

## PROFICIENCY TEST IN MOTIVATIONAL INTERVIEWING ACCORDING TO MITI 4.2.1

Recording id:	Name:	Target:	Date:
46489063	Jamie Smith	Agree to new plan to manage anxiety	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)  1
<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)  3
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)  2

Behaviour Counts	Total
Giving information	5
Persuade	8
Persuade with Permission	9
Questions	7

Simple Reflection	1
Complex Reflection	2
Affirm	2
Seeking Collaboration	2
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>= 0.43</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>= 0.67</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 + Emphazising Autonomy</p> <p>= 4</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>= 8</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>	= 2.00	(≥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:

*If the counselor had made questions and reflections on the client's motives to change the rating of the Cultivating change talk score had been positively affected.*

*The counselor had Seeking Collaboration utterances like 12:23 "we can look into that together and see what it is there to offer", which affect the Partnership score positively.*

*The counselor is directive, for example 5:21 "... Could we try doing something with having a little bit more security at home ..." and 5:51 "it would probably .... Some of the tension ...." and 7:15 "Have you ever tried, with your doctor, any other kind of medication ....?" and 8:53 "Taken it more than it is prescribed is probably not the best thing ...." and 9:46 "Have you tried to talk with a therapist?" This is a Persuade utterance, which has negative impact on the Partnership score.*

*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.*

## Important areas for improvement:

*The counselor makes affirmations that emphasizes that the client understands what he needs to do and keeps trying, for example 16:47 "you know yourself when you are there " and 17:04 "... you have positive attitude and that is really a good start .....". This affects the rating of the Partnership score positively.*

*Complex Reflections, such as 10:08 "... you don't get anything from their coping." and 12:58 "That is the hard piece of it" affect the Empathy score positively.*

*The counselor asks questions, that convey an understanding of the client perspectives, such as 12:50 "In the therapy, you have not met one you click with?", which affect the Empathy score in a positive way.*

*The counselor asks evoking questions, eg 8:33 "Is that more than you should be taken?" 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.*