**PROFICIENCY TEST IN MOTIVATIONAL INTERVIEWING**

**ACCORDING TO MITI 4.2.1**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Recording id: | Name: | Target: | Date: |
| 46489057 | Martha Humphreys | 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)  2 |
| 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)  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. | (1-5)  2 |
| 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)  1 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Behaviour Counts | Total |
| Giving information | 14 |
| Persuade | 3 |
| Persuade with Permission | 0 |
| Questions | 15 |
| Simple Reflection | 1 |
| Complex Reflection | 1 |
| Affirm | 2 |
| Seeking Collaboration | 0 |
| Emphasizing Autonomy | 0 |
| Confront | 0 |

Summary of indices of coded skills demonstrated in the interview

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indices of proficiency |  | Level | |
|  |  | Fair | Good |
| Simple + Complex Reflections  Questions | = 0.13 | (≥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 | = 0.50 | (≥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 | = 2 | --- | --- |
| This is the total number of utterances or interactions within the encounter that were consistent with MI |  |  |  |
| Total MI Non Adherent  = Confront + Persuade | = 3 | --- | --- |
| This is the total number of utterances or interaction within the encounter that were inconsistent with MI |  |  |  |
| Relational Component:  Empathy + Partnership  2 | = 1.50 | (≥3.5) | (≥4.0) |
| Technical Component:  Cultivate Change talk + Softening Sustain talk  2 | = 3.00 | (≥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:

### *More reflections on the client´s thoughts and feeling would have affected 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.* *The clinician is giving advice without asking for permission by doing a Persuade, for example “…Maybe even that might be a good time to poke a pice of nicotine gum instead of a cigarette” (10:58) and “…one thought I have is to decreasing your cigarettes by one or two a day …” (23:01) which have negative impact on the Partnership score.* *The counsellor misses opportunities to encourage the client to elaborate on some potentially important reasons for change, eg (12:42) when he talks about his son and (18:43) when he says that he might sign up in a group” which affect the Cultivating Change Talk score negatively.*

### Important areas for improvement:

### *The counselor asks several evoking questions, eg “What are your biggest concerns around smoking” (11:22) and “If you were going to quit smoking, how might your life be different” (14:04). This contributed to the rating of the Cultivating Change talk score in a positive way.* *The counselor uses some Affirm utterances, for example “…that is wonderful…” (16:27) and “I think that is a wonderful plan” (22:19). These affect the rating of the Partnership score positively.* *The counselor had a Seeking Collaboration utterance, “Do you have any thought of what I said” (07:25)* *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.*