

## PROFICIENCY TEST IN MOTIVATIONAL INTERVIEWING ACCORDING TO MITI 4.2.1

Recording id:	Name:	Target:	Date:
46489050	Allecia Reid	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) 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) 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) 4

Behaviour Counts	Total
Giving information	11
Persuade	1
Persuade with Permission	3
Questions	10

Simple Reflection	1
Complex Reflection	7
Affirm	3
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 = 0.80</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 = 0.88</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 = 4 = 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>	= 4.00	(≥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:

*The Softening sustain talk score is negatively affected by the counselor reflections on difficulties with making the change eg  
06:20 "It seems like alot right now."*

*The Partnership score is negatively affected by some Persuade utterances, eg  
16:00 "What would be a good day for you to set this quit date?"  
Here the counselor is a little too eager to get a commitment statement. The counselor corrects this verry skillfully at a later point and adjusts the ambition to the right level matching the clients motivation.*

*For a higher empathy score the counselor needs to make more reflections. A suggestion could be to vary the length and add some shorter reflections.*

## Important areas for improvement:

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

*09:25 "I'm hearing you saying that you do still have a desire to quit."*

*When the counselor asked about previous successful behavior changes affect the global ratings of the Cultivating Change talk score in a positive way, for example*

*06:30 "What things were helpful for you in that quitting attempt?"*

*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*

*04:24 "You were not sure if this was the right time for you to take on smoking but at the same time you sound really concerned about these health things you see going on with your aunt wanting to prevent those things from happening to you."*

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

*The Partnership score is positively affected by Seeking Collaboration utterances such as*

*13:08 "Would it be Ok with you if I say a little bit of what possibilities would be for moving forward?"*

*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 counselor uses sAffirm utterances, for example*

*16:55 "That's a great plan, taking it little by little."*

*These affect the rating of the Partnership score positively.*

*The Empathy score is positively affected when the counselor demonstrates that the counselor tries to understand the client view, for example*

*02:50 "You said that this year might be a little different, tell me more about what you meant by that?"*

## 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.*