PROFICIENCY TEST IN MOTIVATIONAL INTERVIEWING ACCORDING TO MITI 4.2.1

Recording id:	Name:	Target:	Date:
46489064	Katie Kiehn	Reduce use of opioids	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) 4
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	3
Persuade	1
Persuade with Permission	0
Questions	18

Simple Reflection	3
Complex Reflection	8
Affirm	1
Seeking Collaboration	2
Emphasizing Autonomy	0
Confront	0

Summary of indices of coded skills demonstrated in the interview

Indices of proficiency		Level	
		Fair	Good
$\underline{\text{Simple + Complex Reflections}}$ 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.	= 0.61	(≥1.0)	(≥2.0)
$\underline{\text{Complex Reflections}}$ 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.	= 0.73	(≥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	= 3	---	---
Total MI Non Adherent = Confront + Persuade This is the total number of utterances or interaction within the encounter that were inconsistent with MI	= 1	---	---

Relational Component: $\dfrac{\text{Empathy + Partnership}}{2}$	= 4.00	(≥3.5)	(≥4.0)
Technical Component: $\dfrac{\text{Cultivate Change talk + Softening Sustain talk}}{2}$	= 4.00	(≥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 the counselor had made further efforts to Seek collaboration and emphasize client autonomy, this would have yielded a higher rating of the Partnership score.

The Partnership score is negatively affected by a Persuade utterance, eg 5:25 "I have some concern about that ….".

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.

Important areas for improvement:

The counselor demonstrates that she listens to the client and is trying to understand the client's perspective. She makes several Complex Reflections, such as 5:20 "I know that you are wanting to increase …" and 19:51 "…. people understand and having a group to connect with". This affects the rating of the Empathy score positively.

The counselor had Seeking Collaboration utterances like 7:16 "… alternatives that would be helpful. Would you be open about that?...." and 21:04 "…. Does that sound all right with you?", which affect the Partnership score positively.

The counselor makes an affirmation that emphasizes that the client understands what she needs to do and keeps trying, for example 21:03 "..I think your openness to wanting to … is good …". This affects the rating of the Partnership score positively.

The counselor asks several evoking questions, eg 6:22 "How do you feel …you are dependent on it?" and 7:55 "What makes you feel bad about taken it?" and 9:16 "What do you think they are judging you about?" and 13:28 "The medicine has a positive effect on … Are there other effects of the medicine that you not …?" This contributed to the rating of the Cultivating Change talk score in a positive way.

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 11:36 "We need to treat your pain but we also need to take in consideration your concerns about the dependence …"

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.