**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 | 2024-03-14 |

# 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)  1 |
| 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)  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)  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 |
| Simple + Complex Reflections  Questions | = 0.43 | (≥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 | = 0.67 | (≥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 | = 4 | --- | --- |
| This is the total number of utterances or interactions within the encounter that were consistent with MI |  |  |  |
| Total MI Non Adherent  = Confront + Persuade | = 8 | --- | --- |
| This is the total number of utterances or interaction within the encounter that were inconsistent with MI |  |  |  |
| Relational Component:  Empathy + Partnership  2 | = 2.00 | (≥3.5) | (≥4.0) |
| Technical Component:  Cultivate Change talk + Softening Sustain talk  2 | = 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 inti 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.*