

PROFICIENCY TEST IN MOTIVATIONAL INTERVIEWING ACCORDING TO MITI 4.2.1

| Recording id: | Name: | Target: | Date: |
|---------------|------------------|-------------------|------------|
| 46489057 | Martha Humphreys | 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) 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) 2 |
| 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) 1 |

| Behaviour Counts | Total |
|--------------------------|-------|
| Giving information | 14 |
| Persuade | 3 |
| Persuade with Permission | 0 |
| Questions | 15 |

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Simple Reflection | 1 |
| Complex Reflection | 1 |
| Affirm | 2 |
| Seeking Collaboration | 0 |
| 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 = 0.13</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 = 0.50</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 = 2 = 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> | --- | --- |
| <p>Total MI Non Adherent = 3 = 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> | = 1.50 | (≥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:

More reflections on the client's thoughts and feeling would have affected the Empathy score in a positive way. If some questions had been rephrased as reflections and particularly as Complex reflections the Empathy score had been affected in a positive way.

The clinician is giving advice without asking for permission by doing a Persuade, for example "...Maybe even that might be a good time to poke a piece of nicotine gum instead of a cigarette" (10:58) and "...one thought I have is to decreasing your cigarettes by one or two a day ..." (23:01) which have negative impact on the Partnership score.

The counsellor misses opportunities to encourage the client to elaborate on some potentially important reasons for change, eg (12:42) when he talks about his son and (18:43) when he says that he might sign up in a group" which affect the Cultivating Change Talk score negatively.

Important areas for improvement:

The counselor asks several evoking questions, eg "What are your biggest concerns around smoking" (11:22) and "If you were going to quit smoking, how might your life be different" (14:04). This contributed to the rating of the Cultivating Change talk score in a positive way.

The counselor uses some Affirm utterances, for example "...that is wonderful..." (16:27) and "I think that is a wonderful plan" (22:19). These affect the rating of the Partnership score positively.

The counselor had a Seeking Collaboration utterance, "Do you have any thought of what I said" (07:25) which affect 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.