MIC Lab

PROFICIENCY TEST IN MOTIVATIONAL INTERVIEWING ACCORDING TO MITI 4.2.1

Recording id: 46489067

Name: Michael Charles

Date: 2024-03-02 17:26:09

Target Change: Smoking cessation

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	2 5 2		3	4
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	2 5 (4)		3	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	2 5 (3)		3	4
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	2 5 (2)		3	4

Behaviour Counts	Total
Giving information	9
Persuade	4
Persuade with Permission	4
Questions	10

Simple Reflection	2
Complex Reflection	1
Affirm	0
Seeking Collaboration	4
Emphasizing Autonomy	0
Confront	0

Summary of indices of coded skills demonstrated in the interview

Indices of proficiency		Level	
		Fair	Good
<u>Simple + Complex Reflections</u> 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.	= 0.3	(≥1.0)	(≥2.0)
<u>Complex Reflections</u> 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.	= 0.3	(≥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	= 4	---	---
Total MI Non Adherent = Confront + Persuade This is the total number of utterances or interaction within the encounter that were inconsistent with MI	= 4	---	---

Relational Component: Empathy + Partnership 2	= 2.5	(≥3.5)	(≥4.0)
Technical Component: Cultivate Change talk + Softening Sustain talk 2	= 3.0	(≥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:

06:40 The client mentions reasons for making a change, such as getting back to work, if the clinician had explored the reason for making a change, it would have affected the Cultivating Change positively. The clinician is giving advice without asking for permission by doing a Persuade, for example 17:00 "…Maybe physical therapy is…" It affects the Partnership Score negatively. 17:20 - 19:00 The clinician is dominating the conversation by talking for almost two minutes without involving the client. It affects the Partnership Score negatively.

Important areas for improvement:

The clinician is asking evoking Questions, for example 08:50 "Do you have any concerns about that?" It affects the Cultivating Change Talk Score positively. The clinician is enhancing the client's concerns with the medication by doing a Simple Reflection, for example 09:30 "So you are concerned that…" It affects the Cultivating Change Talk Score positively. The clinician gives the client the possibility to decide on the subject by Seeking Collaboration, for example 12:00 "Would you be open to…" It affects the Partnership Score positively.The clinician is involving the client in the decision making by Seeking Collaboration, for example 12:40 "What do you think about that?" It affects 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.

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

4