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History of MI

• Emerged initially from William Miller’s interactions with Norwegian psychologists specialising in alcohol problems

• First appearance of MI within academic literature in 1983

• Miller then collaborated with Stephen Rollnick to produce *Motivational Interview: Preparing People to Change Addictive Behaviour*
“Motivational Interviewing is a person-centred counselling style for addressing the common problem of ambivalence about change”

(Miller & Rollnick, 2012, p.29)
The evolution of MI
The Transtheoretical Model (TTM)
Ten things that MI is not (Miller & Rollnick, 2009)

• Distanced MI from the TTM
• “TTM is intended to provide a comprehensive conceptual model of how and why changes occur, whereas MI is a specific clinical method to enhance personal motivation for change” (p.130)
• Placed much greater focus on the spirit of MI
The Spirit of MI

- Collaboration
- MI Spirit
- Compassion
- Acceptance
- Evocation

1991 - not defined
2002 - autonomy, collaboration, evocation
Processes of MI

Engaging

Focusing

Evoking

Planning
Skills of MI - OARS

- Open-ended questions
- Affirmations
- Reflections
- Summaries

Change talk
(statements by the client revealing consideration of, or motivation for change)
Effectiveness/efficacy of MI

- Number of randomised trials approaching 750
- Evidence of efficacy across wide range of domains
- Lots of evidence that it works… attention beginning to focus on how
Mechanisms for change

**Therapist behaviours**
- Empathy
- MI Spirit
- Reflections
- Open questions
- MI consistent/inconsistent practice

**Client behaviours**
- Change talk
- Sustain talk
- Self-efficacy
- Self-monitoring
- Stage of change
- Motivation
- Planning

**Client behaviours**
- Therapeutic alliance
- Commitment strength
- Perceived behavioural control

---

Assessing proficiency and the Motivational Interviewing Treatment Integrity (MITI) scale

• Allows robust judgements about proficient practice
• Provides opportunities for practitioner development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Cultivating Change Talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Softening Sustain Talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Empathy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultivating Change Talk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
But...

- Hard to assess
- Hard to achieve proficient practice (“MI is not easy” – Miller & Rollnick, 2009)
- Proficiency on MITI not significantly correlated with client evaluations (Madson et al, 2016)
- Constantly changing – developments to MITI reflect theoretical instability
So where does this leave us as practitioners?

• How are we understanding and using MI within an range of diverse applied contexts?
• Which aspects and elements of MI guide our practice?
• Is there anything which would help us understand or use MI more effectively?
Survey link:

• https://mmu.eu.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_7TL3PfdmFBS2CRT