**PROFICIENCY TEST IN MOTIVATIONAL INTERVIEWING**

**ACCORDING TO MITI 4.2.1**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Recording id: | Name: | Target: | Date: |
| 46489055 | Elizabeth Secundy | 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)  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. | (1-5)  3 |
| **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)  5 |
| 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)  4 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Behaviour Counts | Total |
| Giving information | 10 |
| Persuade | 0 |
| Persuade with Permission | 1 |
| Questions | 14 |
| Simple Reflection | 5 |
| Complex Reflection | 12 |
| Affirm | 5 |
| Seeking Collaboration | 4 |
| Emphasizing Autonomy | 1 |
| Confront | 0 |

Summary of indices of coded skills demonstrated in the interview

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indices of proficiency |  | Level | |
|  |  | Fair | Good |
| Simple + Complex Reflections  Questions | = 1.21 | (≥1.0) | (≥2.0) |
| 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. |  |  |  |
| Complex Reflections  Simple + Complex Reflections | = 0.71 | (≥0.40) | (≥.50) |
| 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. |  |  |  |
| Total MI Adherent  = Seeking Collaboration + Affirm + Emphazising Autonomy | = 10 | --- | --- |
| This is the total number of utterances or interactions within the encounter that were consistent with MI |  |  |  |
| Total MI Non Adherent  = Confront + Persuade | = 0 | --- | --- |
| This is the total number of utterances or interaction within the encounter that were inconsistent with MI |  |  |  |
| Relational Component:  Empathy + Partnership  2 | = 4.50 | (≥3.5) | (≥4.0) |
| Technical Component:  Cultivate Change talk + Softening Sustain talk  2 | = 3.50 | (≥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:

### *Some of the counselor's reflections reinforce the good things for the client about continuing as now, for example 11:52 “if you didn´t smoke you would not have that 5-minute break ….” and 12:13 “… it reduces your stress, you enjoy it, enjoy smoking” 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 10:41 tell me what makes it hard to quit …. What would be not so good things about quitting?” which directs the consultation towards obstacles to change. However, such a question also shows that the counselor wants to understand the client and affects 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 and also the Partnership score given the client more space for how to respond.*

### Important areas for improvement:

### *The Cultivating change talk score is positively affected by reflections that may evoke the client reasons to change, like 6:04 ”…. You are very motivated to quit smoking” and 7:27 “… knowing that would be in the best interest of your child that is definitely a motivating factor” and 18:06 “… what motivate you to stop …. your son, looking at your aunt … and more money ….”.* *The counselor asks several evoking questions, eg 9:06 ”what would change in your life if you stopped smoking?”. This contributed to the rating of the Cultivating Change talk score in a positive way* *The counselor uses some Affirm utterances, for example 6:43 “… quitting cold turkey is so hard, I cannot even believe you lasted …. ” and 17:38 “… give you a lot of credit for taking a first step ”. 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 19:25 “…. That would be something that you have to decide ….”* *The counselor had several Seeking Collaboration utterances like 8:57 ”… any question that you may have I will be happy to answer” and 18:35 “do you mind if I follow up with you or do you want to get back to me?”, 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.*