

## PROFICIENCY TEST IN MOTIVATIONAL INTERVIEWING ACCORDING TO MITI 4.2.1

Recording id:	Name:	Target:	Date:
46489068	Nicholas Stanley	Agree to new plan to manage anxiety	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) 3
<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) 3
<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) 4

Behaviour Counts	Total
Giving information	3
Persuade	1
Persuade with Permission	3
Questions	17

Simple Reflection	4
Complex Reflection	3
Affirm	2
Seeking Collaboration	1
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 = 0.41</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>	( $\geq 1.0$ )	( $\geq 2.0$ )
<p><u>Complex Reflections</u> Simple + Complex Reflections = 0.43</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>	( $\geq 0.40$ )	( $\geq .50$ )
<p>Total MI Adherent = 3 = Seeking Collaboration + Affirm + Emphasizing Autonomy</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 = 1 = Confront + Persuade</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>	= 3.00	(≥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:

*If more suggestions and questions were rephrased into reflections a more balanced partnership might have developed between the client and the counselor, which had affected the Partnership score positively.*

*The counselor is directive, for example 18:48 “and with regards to your sleeping – do you think that tonight would be an opportunity to kind of explore ...”. This is a Persuade utterance, which has negative impact on the Partnership score.*

*For a higher rating of the Partnership score, the counselor could have emphasized the client control more.*

*If some questions had been rephrased as reflections and particularly as Complex reflections the Empathy score had been affected in a positive way and also the Partnership score given the client more space for how to respond.*

*The Partnership score is positively affected by the practitioner seeking to explore the client's views and opinions, for example 12:27 “... how would you feel about ....?”*

## Important areas for improvement:

*The counselor asks several evoking questions, eg 6:07 “How do you think that this anxiety has held you back from living ...?” and 13:41 “What are your thought about that?” This contributed to the rating of the Cultivating Change talk score in a positive way.*

*The counselor makes affirmations that emphasizes that the client understands what she needs to do and keeps trying, for example 9:27 “you have a will to get there ...” and 12:14 “... that is something you are looking to kind of take a look at....”*

*The counselor demonstrates that she listens to the client and is trying to understand the client's perspective. The counselor makes several Reflections, such as 6:43 “It gets overwhelming” and 8:31 “... the relationship between you and your husband .... because of the financial aspect ...”, and 12:02 “...coming into a routine that could benefit not only the relationship between you and your husband but possibly also ...” This affects the rating of 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.*