

## PROFICIENCY TEST IN MOTIVATIONAL INTERVIEWING ACCORDING TO MITI 4.2.1

Recording id:	Name:	Target:	Date:
46489071	Kizmet Johnson	Smoking cessation	2024-03-04

### Global Ratings

Technical Components	
<b>Cultivating Change Talk</b> This rating reflects your use of MI skills to highlight and strengthen the patient's own reasons for making a change.	(1-5) 2
<b>Softening Sustain Talk</b> 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) 2
Relational Components	
<b>Partnership</b> 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
<b>Empathy</b> 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	9
Persuade	8
Persuade with Permission	4
Questions	13

Simple Reflection	7
Complex Reflection	4
Affirm	1
Seeking Collaboration	1
Emphasizing Autonomy	0
Confront	1

### 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>= 0.85</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>= 0.36</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>= 2</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>= 9</p> <p>This is the total number of utterances or interaction within the encounter that were inconsistent with MI</p>		---	---

<p>Relational Component:  <math display="block">\frac{\text{Empathy} + \text{Partnership}}{2}</math> </p>	= 1.50	(≥3.5)	(≥4.0)
<p>Technical Component:  <math display="block">\frac{\text{Cultivate Change talk} + \text{Softening Sustain talk}}{2}</math> </p>	= 2.00	(≥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:

*Disturbing sounds and signals during the call made reliable coding difficult*

*If some questions had been rephrased as reflections and particularly as Complex reflections the Empathy score had been affected in a positive way and also the Partnership score given the client more space for how to respond.*

*If the counselor had used utterances to Affirm the client's resources and accomplishments, the Partnership score had been positively affected.*

*The rating of Partnership score is negatively affected when the counselor makes suggestions and advices without involving the client in evaluating, for example 6:39 "Have you ever tried using nicotine gum, patches or ....?" and 8:00 "It is not gona happen over night ...it is not gona be easy" and 9:08 "Don't you think all those benefits would ....trying to put in the effort to stop smoking?"*

*For a higher rating of the Partnership score, the counselor could have emphasized the client control.*

*The counselor makes Persuade utterances which eg, 7:16 "Are your cigarettes covered by your insurance?", which have negative impact on the Partnership score.*

*The Softening sustain talk score is negatively affected by the counselor reflections on difficulties with making the change eg 15:32 "It is definitely gona be heard, not gona be easy"*

## 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 Reflections, such as 6:15 “that sounds more like a habit”. This affects the rating of the Empathy score positively.*

*The counselor makes an affirmation that emphasizes that the client understands what she needs to do and keeps trying, for example 17:09 “.... Help yourself come up with a solution”*

*The Partnership score is positively affected by the practitioner seeking to explore the client's views and opinions, for example 13:32 “Do you think it would be helpful for you to ...?”*

*The Cultivating change talk score is positively affected by reflections that may evoke the client reasons to change, like 8:46 “... your health improving ... some breath ... money ...positive things” and 11:49 “so, that are other factors that ..”*

## 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.*