**PROFICIENCY TEST IN MOTIVATIONAL INTERVIEWING**

**ACCORDING TO MITI 4.2.1**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Recording id: | Name: | Target: | Date: |
| 46489072 | Hanaa Madani | 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)  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)  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. | (1-5)  3 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Behaviour Counts | Total |
| Giving information | 6 |
| Persuade | 2 |
| Persuade with Permission | 4 |
| Questions | 21 |
| Simple Reflection | 5 |
| Complex Reflection | 4 |
| Affirm | 1 |
| Seeking Collaboration | 1 |
| Emphasizing Autonomy | 3 |
| 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 | = 0.44 | (≥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 | = 5 | --- | --- |
| This is the total number of utterances or interactions within the encounter that were consistent with MI |  |  |  |
| Total MI Non Adherent  = Confront + Persuade | = 2 | --- | --- |
| This is the total number of utterances or interaction within the encounter that were inconsistent with MI |  |  |  |
| Relational Component:  Empathy + Partnership  2 | = 3.50 | (≥3.5) | (≥4.0) |
| Technical Component:  Cultivate Change talk + Softening Sustain talk  2 | = 2.50 | (≥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:

### *There is room for more reflective listening in this session and some utterances could have been rephrased into reflections. That affect the Empathy score negatively.* *For a higher rating of the Empathy score, the counsellor could have used more Complex Reflections.* *The rating of Partnership score is negatively affected when the counselor makes suggestions and advices without involving the client in evaluating, for example 8:47 “when you are using the patch and the gum …. But it is taking away the health risk you are getting with smoking. That is something to consider” and 14:34 “… and when you not tried the patch before … also having that keep the craving …”* *The Softening sustain talk score is negatively affected by the counselor questions on reasons to smoke, like 3:49 “what do you feel your idea about smoking is?” and 4:32 “on the days when you feel that you need to smoke – what exactly does it do for you?” and reflections on reasons to smoke, for example 6:20 “…. It is a reward after completing tasks …. ”. The conversation is directed towards reasons for change which affect the Softening sustain talk score negatively.*

### Important areas for improvement:

### *The Empathy score is positively affected when the counselor demonstrates that she tries to understand the client view, for example 8:00 “the patch or the ” and 9:46 “… and you were kind of glad to have gone away from that conversation” and 15:45 “… I know you were not keen on discussing with the doctor ….”* *The counselor uses an Affirm utterance, like 15:46 “… so that you have a call with me is showing some sort of interest”. This affects the rating of the Partnership score positively.* *The counselor makes utterances, which emphasize the client autonomy, which is positive for the Partnership score eg 14:01 “if you do decide … reducing or quitting ….”* *The Cultivating change talk score is positively affected by questions that may evoke the client reasons to change, like 5:23 “on the days when you feel like maybe you want to quit – what kind of prompts those thoughts?”*

### 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.*