PROFICIENCY TEST IN MOTIVATIONAL INTERVIEWING ACCORDING TO MITI 4.2.1

Recording id:	Name:	Target:	Date:
46489062	Hannah Mainard	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) 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) 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) 3

Behaviour Counts	Total
Giving information	7
Persuade	3
Persuade with Permission	2
Questions	20

Simple Reflection	5
Complex Reflection	3
Affirm	1
Seeking Collaboration	1
Emphasizing Autonomy	0
Confront	2

Summary of indices of coded skills demonstrated in the interview

Indices of proficiency		Level	
		Fair	Good
$\underline{\text{Simple + Complex Reflections}}$ 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.	= 0.40	(≥1.0)	(≥2.0)
$\underline{\text{Complex Reflections}}$ 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.	= 0.38	(≥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	= 2	---	---
Total MI Non Adherent = Confront + Persuade This is the total number of utterances or interaction within the encounter that were inconsistent with MI	= 5	---	---

Relational Component: $\dfrac{Empathy + Partnership}{2}$	= 3.00	(≥3.5)	(≥4.0)
Technical Component: $\dfrac{Cultivate\ Change\ talk + Softening\ Sustain\ talk}{2}$	= 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:

The Softening sustain talk score is negatively affected by the counselor´s questions on difficulties with making the change, for example 13:19 ”What benefits do you feel it does for your body? … Is it …?” and 4:34 “on the days where you feel that you need to smoke – what exactly does it give for you?” which directs the consultation towards obstacles to change. However, such a question also shows that the counselor wants to understand the client and affects the Empathy score in a positive way.

The Cultivating change talk score would have been positively affected if the counsellor had explored on a deeper level disadvantages of the situation as it is now (status quo), and explored the benefits of implementing a change. For example how quitting would affect her son, her chest infections, her breath

If more questions were rephrased into reflections a more balanced partnership might have developed between the client and the counselor.

The counselor is directive, for example 8:51 ”… you are still giving your body the nicotine but it is taking away the health risk … so that is something to consider”. This is a Persuade utterance, which has negative impact on the Partnership score.

For a higher rating of the Empathy and the Partnership scores, the counselor could have tried to rephrase some of her questions into reflections. The counselor asks many questions, and trying to reformulate some of those into reflections, and into Complex Reflections in particular, would have yielded higher Empathy and Partnership ratings.

® Protocol of MITI 4.2.1 by Dan Mullin, Lars Forsberg, Carola Hellberg; www.miclabglobal.com,   E-mail: contact@miclabglobal.com

4

Important areas for improvement:

The counselor demonstrates that she listens to the client and is trying to understand the client's perspective. The counselor makes some Complex Reflections, such as 9:46 "… and you were kind of glad to getting away from that conversation ". This affects the rating of the Empathy score positively.

The counselor makes utterances, which emphasize the client autonomy, which is positive for the Partnership score eg 14:04 "If you do decide that …?"

The counselor uses an Affirm utterance, like 15:51 "… showing some sort of interest ….". This affects the rating of the Partnership score positively.

The Partnership score is positively affected by Seeking Collaboration utterances such as 15:07 "I just want to make sure that you have all the resources that we can provide you with …", which is helpful in focusing the conversation and also structures the session in a way that gives space for two people to collaborate towards a change goal, and these clinical behaviors are positive for the rating of the Partnership score.

The counselor asks several evoking questions, eg 3:53 "… What do you feel your idea about smoking is?" and 5:19 "and on the days where you feel that maybe you want to quit – what kind of prompts those thoughts?". This contributed to the rating of the Cultivating Change talk score in a positive way.

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.

® Protocol of MITI 4.2.1 by Dan Mullin, Lars Forsberg, Carola Hellberg; www.miclabglobal.com, E-mail: contact@miclabglobal.com

5