

## PROFICIENCY TEST IN MOTIVATIONAL INTERVIEWING ACCORDING TO MITI 4.2.1

Recording id:	Name:	Target:	Date:
46489076	Alison Carrillo	Reduce use of opioids	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) 2
<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) 4
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) 2

Behaviour Counts	Total
Giving information	4
Persuade	0
Persuade with Permission	1
Questions	11

Simple Reflection	1
Complex Reflection	4
Affirm	1
Seeking Collaboration	0
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 = 0.45</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 = 0.80</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 = 1 = 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 = 0 = 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>	= 2.50	(≥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 the clinician had asked about the benefits of making a change and explored the reasons, it would have affected the Cultivated Change Talk Score positively.*

*If the clinician had involved the client in the decision making by Seeking Collaboration as well as emphasized the client autonomy and control, it would have affected the Partnership Score positively.*

*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.*

## Important areas for improvement:

*The clinician is leading into the reasons for making a change by asking, for example 10:10 "Do you feel like that is..." It affects the Cultivating Change Talk Score positively.*

*The clinician is leading into the reasons for making a change by doing a Complex Reflection, for example 11:40 "I hear you talk about...but you're also really concerned..." It directs the consultation towards change and affects the Softening Sustain Talk Score positively.*

*The clinician is trying to understand her client's thoughts and feelings by doing a Complex Reflection, for example 15:30 "It sounds really..." It affects the Empathy Score positively.*

*The clinician is enhancing the client's ambitions by doing an Affirm, for example 20:15 "I'm glad...and that you're willing to consider that..." It affects the Partnership 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.*