

PROFICIENCY TEST IN MOTIVATIONAL INTERVIEWING ACCORDING TO MITI 4.2.1

Recording id:	Name:	Target:	Date:
46489070	Diane Russo	Reduce blood pressure	2024-03-14

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) 4

Behaviour Counts	Total
Giving information	13
Persuade	1
Persuade with Permission	8
Questions	12

Simple Reflection	2
Complex Reflection	6
Affirm	2
Seeking Collaboration	4
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 = 0.67</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 = 0.75</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 = 6 = Seeking Collaboration + Affirm + Emphazising 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: $\frac{\text{Empathy} + \text{Partnership}}{2}$ </p>	= 3.50	(≥3.5)	(≥4.0)
<p>Technical Component: $\frac{\text{Cultivate Change talk} + \text{Softening Sustain talk}}{2}$ </p>	= 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:

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.

The counselor is directive, for example 12:29 "... that would be important to figure out with your primary care doctor". This is a Persuade utterance, which has negative impact on the Partnership score.

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 (status quo), and explored the benefits of implementing a change.

The Softening sustain talk score is negatively affected by the counselor reflections on difficulties with making the change eg 11:15 "That can be overwhelming for shore". However, such a reflection also shows that the counselor wants to understand the client and affects the Empathy score in a positive way.

Important areas for improvement:

The counselor makes affirmations that emphasizes that the client understands what he needs to do and keeps trying, for example 11:49 "... you have a good sense of the need to take the medication and then that it is some connection between the diet" and 16:12 "... aware of a few different areas that can be affecting your blood pressure". This affects the rating of the Partnership score positively.

The Cultivating change talk score is positively affected by reflections that may evoke the client reasons to change, like 7:21 "... overall it is not a particular point of concern or stress by having that recent blood pressure reading that was higher than usual is something that is concerning for you...."

The Partnership score is positively affected by the practitioner seeking to explore the client's views and opinions, for example 8:28 "is that something you would be open to either a change in your medication or discussing that or something else ...?" and 13:48 ".... Is that something you would be open to looking into again ...?"

The counselor demonstrates that she listens to the client and is trying to understand the client's perspective. The counselor makes Reflections, such as 14:25 ".... Taste is definitely a consideration but then also to make sure that is healthy" and 17:07 "... being more specific on". 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.