

MOTIVATIONAL INTERVIEWING CLINICIAN SELF-ASSESSMENT REPORT

INSTRUCTIONS: Listed below are a variety of Motivational Interviewing consistent and inconsistent skill areas. Please rate the degree to which you incorporated any of these strategies or techniques into your session with the child / youth and family.

Be sure to write comments below items for any areas you want to discuss with your supervisor. For each item please rate your best estimate about how frequently you used the strategy using the definitions for each scale point. *(Remember, that a high frequency is not always needed in the interaction for all items. The items are designed to provide a catalyst for conversation in the supervisory session about the degree to which the frequency and the quality of your motivational interviewing responses supported discussion about change.)*

1 (NOT AT ALL)	Never used the strategy
2 (A LITTLE)	Used the strategy 1 time briefly
3 (INFREQUENTLY)	Used the strategy 2 times briefly
4 (SOMEWHAT)	Used the strategy 3-4 times briefly or once or twice extensively
5 (QUITE A BIT)	Used the strategy 5-6 times briefly or thrice extensively
6 (CONSIDERABLY) ...	Used the strategy during more than half of the session
7 (EXTENSIVELY)	Use of the strategy almost the entire session
.....	

MOTIVATIONAL INTERVIEWING CONSISTENT ITEMS

1. MOTIVATIONAL INTERVIEWING STYLE OR SPIRIT:

- To what extent did you provide low-key feedback, roll with resistance (e.g., avoiding arguments, shifting focus), and use a supportive, warm, nonjudgmental, collaborative approach?
- To what extent did you convey empathic sensitivity through words and tone of voice, demonstrate genuine concern and an awareness of the child / youth and family’s experiences?
- To what extent did you follow the child / youth and family’s lead in discussions instead of structuring the discussion according to your agenda?

..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4..... 5..... 6..... 7.....
NOT AT ALL	A LITTLE	INFREQUENTLY	SOMEWHAT	QUITE A BIT	CONSIDERABLY	EXTENSIVELY

Comments:

2. OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS:

- To what extent did you use open-ended questions (i.e., questions or requests that elicit more than yes/no responses) to elicit the child / youth and family’s perception of his/her problems, motivation, change efforts, and plans? These questions often begin with the interrogatives: “What,” “How,” and “In what” or lead off with the request, “Tell me…” or “Describe…”

..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4..... 5..... 6..... 7.....
NOT AT ALL	A LITTLE	INFREQUENTLY	SOMEWHAT	QUITE A BIT	CONSIDERABLY	EXTENSIVELY

Comments:

3. AFFIRMATION OF STRENGTHS AND CHANGE EFFORTS:

- To what extent did you verbally reinforce the child / youth and family’s strengths, abilities, or efforts to change his/her behavior?
- To what extent did you try to develop the child / youth and family’s confidence by praising small steps taken by the child / youth and family in the direction of change or by expressing appreciation for the child / youth and family’s personal qualities that might facilitate successful change efforts?

..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4..... 5..... 6..... 7.....
NOT AT ALL	A LITTLE	INFREQUENTLY	SOMEWHAT	QUITE A BIT	CONSIDERABLY	EXTENSIVELY

Comments:

4. REFLECTIVE STATEMENTS:

- To what extent did you use reflective listening skills such as repeating (exact words), rephrasing (slight rewording), paraphrasing (e.g., amplifying the thought or feeling, use of analogy, making inferences) or making reflective summary statements of what the child / youth and family says?

..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4..... 5..... 6..... 7.....
NOT AT ALL	A LITTLE	INFREQUENTLY	SOMEWHAT	QUITE A BIT	CONSIDERABLY	EXTENSIVELY

Comments:

5. FOSTERING A COLLABORATIVE ATMOSPHERE:

- To what extent did you convey in words or actions that counseling is a collaborative relationship in contrast to one where you are in charge?
- How much did you emphasize the (greater) importance of the child / youth and family’s own decisions, confidence, and perception of the importance of changing?
- To what extent did you verbalize respect for the child / youth and family’s autonomy and personal choice?

..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4..... 5..... 6..... 7.....
NOT AT ALL	A LITTLE	INFREQUENTLY	SOMEWHAT	QUITE A BIT	CONSIDERABLY	EXTENSIVELY

Comments:

6. MOTIVATION TO CHANGE:

- To what extent did you try to elicit child / youth and family discussion of change (self-motivational statements) through evocative questions or comments designed to promote greater awareness/concern for the problem, recognition of the advantages of change, increased intent/optimism to change, or elaboration on a topic related to change?
- To what extent did you discuss the stages of change, help the child / youth and family develop a rating of current importance, confidence, readiness or commitment, or explore how motivation might be strengthened?

..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4..... 5..... 6..... 7.....
NOT AT ALL	A LITTLE	INFREQUENTLY	SOMEWHAT	QUITE A BIT	CONSIDERABLY	EXTENSIVELY

Comments:

7. DEVELOPING DISCREPANCIES:

- To what extent did you create or heighten the internal conflicts of the child / youth and family relative to his/her current pattern of behavior?
- To what extent did you try to increase the child / youth and family’s awareness of a discrepancy between where his or her life is currently versus where he or she wants it to be in the future?
- How much did you explore how current pattern of behavior may be inconsistent with a child / youth and family’s goals, values, or self-perceptions?

..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4..... 5..... 6..... 7.....
NOT AT ALL	A LITTLE	INFREQUENTLY	SOMEWHAT	QUITE A BIT	CONSIDERABLY	EXTENSIVELY

Comments:

8. PROS, CONS, AND AMBIVALENCE:

- To what extent did you address or explore with the child / youth and family the positive and negative effects or results of his or her current pattern of behavior and what might be gained and lost by changing current pattern of behavior ?
- To what extent did you conduct a decisional balance activity consisting of a cost-benefits analysis or list of pros and cons of substance use?
- How much did you develop and highlight the child / youth and family’s ambivalence, support it as a normal part of the change process, and reflect back to the child / youth and family the mixed thoughts and feelings that underpin the child / youth and family’s ambivalence?

..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4..... 5..... 6..... 7.....
NOT AT ALL	A LITTLE	INFREQUENTLY	SOMEWHAT	QUITE A BIT	CONSIDERABLY	EXTENSIVELY

Comments:

9. CHANGE PLANNING DISCUSSION:

- To what extent did you develop a change plan with the child / youth and family in a collaborative fashion?
- How much did you cover critical aspects of change planning such as facilitating discussion of the child / youth and family’s self-identified goals, steps for achieving those goals, supportive people available to help the child / youth and family, what obstacles to the change plan might exist, and how to address impediments to change?

..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4..... 5..... 6..... 7.....
NOT AT ALL	A LITTLE	INFREQUENTLY	SOMEWHAT	QUITE A BIT	CONSIDERABLY	EXTENSIVELY

Comments:

10. CHILD / YOUTH AND FAMILY-CENTERED PROBLEM DISCUSSION AND FEEDBACK:

- To what extent did you facilitate a discussion of the problems for which the child / youth and family entered Wraparound instead of directing the conversation to problems identified by you but not by the child / youth and family?
- To what extent did you provide feedback to the child / youth and family about his or her current pattern of behavior or problems in other life areas only when solicited by the child / youth and family or when you explicitly sought the child / youth and family’s permission first?

..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4..... 5..... 6..... 7.....
NOT AT ALL	A LITTLE	INFREQUENTLY	SOMEWHAT	QUITE A BIT	CONSIDERABLY	EXTENSIVELY

Comments:

MOTIVATIONAL INTERVIEWING INCONSISTENT ITEMS

11. UNSOLICITED ADVICE, DIRECTION-GIVING, OR FEEDBACK:

- To what degree did you provide unsolicited advice, direction, or feedback (e.g., offering specific, concrete suggestions for what the child / youth and family should do)?
- To what extent was your style one of instructing the child / youth and family how to be successful in achieving his/her/their goals?

..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4..... 5..... 6..... 7.....
NOT AT ALL	A LITTLE	INFREQUENTLY	SOMEWHAT	QUITE A BIT	CONSIDERABLY	EXTENSIVELY

Comments:

12. EMPHASIS ON ONE GOAL:

- To what extent did you present a particular goal as the only legitimate goal and indicate that other goals were not acceptable or realistic?
- How much did you try to definitively emphasize a particular goal as a necessary standard for judging any improvement during session?

..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4..... 5..... 6..... 7.....
NOT AT ALL	A LITTLE	INFREQUENTLY	SOMEWHAT	QUITE A BIT	CONSIDERABLY	EXTENSIVELY

Comments:

13. DIRECT CONFRONTATION OF CHILD / YOUTH AND FAMILY:

- To what extent did you directly confront the child / youth and family about his or her failure related to his/her/their current pattern of behavior or other behavioral difficulties (e.g., psychiatric symptoms, lying, non-compliance with treatment)?
- To what extent did you directly confront the child / youth and family about not taking steps to try to change identified problem areas?

..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4..... 5..... 6..... 7.....
NOT AT ALL	A LITTLE	INFREQUENTLY	SOMEWHAT	QUITE A BIT	CONSIDERABLY	EXTENSIVELY

Comments:

14. ASSERTING AUTHORITY:

- To what extent did you verbalize clear conclusions or decisions about what course of action would be best for the child / youth and family?
- How much did you warn the child / youth and family that progress would be impeded unless the child / youth and family followed certain steps or guidelines?
- To what extent did you tell the child / youth and family about “what works” best in Wraparound or the likelihood of poor outcome if the child / youth and family tried to do his/her own treatment?
- To what extent did you refer to your own experiences, knowledge, and expertise to highlight the points you made to the child / youth and family?

..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4..... 5..... 6..... 7.....
NOT AT ALL	A LITTLE	INFREQUENTLY	SOMEWHAT	QUITE A BIT	CONSIDERABLY	EXTENSIVELY

Comments:

15. CLOSED-ENDED QUESTIONS:

- To what extent did you ask questions that could be answered with a ‘yes’ or ‘no’ response or that sought very specific answers, details, or information about the child / youth and family’s past or current behavior and circumstances? These questions typically begin with the interrogative stems: “Could/can you,” “Do/did you,” “Are you,” or “Have you.”

..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4..... 5..... 6..... 7.....
NOT AT ALL	A LITTLE	INFREQUENTLY	SOMEWHAT	QUITE A BIT	CONSIDERABLY	EXTENSIVELY

Comments:

REFERENCES

- Ball, S. A., Bachrach, K., DeCarlo, J., Farentinos, C., Keen, M., McSherry, T., Polcin, D., Snead, N., Sockriter, R., Wrigley, P., Zammarelli, L., & Carroll, K. M. (2002). Characteristics, beliefs, and practices of community clinicians trained to provide manual-guided therapy for substance abusers. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, 23(4):309-18.
- Burke, B. L., Arkowitz, H., & Menchola, M. (2003). The efficacy of motivational interviewing: A meta-analysis of controlled trials. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 71, 843-861.
- Carroll, K. M., Connors, G. J., Cooney, N. L., DiClemente, C. C., Donovan, D. M., Longabaugh, R. L., Kadden, R. M., Rounsaville, B. J., Wirtz, P. W., & Zweben, A. (1998). Internal validity of Project MATCH treatments: Discriminability and integrity. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 66, 290-303.
- Carroll, K.M., Farentinos, C., Ball, S.A., Crits-Christoph, P., Libby, B., Morgenstern, J., Obert, J.L., Polcin, D. & Woody, G.E., for the Clinical Trials Network (2002). MET meets the real world: Design issues and clinical strategies in the Clinical Trials Network. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, 23, 73-80.
- Carroll, K. M., Nich, C., Sifry, R., Frankforter, T., Nuro, K. F., Ball, S. A., Fenton, L. R., & Rounsaville, B. J. (2000). A general system for evaluating therapist adherence and competence in psychotherapy research in the addictions. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 57, 225-238.
- McLellan, T. A., Kushner, H., Metzger, D., Peters, R., Smith, I., Grissom, G., Pettinati, H., & Argeriou, M. (1992). The 5th edition of the Addiction Severity Index. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, 9, 199-213.
- Miller, W. R. & Mount, K. A. (2001). A small study of training in motivational interviewing: does one workshop change clinician and client behavior? *Behavioural and Cognitive Psychotherapy*, 29, 457-471.
- Miller, W. R., & Rollnick, S. (2002). *Motivational Interviewing: Preparing People for Change* (2nd ed). New York: Guilford Press.
- Miller, W. R., Yahne, C. E., Moyers, T. B., Martinez, J., & Pirritano, M. (2004). A randomized trial of methods to help clinicians learn motivational interviewing. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 72, 6, 1050- 1062.
- Project MATCH Research Group. (1997). Matching alcoholism treatment to client heterogeneity: Project MATCH posttreatment drinking outcomes. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 58, 7-29.
- Project MATCH Research Group. (1998). Therapist effects in three treatments for alcohol problems. *Psychotherapy Research*, 8, 455-474.
- Sholomskas, D., Syracuse, G., Rounsaville, B. J., Ball, S. A., Nuro, K. F., & Carroll, K. M. (2005). We don't train in vain: A randomized trial of three strategies for training clinicians in CBT. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 73, 1, 106-115.