

## PROFICIENCY TEST IN MOTIVATIONAL INTERVIEWING ACCORDING TO MITI 4.2.1

Recording id:	Name:	Target:	Date:
46489069	Sneha Shankar	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) 3
<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) 3
<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) 4

Behaviour Counts	Total
Giving information	11
Persuade	2
Persuade with Permission	4
Questions	16

Simple Reflection	7
Complex Reflection	7
Affirm	2
Seeking Collaboration	3
Emphasizing Autonomy	1
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>= 0.88</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>= 0.50</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 = Seeking Collaboration + Affirm + Emphazising Autonomy</p> <p>= 6</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>= 2</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>	= 3.50	(≥3.5)	(≥4.0)
<p>Technical Component:  <math display="block">\frac{\text{Cultivate Change talk} + \text{Softening Sustain talk}}{2}</math> </p>	= 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:

*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.*

*For a higher rating of the Empathy and the Partnership scores, the counselor could have tried to reduce her speech space. The counselor has long word flows, which reduce the space for the client to express her thoughts and feelings. Complex Reflections in particular, would have yielded higher Empathy and Partnership ratings.*

*The Partnership score is negatively affected by some Persuade utterances, eg 16:34 "... sometimes what we instead can focus on is looking at the sky ..."*

*Some of the counselor's reflections reinforce the good things for the client about continuing as now, for example 8:11 "you still feel good every time you take it ....." and therefore affect the rating of the Softening Sustain Talk score negatively.*

*The Softening sustain talk score is negatively affected by the counselor's questions on difficulties with making the change, for example 6:50 "... intrusive thoughts – how does those change after you take clozepam?", which directs the consultation towards obstacles to change*

*The counselor explored potential obstacles to successful change, for example 5:23 "... an uncomfortable feeling " and 15:04 "... and that is discouraging ....". She explores what the factors that will make it hard are, which affects the Softening sustain talk score negatively.*

## Important areas for improvement:

*The counselor uses some Affirm utterances, for example 12:55 "... I think that is a great first step ...." and 18:34 "... I appreciate that you are willing to try ...". These affect the rating of the Partnership score positively.*

*The counselor makes utterances, which emphasize the client autonomy, which is positive for the Partnership score eg 20:24 "... a big decision .... make sense that you ... before really making a decision".*

*The Partnership score is positively affected by the practitioner seeking to explore the client's views and opinions, for example 8:45 "What do you think about that?"*

*The Empathy score is positively affected by the practitioner demonstrating an effort to understand the client's perspective through Complex reflections that extend beyond what the client expressed in the conversation, for example 4:40 "... it sounds like it is overwhelming and ... a terrible feeling to have "*

## 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.*