

PROFICIENCY TEST IN MOTIVATIONAL INTERVIEWING ACCORDING TO MITI 4.2.1

Recording id:	Name:	Target:	Date:
46489061	Ethan Rogers	Smoking cessation	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) 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) 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) 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) 2

Behaviour Counts	Total
Giving information	10
Persuade	1
Persuade with Permission	2
Questions	4

Simple Reflection	2
Complex Reflection	4
Affirm	1
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</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>	= 1.50	(≥1.0)	(≥2.0)
<p><u>Complex Reflections</u> Simple + Complex Reflections</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>	= 0.67	(≥0.40)	(≥.50)
<p>Total MI Adherent = 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>	= 2	---	---
<p>Total MI Non Adherent = Confront + Persuade</p> <p>This is the total number of utterances or interaction within the encounter that were inconsistent with MI</p>	= 1	---	---

<p>Relational Component: $\frac{\text{Empathy} + \text{Partnership}}{2}$ </p>	= 2.50	(≥3.5)	(≥4.0)
<p>Technical Component: $\frac{\text{Cultivate Change talk} + \text{Softening Sustain talk}}{2}$ </p>	= 3.50	(≥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:

The clinician is giving advice without asking for permission by doing a Persuade, for example 08:35 "Have you thought about..." It affects the Partnership Score negatively.

If the clinician had tried to understand the client's thoughts and feelings by doing Complex Reflections, it would have affected the Empathy Score positively.

Important areas for improvement:

The clinician is enhancing the client's reasons for making a change by doing a Complex Reflection, for example 07:40 "It sounds like you've had some health complications..." It affects the Cultivating Change Talk Score positively.

The clinician is involving the client in the problem solving by Seeking Collaboration and Persuading with Permission, for example 07:45 "...How do you feel about that?" It affects the Partnership Score positively.

The clinician is asking evoking Questions, for example 09:35 "Do you think there..." It affects the Cultivating Change Talk Score positively.

The clinician is enhancing the client's ideas by doing an Affirm, for example 14:00 "I think that's a great idea..." 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.