something that I need to maintain neutrality? Or this phrase that you're using or the word you were using was equipoise, right? The purposeful neutrality.

Sebastian Kaplan:

And I guess what I was wondering to hear more about, although there's so many things, I would want to hear more about given what you were just saying, how do you decide what to be neutral about or not?

Patrick Berthiaume:

That's why I really like using this during training, because then I ask my attendees, my learners, to ask them on what we can base our lack of neutrality. So on what are we able to base our lack of neutrality? And then I have a lot of a great discussion with people. So I always do a list with the peoples or different things on what we can base our lack of neutrality, which is our profession, our mandate, our mission, the professional role, the



professional values, our professional responsibilities, our professional order, the department or the institution that we represent, the law, the scientific data, the objective or the goal of the intervention.

Patrick Berthiaume:

There is a lot of things on which we can base our lack of neutrality. And one thing, well it surprised me but I think it's the way of many area which I have a lot of learners who said to me, "Well, I don't know my mandate. I don't know... People coming in my office and it's not clear why they are there." And I said, "Well, from my point of view, in the focus processes we should include the frame of the consultation." So, for me, discussion about the mandate, about the professional, about the responsibilities of others during the follow-up, about all those things in my perception should be included in the focusing process.

Patrick Berthiaume:

Because it's giving the frame of the direction we are doing during the consultation. And the way that I really like to help my learners to put this during their consultation, because usually I already spoke during the training about the Elicit-Provide-Elicit model, and I asked them, "How do you think you can use the EPE model to speak about the mandate about your professional role about all those things?" And I let them create the three steps of the EPE model. And I asked them to create an introduction of this with a client of your choice.

Patrick Berthiaume:

And what beautiful thing to ask the patient. And said, "How do you think as a sexologist I would say to the issue you brought right now?" Or, "What do you think as a person who worked for this institution would say with what you just said right now?" And taking this as an advantage to really pop up and clarify the target and the direction that we take based off of our lack of neutrality, which as I said before about the mandate, the mission or the profession. But I always...

Patrick Berthiaume:

MI make me realize that if someone come to see me in consultation without a voluntary choice or not, I have a reason to be there. And it's that reason who should be allowed to make a direction during the consultation. And for me, using that EPE way and say, "How do you think I would say as a sexologist?" And hear how the client would understand my... And usually when I use it with my client, I just realize that the client knows it. Usually they really have a great perception of my position or the way I should, which is legitimate my change talk focus on the direction.

Patrick Berthiaume:

And for me that's a great way to let people practice the EPE model with that. But I personally really think that all practitioner should really have taking two minutes in their consultation to really focus on the mandate or the institution. And sometimes there is many things to clarify with the client because the client give perception to the practitioner



for different reason, but which is not totally aligned with the mandate or the service of the institution or things like this. So it's a really good way to doing it, from my perception.

Glenn Hinds:

Well, there's just so much to mine down into, in what you're describing. I just love that phrase, lack of neutrality. It's so rich in inviting us to think about what it is we do as practitioners, and to recognize, while we go in and we're trying to be really good human beings, trying to be helpful to other people, we are invested, most of us are invested in certain types of outcomes that we, or our organization, have already predetermined as being good for people. And that that lack of neutrality, just what does that mean? And as I listen to you, I just thought how seductive those justifications can be.

Glenn Hinds:

It's evidence-based, the research shows that doing this is really good for you. I belong to a government based organization, and they say it's a good thing. And there's this list of reasons why it justifies me having this lack of neutrality. But what you're also encouraging us to recognize is just having that justification isn't in itself enough then to impose it on someone else, it's how you take that possession and enter into the Motivational Interviewing, the spirit of our MI and the dance, which is, yes you are taking this position.

Glenn Hinds:

But ethically what you've got to do is continue to fully value the other person's right to choose not to do it that way in their own lives. But what you want to do is look for opportunities where they may begin to lean into that way of thinking or that way of behaving, and you will be leaning on purpose and that conversation with them. You will be inviting certain types of change talk, you will be avoiding certain types of other language that you know may lead them towards sustaining their behavior. But it's that ethical dance which is, look, don't be imposing your power on these people, you have power but it's to be used in a very supportive way and inviting them to achieve things for themselves when it's the right time for them, or in the right circumstances. Wow, it's just-

Patrick Berthiaume:

That's the reason, Glenn. And then I really appreciate to encourage people to really speak to say, as a sexologist, as a nurse, as a part of a team who worked to the benefit of the children, to try to let them learn how to frame that it's not based on their own person or on their own moral. That's what I really want to avoid. And one of the good example, I remember that I trained a team of nurse to vaccination and I had the nurse who asked me the question and she said that I really have a big problem because I totally do not agree with vaccination. For me, it's not natural.

Patrick Berthiaume:

And I was thinking, "Well, if I would be her boss." And I would hear that nurse, that a mother asked the nurse and said, "What should I do with the vaccination?" And the nurse responds, "Well, personally I really don't think it's natural." If I would be the boss or someone's who hires the nurse, I would say, "Well, maybe you should look for another



job." Because you should have a lack of neutrality to promote the vaccination, if I take this example. But it's some things like this for many things. So that's one of the examples.

Patrick Berthiaume:

So, it's for me really important to really increase the importance to base and to frame when you discuss to base the fact that if you're a tendency or influence that discussion, it's based on some things that it's bigger than just your own perception or your own thinking as a person or your moral issues and be more able to step back and having this doubt before going further on subject.

Glenn Hinds:

I love, again, that phrase importance of doubt. Just keep questioning, just keep stepping back, keep stepping back, just checking and just checking in. And if it's okay, can I just maybe... feels like this is a natural point to explore one of two questions that were sent to us before we went on air. One was from Ross Duncan. He asked us, he just says, "The use of Motivational Interviewing and social work practice where there's an inherent power imbalance, and the autonomy and choice may have negative outcomes for children."

Glenn Hinds:

And it's just that ethical dilemma that I guess that Ross is describing that as a social worker myself, how do I practice good Motivational Interviewing where I am talking to you as a parent or an adult and some of your decisions, I consider to be putting a child's well-being at risk? And how do we hold those two things at the same time, and how do you manage that ethically?

Patrick Berthiaume:

Still for me it's always based on the mandate. I would be curious to ask this person who asked you the question, what is his mandate? Because if it's the mandate it's to being care of the protection of the children, or for me the ethical point of view and the focus really helps me and helps people to really, when we have a discussion where we going for on many direction, to bring back of the mandate and the mission. I would be curious, and maybe Glenn you have an example, but where the mandate or the mission of the social worker would be prioritize the parent health or the parent well-being instead of the children.

Patrick Berthiaume:

I can think about right now, if I remember when I was working on the street there was a lot of teenager who was on the street and there was in some addiction realities and all that stuff. And they came back frequently to their parents and sometime they stole some things or they did some things, which is not necessarily in the respect of the mothers or the parent. And just thinking right now, if the parent came to see me in consultation and my mandate it's to taking care of the well-being of the parent or making sure that the parent will maintain a low level of anxiety, maybe the choice that we will be focused on will not be necessarily on the best interest of the teenager.



Patrick Berthiaume:

But my purpose or my mandate it's to help the parent, but if the parent come to see me and I'm in the adolescent services or something like this, I will focus on how we can try to find a balance between the well-being of their parents and the well-being of the adolescents. And from my point of view, I really like to say there is '50 Shades of Gray' in those ethics things. For me there is a lot of shades, it's not black or white as a decision. But for me where we will have the best answer and response will be regard the mandate that we have.

Patrick Berthiaume:

That's our main focus. But maybe you have other examples that relate maybe to the question that this person asked would be different.

Glenn Hinds:

No, I think you're right. The fact that the situation isn't precise and it isn't clearly identified, and that idea of the 50 shades of possibility.

Patrick Berthiaume:

Exactly.

Glenn Hinds:

What it sounds like you're inviting Ross and anyone else listening to think about is, what is your purpose here? What have you been mandated to do? Because that's going to clarify some of what it is you're going to be doing with this person. And significantly from what you said previously, in the early stages of this conversation you will have clarified that with this person, that while you will be-

Patrick Berthiaume:

Exactly.

Glenn Hinds:

... wanting to support them with their drinking or make decisions, your priority will always be if you think that their behavior is going to be detrimental to the child, that that will continue to be a real concern for you and all your reporting processes will be contingent on your assessment of that. So they can make an informed decision about their relationship with you, how much information they give you, what it is they're prepared to talk about, what it is they're prepared to change while they're with you.

Patrick Berthiaume:

But just to take, again, the example of the EPE, I can ask this person, "What do you think it will be my mandate in that follow-up?" And the person will answer it. And I would say, "Well, what do you think of it?" First I can ask him to wear my shoes as the professional, and then I can ask the person, well, you quite framed well my mandate. What do you think of it? What do you think I will do with this mandate during that follow-up? What would be



the responsibility to you and my responsibility during that follow-up? And clarify and making transparency toward the direction that we are taking.

Patrick Berthiaume:

There is no problem with that, but where MI really helped me it's to try to let the person evoke first before me taking the place to really precise or explain my mandate and all that stuff. That's for me really rich if it's coming first from the client instead of myself.

Sebastian Kaplan:

So two things that you seem to highlight, first of all, is this well, it's really... It's part of I guess the evocation within the MI spirit, it's that element that is coming through as opposed to evoking change talk, because it's not really quite what you're talking about. You're describing a particular part of the conversation where you are wanting to evoke from them what their ideas are, impressions are, or assumptions are perhaps about what your responsibilities are given the work that you're doing.

Sebastian Kaplan:

And the other thing that you're really emphasizing is the importance of being transparent throughout the conversation at many steps along the way. Probably at the very beginning, the first time you ever meet with this person, but then there's these other opportunities to be transparent. So if you give feedback to somebody and say, "Well, as a nurse," so you're being transparent about your role, and they already know that but it's like saying, "This is who I am professionally and therefore this is the place from which I am giving you this information or making this decision is as a nurse or as a psychologist or a social worker or whatever."

Sebastian Kaplan:

So, evocation, and then really being clear about the places where you can be transparent in your communication really, are some of the specific tools that help you uphold an ethical stance in your work.

Patrick Berthiaume:

Yeah. And I remember one time that when I was working more in the HIV field there is a boy which was in Canada for maybe two years. It was from another country where the reality of the country and his family it's quite different that we are living in Canada. This guy had a heterosexual encounter all his life, and when he came to Canada he had the desire to have a sexual relation with the men. Three months after we've got the diagnostic that he had the HIV and the nurse starting to say to him, "Well, you should call your parents to say that you are homosexual."

Patrick Berthiaume:

And she starts really push him and really try, and that's a nurse then I know that she had the feeling to practice MI and she really started asking, how do you think it's important to disclose to your parents and then all kind of like this. And I remember that, because I was mainly in close off the same services and the young boy came back to my office two days



after and he was crying and he was devastated in his life. And for me it was a really good example to really put aside of which is my moral or my personal point of view and which is my mandate as a professional, because for me it was really unethical to address this.

Patrick Berthiaume:

It's not our business. You should not taking this. But for sure this nurse if I ever talk with her, she would say, "Well, I think it's much better for him and when the disclosure will be done he you will feel free. And I think when you have already HIV you don't have to be ashamed or something else." And she will probably have a discourse to legitimize why she are doing it, but that's why you should have a border between what I bring up, which is from my professional point of view and what I brought, and try to avoid much as I can when it's from my personal point of view, which has really helped me.

Patrick Berthiaume:

And maybe just to take another example, when, in my personal life, I have a good friend who come to see me and say, "Well Patrick, I'm not sure if I should continue with my boyfriend. I'm very ambivalent." So I have a change target. I have the ambivalence, and in my personal life I always taking the time to think, where I have a lack of neutrality in that discussion? Because I remember when I was a younger I would easily say, "Well, it's not good with you is you don't have any respect and she will probably decide to split up." And three weeks after she will be back to me and say, "Well, Patrick, he said that he will be really trying and he'd change his life."

Patrick Berthiaume:

And then I feel ashamed to have took a position on something that I should not. So even in my personal life, this ethical stem helped me to think where I have a lack of neutrality. And in this example I have a lack of neutrality that she can have a decision which is aligned with her integrity, with her well-being. So I will try to focus less on she should or not stay within her loving relationship, but I will focus my discussion on how is that important for you to align your decision on your well-being, on your integrity, and how do you do it usually?

Patrick Berthiaume:

And I will focus more on that instead of giving my position on something... That's something just to illustrate that even in our personal life, it could be helpful to think about this ethical... Because as I said in the beginning, we influence much more that we think. And for me thinking of that ethical issues helped me really much in my professional life as an MI practitioner, but in my personal life it's really helped me also to really devise what I should do, going further, and what I should prioritize and what should I put on this side?

Patrick Berthiaume:

Because we have also, I think, a personal responsibility of the way that on those decision when peoples are ambivalent or somethings like this. And if I want to give my advice or something like this, I could be transparent in that it's my own perception and I'm not in



their shoes and very clarified making differences. So you can use this ethical point of view even in your personal life.

Glenn Hinds:

It seems to be very important with what you're describing there is, your willingness to trust the other person, that while you may have an opinion, while you may have ideas, while you may have priority or preference yourself, what you're also doing is recognizing, what if I could create a space for them to come to this awareness for themselves within their own dialogue? So even in that example you're offering about your friend who was maybe considering ending their relationship, rather than specifically looking at the relationship, what you did was you went to a deeper level, almost to a values level, to explore, how do you work things like this out for yourself?

Glenn Hinds:

What are the criteria you use to live a good life? Or how do you decide to make a decision that will have a lasting benefit to you when you are having moments of uncertainty? And it sounds like that's where you were helping them, because you were trusting that other person. And it leads then to another question that I would like to bring up, because that came in through Twitter on the handle Angela Fell from Angela Wigan citizen.

Glenn Hinds:

And her question was around the idea that, of the particular challenge or doubt that she often hears about the idea of demonstrating, understanding without agreeing. You have already begun to explore I think that idea of coming alongside of someone where I can search and explore my understand, without necessarily agreeing with you. From what I understand she said that she often hears people say, "Well, you can't do that. You can't come alongside without agreeing."

Patrick Berthiaume:

That's some things with the differences between MI two and MI three, with the change from autonomy to acceptance. That I really appreciate, because the way that in my training that I like to doing it's to ask... Well, I first asking my attendees to say, "Well, what's mean acceptance for you?" And it's very hard to explain what does it mean for people, acceptance. But the way that I saw that it's more easier, is I start asking, "What's the difference for you between acceptance and tolerance?"

Patrick Berthiaume:

Then people, and my attendees they are very easy to make the difference between the two of it. And then I ask the people, "What's the difference between acceptance and approval?" For me, acceptance it's a natural... The main differences for me between tolerance, acceptance and approval, that's the neutrality of acceptance. And that's where, from my point of view, that would be my answer, it's really focus of not going to step aside on approval or intolerance and trying to improve and increase your way of being more naturally as the person just speaking to you.



Patrick Berthiaume:

And that remain the balance, and as I said before, which is we have to have a lack of neutrality of the direction of what should I focus but maintain the neutrality of what the person will do or will think are the outcome will bring up. The main answer will be to know yourselves, to be focused on the acceptance.

Sebastian Kaplan:

Yeah. Well, maybe for all of us we... Just thinking about some kind of internal, I don't know, a system of recognizing when we're in an accepting or when we're in acceptance or upholding that, I suppose, and then it's crossing over into some of these other things that you're describing, approval or agreement as the tweeter had put out, tolerance. It's about, for all of us as practitioners in whatever fields we're in, it's just to try to help, try to understand. I don't know, there must be something internally for us that we would recognize, right?

Sebastian Kaplan:

To know when we're in a neutral stance, even if we have a personal position about it, like your abortion example. And maybe it's about some internal questions that we might go through again really quickly, but what's my mandate, what's my role here, is there a natural clinical direction here or am I responding... If I were to encourage someone to get an abortion, for instance, what's that about? And where is that coming from? And it's going to look differently in different contexts, in different roles, but the idea of introducing the concept of neutrality and acceptance, what you were saying, Glenn, is really helpful.

Sebastian Kaplan:

I feel like there's so many different... Just in the course of sitting here I've been thinking about, "Well, what about this kind of example and this kind of example?" And I think we could just go on and on which unfortunately we can't. But I would maybe like to transition to a question that we ask our guests as we start to wind down, what sorts of things do you have on your horizon, professionally or personally, that you would want to share? And it could be about MI or perhaps not.

Patrick Berthiaume:

Well, I would like to be grateful to Denise Ernst which she's one of the co-authors of the Motivational Interviewing integrity treatment for the fidelity of MI. Since I attend for a few of her trainings about a workshop on self-exploration skills, I really liked the self-exploration skills, which is skills you create from Truax and Carkhuff which there was a student of Cal Rogers. I link it very much to the concept of vulnerability. As a good MI passionate, I really liked the psycho-linguistic field of...

Patrick Berthiaume:

And I'm amazed how the words vulnerability can be here from someone as a weakness. So the same word could have the meaning of different things. In English, you have only one word to say two things. Proud can be something's really fantastic. It can be some things that we... In French, we have two words for the same meaning of your word in



English, which is proud. But if I'm going back to a vulnerability, it can be means weak for someone, and it could be a strength for others. And I tried for many times, since I go further in the self-exploration skills, to really be conscious of the importance...

Patrick Berthiaume:

For me to be open to change, you have to be open to be vulnerable. If you keep a facade or a gate between who you are and others, and you want to keep in your secret field that you hide yourself to taking a call and you are not able to be vulnerable and be open to be who you are, I don't think you will really have... It will be easy to change your alcohol consumption. But for me it just made me realize that, for me vulnerability, the way that I would like to promote is it's a blend of integrity, humility, dignity, and well, I'm not sure about authenticity or be genuine.

Patrick Berthiaume:

Because this is some things that you have the chance in English to have two word. In French, we don't have. It's only authenticity. If I have to translate genuine in French, it will be being true but we don't have the proper word for genuine. I would be curious to know the level of being transparent in authenticity, versus genuine. In my sense, you are more transparent when you are genuine, instead of authentic, but maybe I'm not at the place. But for me I really like to going further in that concept of vulnerability to help people.

Patrick Berthiaume:

I just think that more you are able to be vulnerable with yourself, more you are able to lean on yourself, and more you're able to lean on yourself, more you have the ability to shine and really more align with who you are and what you would like to do. And it's very something that I really, since few months I really start writing a lot of notes about it. And like I said, I did a lot of link with the self-exploration skills and I really would like to create some things where it will be to increase the beauty of vulnerability. There is Daniel Brown and others, author, going quite in the same way.

Patrick Berthiaume:

So, I'm very passionate about the vulnerability. Because for me, the reason that we link vulnerability with weak, it's mostly something's out of yourself. Like in the COVID situation, there is some vulnerable population. So we will use vulnerability because they are the reason of their age, the reason of your health issue, but it's they are vulnerable from some things outside of themselves. And I think when I speak about vulnerability in my meaning of dignity, humility, integrity, and genuineness, it's more toward inner, within yourself or inner yourself.

Patrick Berthiaume:

So that's where I'm making the differences in vulnerability between weak and strength. It's mainly when we are speaking about something within ourselves, it should be something is framed as a strength. And when we are speaking about vulnerability from some things out of ourselves, I can understand the meaning of weakness. But that's the small portion of my obsession towards this word, which is for me fantastic.



Glenn Hinds:

Absolutely. And you've just opened the doors that I just want to walk through. I want to spend time talking to you about it because it is so fascinating, because as I listen to you it just signs the vulnerability is the risk of what will happen if I am myself. And the vulnerable, I am vulnerable to COVID, but that's the risk I have to take is to come out and say, "I am one of these people." And the invitation is, how do we create an environment where someone is experiencing risk in being themselves with us?

Glenn Hinds:

That's the environment that we're trying to create. And then that internal relationship, how can I therefore have that relationship with myself where the flawed parts of myself can be visible to the rest of me, and how can the rest of me support that so that I can then turn to myself, I can be an aid to myself? And again, fascinating conversation and it's just so interesting and I'd love to talk to you more about it. But again, unfortunately because of time we have to leave it there.

Glenn Hinds:

And I guess it will mean that the next question I'm asking you probably will prompt some people to take you up on this offer, which is if people want to contact you after listening to this episode, can they contact you? And if they are contacting you, how would you prefer them to reach out to speak to you, Patrick?

Patrick Berthiaume:

Of course, I would be a very pleased to stay in touch and to receive any questions or contact about it. And they can write me by email to my address, it's information, I-N-F-O @ perspectives, P-E-R-S-P-E-C-T-I-V-E-S-A-N-T-E.com. But I don't know really well...

Glenn Hinds:

We'll include that in the blurb and on the podcast as well.

Patrick Berthiaume:

Which is my website, which is Perspective Sante. In English it will be health perspective. That's my address, then I'll be in touch too.

Glenn Hinds:

So people can contact you directly by email or go onto your website. That's fantastic. I really appreciate that, Patrick. And again, just to remind people how they can contact myself and Sebastian, @ChangeTalking on Twitter, Talking To Change Podcast on Instagram, and thank you, Maeve, for all the work that you're doing on that, it's fantastic. Talking To Change, Facebook. For next thoughts, questions, comments, or information on training we offer it's podcast@glennhinds.com.

Sebastian Kaplan:

Wonderful.



Patrick Berthiaume:

Thank you.

Sebastian Kaplan:

Patrick, thank you so much for joining us. This has been a really fascinating conversation and I look forward to talking with you more about it in the future.

Patrick Berthiaume:

Thank you very much. I really appreciate this time with you guys. Thank you.

Glenn Hinds:

Thanks, Patrick. Thanks, Seb. Thanks to everybody.

Patrick Berthiaume:

Merci beaucoup.

Glenn Hinds:

Merci beaucoup. Au revoir.

Sebastian Kaplan:

Merci, Patrick.

