**PROFICIENCY TEST IN MOTIVATIONAL INTERVIEWING**

**ACCORDING TO MITI 4.2.1**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Recording id: | Name: | Target: | Date: |
| 46489071 | Kizmet Johnson | 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)  2 |
| **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 | 9 |
| Persuade | 8 |
| Persuade with Permission | 4 |
| Questions | 13 |
| Simple Reflection | 7 |
| Complex Reflection | 4 |
| Affirm | 1 |
| Seeking Collaboration | 1 |
| Emphasizing Autonomy | 0 |
| Confront | 1 |

Summary of indices of coded skills demonstrated in the interview

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indices of proficiency |  | Level | |
|  |  | Fair | Good |
| Simple + Complex Reflections  Questions | = 0.85 | (≥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 | = 0.36 | (≥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 | = 9 | --- | --- |
| 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 | = 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:

### *Disturbing sounds and signals during the call made reliable coding difficult* *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.* *If the counselor had used utterances to Affirm the client´s resources and accomplishments, the Partnership score had been positively affected.* *The rating of Partnership score is negatively affected when the counselor makes suggestions and advices without involving the client in evaluating, for example 6:39 “Have you ever tried using nicotine gum, patches or ….?” and 8:00 “It is not gona happen over night …it is not gona be easy” and 9:08 “Don´t you think all those benefits would ….trying to put in the effort to stop smoking?”* *For a higher rating of the Partnership score, the counselor could have emphasized the client control.* *The counselor makes Persuade utterances which eg, 7:16 “Are your cigarettes covered by your insurance?”, which have negative impact on the Partnership score.* *The Softening sustain talk score is negatively affected by the counselor reflections on difficulties with making the change eg 15:32 “It is definitely gona be heard, not gona be easy”*

### Important areas for improvement:

### *The counselor demonstrates that she listens to the client and is trying to understand the client's perspective. The counselor makes Reflections, such as 6:15 “that sounds more like a habit”. This affects the rating of the Empathy score positively.* *The counselor makes an affirmation that emphasizes that the client understands what she needs to do and keeps trying, for example 17:09 “…. Help yourself come up with a solution”* *The Partnership score is positively affected by the practitioner seeking to explore the client's views and opinions, for example 13:32 “Do you think it would be helpful for you to …?”* *The Cultivating change talk score is positively affected by reflections that may evoke the client reasons to change, like 8:46 “… your health improving … some breath …money …positive things” and 11:49 “so, that are other factors that ..”*

### 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.*