

PROFICIENCY TEST IN MOTIVATIONAL INTERVIEWING ACCORDING TO MITI 4.2.1

Recording id:	Name:	Target:	Date:
46489051	John Holtzaple	Reduce blood pressure	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) 3
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) 4
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) 4
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) 4

Behaviour Counts	Total
Giving information	10
Persuade	3
Persuade with Permission	1
Questions	13

Simple Reflection	3
Complex Reflection	16
Affirm	1
Seeking Collaboration	7
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 = 1.46</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 = 0.84</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)	($\geq .50$)
<p>Total MI Adherent = 8 = 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 = 3 = 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: $\frac{\text{Empathy} + \text{Partnership}}{2}$ </p>	= 4.00	(≥3.5)	(≥4.0)
<p>Technical Component: $\frac{\text{Cultivate Change talk} + \text{Softening Sustain talk}}{2}$ </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 Partnership score is negatively affected by some Persuade utterances, eg
17:30 "Or if you want to start with one extra walk per week and plan from there."*

The practitioner shows great skill in probing what kind of changes the client is willing to do to lower the blood pressure.

For a higher score at Cultivating Change Talk, more time must be spent on exploring the benefits of change. For example the client mentions that he doesn't want to be a burden for the family and relatives. Are there more reasons the client thinks are important and is it possible to deepen the conversation around those topics?

Important areas for improvement:

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

*03:14 "So you are interested in getting your blood pressure in control."
and like*

13:45 "So a priority for you would be something that is gentle, something you enjoy and that wouldn't put you at risk, something like the sunday walks with your wife."

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

*03:08 "Would it be Ok for us to have a conversation about blood pressure?"
and such as*

15:38 "I wonder how that number sounds to you?"

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 view, for example

05:10 "Tell me a little bit more about that, what sort of differences might you expect?"

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.