PROFICIENCY TEST IN MOTIVATIONAL INTERVIEWING ACCORDING TO MITI 4.2.1

Recording id:	Name:	Target:	Date:
46489077	Caroline Carter	Smoking cessation	2024-03-04

Global Ratings

Technical Components	
Cultivating Change Talk This rating reflects your use of MI skills to highlight and strengthen the patient's own reasons for making a change.	(1-5) 2
Softening Sustain Talk 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	
Partnership 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) 3
Empathy 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	9
Persuade	4
Persuade with Permission	4
Questions	14

Simple Reflection	3
Complex Reflection	2
Affirm	5
Seeking Collaboration	3
Emphasizing Autonomy	1
Confront	0

Summary of indices of coded skills demonstrated in the interview

Indices of proficiency		Level	
		Fair	Good
<u>Simple + Complex Reflections</u> Questions 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.	= 0.36	(≥1.0)	(≥2.0)
<u>Complex Reflections</u> Simple + Complex Reflections 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.	= 0.40	(≥0.40)	(≥.50)
Total MI Adherent = Seeking Collaboration + Affirm + Emphazising Autonomy This is the total number of utterances or interactions within the encounter that were consistent with MI	= 9	---	---
Total MI Non Adherent = Confront + Persuade This is the total number of utterances or interaction within the encounter that were inconsistent with MI	= 4	---	---

Relational Component: Empathy + Partnership 2 = 3.00	(≥3.5)	(≥4.0)
Technical Component: Cultivate Change talk + Softening Sustain talk 2 = 2.50	(≥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:

There is room for more reflective listening in this session and some utterances could have been rephrased into reflections. That affect the Empathy score negatively.

The counselor explored potential obstacles to successful change. She does acknowledge that some of the proposed changes will be hard, and she explores what the factors that will make it hard are, which affects the Softening sustain talk score negatively, for example 6:51 "you bring up a really good point … I wonder how you feel when you didn´t succeed …?" However, such a question also shows that the counselor wants to understand the client and affects the Empathy score in a positive way.

The Cultivating change talk score would have been positively affected if the counsellor had explored on a deeper level disadvantages of the situation as it is now, and explored the benefits of implementing a change.

The counselor is directive, for example 4:13 "Since many people do understand the detrimental effects of smoking …. that you do understand the detrimental effects of smoking" and 19:27 "…a conversation before March so that we can develop a ….". This is Persuade utterances, which has negative impact on the Partnership score.

Important areas for improvement:

The counsellor asks some evocative questions that positively affect the Cultivating Change Talk score, eg. 8:39 "… what would be the benefit to you?" and 13:45 "What do you think would get you to a 60% chance?"

The counselor uses some Affirm utterances, for example 8:17 "…you have a lot of power over that …" and 10:51 "and that can be a really good strategy ….." and 14:32 "I love that idea …" These affect the rating of the Partnership score positively.

The counselor makes an utterance, which emphasize the client autonomy, which is positive for the Partnership score eg 8:05 "… this is your life, you are an adult, you have autonomy. This is all about your choice …. "

The counselor had several Seeking Collaboration utterances like 12:33 "… I can help support you with that " and 14:52 "I have an idea – if I can share it with you ", which affect the Partnership score positively.

The counselor uses Reflections, such as 5:31 "probably a couple of reasons …. and smoking less …." and 18:37 "that sounds like a strong factor ….", which affect the Empathy score positively.

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.

® Protocol of MITI 4.2.1 by Dan Mullin, Lars Forsberg, Carola Hellberg; www.miclabglobal.com, E-mail: contact@miclabglobal.com

5