Developments in Motivational Interviewing – how have these affected practice?
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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
- 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Therapist behaviours</th>
<th>Client behaviours</th>
<th>Client behaviours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>Change talk</td>
<td>Therapeutic alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI Spirit</td>
<td>Sustain talk</td>
<td>Commitment strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflections</td>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>Perceived behavioural control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open questions</td>
<td>Self-monitoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI consistent/inconsistent practice</td>
<td>Stage of change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessing proficiency and the Motivational Interviewing Treatment Integrity (MITI) scale

- Allows robust judgements about proficient practice
- Provides opportunities for practitioner development
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 a 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