

PROFICIENCY TEST IN MOTIVATIONAL INTERVIEWING ACCORDING TO MITI 4.2.1

Recording id:	Name:	Target:	Date:
46489068	Nicholas Stanley	Agree to new plan to manage anxiety	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) 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	3
Persuade	1
Persuade with Permission	3
Questions	17

Simple Reflection	4
Complex Reflection	3
Affirm	2
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 = 0.41</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 = 0.43</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 = 3 = 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: $\frac{\text{Empathy} + \text{Partnership}}{2}$ </p>	= 3.50	(≥3.5)	(≥4.0)
<p>Technical Component: $\frac{\text{Cultivate Change talk} + \text{Softening Sustain talk}}{2}$ </p>	= 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 more suggestions and questions were rephrased into reflections a more balanced partnership might have developed between the client and the counselor, which had affected the Partnership score positively.

The counselor is directive, for example 18:48 “and with regards to your sleeping – do you think that tonight would be an opportunity to kind of explore ...”. This is a Persuade utterance, which has negative impact on the Partnership score.

For a higher rating of the Partnership score, the counselor could have emphasized the client control more.

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.

The Partnership score is positively affected by the practitioner seeking to explore the client's views and opinions, for example 12:27 “... how would you feel about?”

Important areas for improvement:

The counselor asks several evoking questions, eg 6:07 “How do you think that this anxiety has held you back from living ...?” and 13:41 “What are your thought about that?” This contributed to the rating of the Cultivating Change talk score in a positive way.

The counselor makes affirmations that emphasizes that the client understands what she needs to do and keeps trying, for example 9:27 “you have a will to get there ...” and 12:14 “... that is something you are looking to kind of take a look at....”

The counselor demonstrates that she listens to the client and is trying to understand the client's perspective. The counselor makes several Reflections, such as 6:43 “It gets overwhelming” and 8:31 “... the relationship between you and your husband because of the financial aspect ...”, and 12:02 “...coming into a routine that could benefit not only the relationship between you and your husband but possibly also ...” 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.