PROFICIENCY TEST IN MOTIVATIONAL INTERVIEWING ACCORDING TO MITI 4.2.1

Recording id:	Name:	Target:	Date:
46489074	Juliette Holtzman	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) 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) 2

Behaviour Counts	**Total**
Giving information	4
Persuade	0
Persuade with Permission	1
Questions	14

Simple Reflection	1
Complex Reflection	1
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
<u>Simple + Complex Reflections</u> 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.	= 0.14	(≥1.0)	(≥2.0)
<u>Complex Reflections</u> 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.	= 0.50	(≥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	= 0	---	---

Relational Component: Empathy + Partnership 2	= 2.50	(≥3.5)	(≥4.0)
Technical Component: Cultivate Change talk + Softening Sustain talk 2	= 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:

The clinician is asking about positive aspects of smoking, for example 10:25 "What are some of the good things…" It affects the Softening Sustain Talk Score negatively.

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

14:40 - 15:30 The clinician is dominating the conversation by talking for almost one minute without involving the client. It affects the Partnership Score negatively.

Important areas for improvement:

The clinician is asking evoking Questions, for example 05:50 "Is it anything that is driving this…" It affects the Cultivating Change Talk Score positively.

The clinician is asking about negative aspects of smoking, for example 11:00 "What are some not good things…" It affects the Cultivating Change Talk Score positively.

The clinicians enhancing the client's strengths by doing an Affirm, for example 06:48 "It seems like you have some really good insight…" It affects the Partnership Score positively.

The clinician is trying to understand the client's thoughts and feelings by doing a Complex Reflection, for example 09:20 "…and having the support…" It affects 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.