

PROFICIENCY TEST IN MOTIVATIONAL INTERVIEWING ACCORDING TO MITI 4.2.1

Recording id:	Name:	Target:	Date:
46489072	Hanaa Madani	Smoking cessation	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) 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) 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) 3

Behaviour Counts	Total
Giving information	6
Persuade	2
Persuade with Permission	4
Questions	21

Simple Reflection	5
Complex Reflection	4
Affirm	1
Seeking Collaboration	1
Emphasizing Autonomy	3
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</p> <p>= 0.43</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</p> <p>= 0.44</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 = Seeking Collaboration + Affirm + Emphasizing Autonomy</p> <p>= 5</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 = Confront + Persuade</p> <p>= 2</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:

There is room for more reflective listening in this session and some utterances could have been rephrased into reflections. That affect the Empathy score negatively.

For a higher rating of the Empathy score, the counsellor could have used more Complex Reflections.

The rating of Partnership score is negatively affected when the counselor makes suggestions and advices without involving the client in evaluating, for example 8:47 “when you are using the patch and the gum But it is taking away the health risk you are getting with smoking. That is something to consider” and 14:34 “... and when you not tried the patch before ... also having that keep the craving ...”

The Softening sustain talk score is negatively affected by the counselor questions on reasons to smoke, like 3:49 “what do you feel your idea about smoking is?” and 4:32 “on the days when you feel that you need to smoke – what exactly does it do for you?” and reflections on reasons to smoke, for example 6:20 “.... It is a reward after completing tasks ”. The conversation is directed towards reasons for change which affect the Softening sustain talk score negatively.

Important areas for improvement:

The Empathy score is positively affected when the counselor demonstrates that she tries to understand the client view, for example 8:00 “the patch or the ” and 9:46 “... and you were kind of glad to have gone away from that conversation” and 15:45 “... I know you were not keen on discussing with the doctor”

The counselor uses an Affirm utterance, like 15:46 “... so that you have a call with me is showing some sort of interest”. This affects the rating of the Partnership score positively.

The counselor makes utterances, which emphasize the client autonomy, which is positive for the Partnership score eg 14:01 “if you do decide ... reducing or quitting”

The Cultivating change talk score is positively affected by questions that may evoke the client reasons to change, like 5:23 “on the days when you feel like maybe you want to quit – what kind of prompts those thoughts?”

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.