

Motivational Interviewing

Review 10

Rubak, S., Sandbaek, A., Lauritzen, T., & Christensen, B. (2005). Motivational interviewing: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *British Journal of General Practice*, 55(513), 305–312. PubMed abstract available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15826439>.

Objectives	Evaluate the effectiveness of MI in different areas of disease and identify factors shaping outcomes.
Studies Included	Seventy-two U.S. and international studies published from 1991 to 2004
Participants in the Studies	Male and female adults and adolescents with a variety of medical conditions (diabetes, asthma, hypertension, HIV/AIDS), behavioral health issues (weight management, physical activity), or substance addiction (smoking, alcohol, and drugs)
Settings	Alcohol treatment centers, colleges, hospitals, emergency room, inpatient services, primary care offices, scientific settings , trauma centers, jails
Outcomes	Alcohol use, substance addiction, smoking cessation, biological and clinical measures for diabetes and asthma, body mass index, total blood cholesterol, utilization of health care services, adherence to treatment, adherence to lifestyle changes
Limitations of the Studies	Some of the included studies reported a positive effect or tendency for MI to be effective, but not all studies showed statistically significant effects for MI. Most of the studies were conducted in scientific settings, thus limiting the generalizability of results to real-world clinical settings.

Results

MI demonstrated an effect in 74% of the randomized controlled trials regardless of whether the problems were physiological or psychological. Certain factors such as number of counseling sessions, length of follow-up, and who delivers the MI intervention were identified as augmenting the impact of MI. Specifically, studies that included an intervention with more than five MI sessions produced larger effects than studies that only included one MI session, although these studies also showed an MI effect in 40% of the studies. Studies that included a longer follow-up period (over 3 months) revealed an effect compared to studies with a follow-up period shorter than 3 months. This review found the effectiveness of MI was not related to the educational background of the person delivering MI. Comparable effects were obtained whether the intervention was delivered by a medical doctor, psychologist, or other health care providers (midwives, dieticians, nurses). No studies showed MI to be harmful or to have adverse effects. This review found MI can be used in the treatment of a broad area of diseases that to some extent are influenced by behavior.