

## PROFICIENCY TEST IN MOTIVATIONAL INTERVIEWING ACCORDING TO MITI 4.2.1

Recording id:	Name:	Target:	Date:
46489078	Betsy Hinrichsen	Smoking cessation	2024-03-14

### Global Ratings

Technical Components	
<b>Cultivating Change Talk</b> This rating reflects your use of MI skills to highlight and strengthen the patient's own reasons for making a change.	(1-5) 4
<b>Softening Sustain Talk</b> This rating reflects your use of MI skills to validate the patient's barriers to change and guide them to consider possible reasons for change.	(1-5) 3
Relational Components	
<b>Partnership</b> This rating reflects your use of skills designed to build a collaborative working relationship with your patient, consistent with the Spirit of MI.	(1-5) 4
<b>Empathy</b> This rating reflects your use of skills designed to express warmth and understanding of your patient within their unique circumstances, consistent with the Spirit of MI.	(1-5) 3

Behaviour Counts	Total
Giving information	6
Persuade	1
Persuade with Permission	4
Questions	19

Simple Reflection	2
Complex Reflection	7
Affirm	6
Seeking Collaboration	6
Emphasizing Autonomy	0
Confront	0

### Summary of indices of coded skills demonstrated in the interview

Indices of proficiency		Level	
		Fair	Good
<p><u>Simple + Complex Reflections</u> Questions</p> <p>= 0.47</p> <p>This is the ratio of your reflections to your questions. Within MI, we aim for reflections to exceed questions, ideally with 3 or 4 (or more) reflections for every question.</p>		(≥1.0)	(≥2.0)
<p><u>Complex Reflections</u> Simple + Complex Reflections</p> <p>= 0.78</p> <p>This is the ratio of your complex reflections to your total number of reflections. Generally speaking, having a higher percentage of complex reflections suggests a better quality of MI interaction.</p>		(≥0.40)	(≥.50)
<p>Total MI Adherent = Seeking Collaboration + Affirm + Emphasizing Autonomy</p> <p>= 12</p> <p>This is the total number of utterances or interactions within the encounter that were consistent with MI</p>		---	---
<p>Total MI Non Adherent = Confront + Persuade</p> <p>= 1</p> <p>This is the total number of utterances or interaction within the encounter that were inconsistent with MI</p>		---	---

<p>Relational Component:  <math display="block">\frac{\text{Empathy} + \text{Partnership}}{2}</math> </p>	= 3.50	(≥3.5)	(≥4.0)
<p>Technical Component:  <math display="block">\frac{\text{Cultivate Change talk} + \text{Softening Sustain talk}}{2}</math> </p>	= 3.50	(≥3.0)	(≥4.0)

## Guidelines on the meaning of Empathy and Partnership

	Value	Proficient in relational skills	Things to consider in future use of MI
	1 – 2.5	Low	Risk of not being able to help the clients
	2.5 – 3.5	Fair	Continued training is recommended
	3.5 – 5.0	Good	Likely helpful for clients

## Guidelines on the meaning of technical variables

	Value	Proficient in technical skills	Things to consider in future use of MI
	1 – 2.5	Low	Risk of not being able to help the clients
	3.0	Fair	Continued training is recommended
	3.5 – 5.0	Good	Likely helpful for clients

## Clinician strengths:

*The Softening sustain talk score is negatively affected by the counselor's reflections on difficulties with making the change e.g. 07:00 "It's kind of a part of your own identity."*

*The Softening sustain talk score is negatively affected by the counselor's questions on difficulties with making the change, for example 13:25 "What do you see as the largest obstacle for cutting down?" which directs the consultation towards obstacles to change.*

*However, such a question also shows that the counselor wants to understand the client and affects the Empathy score in a positive way.*

*For a higher rating of the Empathy and the Partnership scores, the counselor could have tried to rephrase some of her questions into reflections. The counselor asks many questions, and trying to reformulate some of those into reflections, and into Complex Reflections in particular, would have yielded higher Empathy and Partnership ratings.*

## Important areas for improvement:

*The Cultivating change talk score is positively affected by reflections that may evoke the client reasons to change, like*

*07:50 "It sounds like you are concerned that your son might pick up the bad habits that you have picked up as well now."*

*The counselor asks several evoking questions, e.g. 08:10 "What things have you thought about changing in your life to move towards reducing your smoking at this point?"*

*This contributed to the rating of the Cultivating Change talk score in a positive way.*

*The Softening Sustain Talk score is positively affected when the clinician directs the consultation towards motives for change by doing reflections, and in particular double-sided and starts with the good things of status quo and ends with the reasons to change, for example 06:50 "So it feels like you are a little discouraged by your past attempts but you still have a goal and a desire to move in that direction."*

*Also, the Empathy score is positively affected because the clinician demonstrates an understanding of the client ambivalence.*

*The counselor makes affirmations that emphasizes that the client understands what he needs to do and keeps trying, for example 07:45 "That is quite an accomplishment that you have achieved."*

*This affects the rating of the Partnership score positively.*

*The Partnership score is positively affected by Seeking Collaboration utterances such as 22:30 "Is there any other way i can help you today?" which is helpful in focusing the conversation and also structures the session in a way that gives space for two people to collaborate towards a change goal, and these clinical behaviors are positive for the rating of the Partnership score.*

*The Empathy score is positively affected when the counselor demonstrates that she tries to understand the client's view, for example 06:10 "So how does smoking fit into your life these days, let me understand that a bit better."*

## How was the coding performed?

*The interview between the practitioner and the client (or actor) is reliably assessed according to a manual developed and validated for assessing how well MI is performed. The assessment is made by professional coders at MIC Lab whose reliability is regularly checked.*