**PROFICIENCY TEST IN MOTIVATIONAL INTERVIEWING**

**ACCORDING TO MITI 4.2.1**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Recording id: | Name: | Target: | Date: |
| 46489073 | Julian Laude | 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)  3 |
| 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 | 9 |
| Persuade | 1 |
| Persuade with Permission | 3 |
| Questions | 21 |
| Simple Reflection | 7 |
| Complex Reflection | 2 |
| Affirm | 1 |
| 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 | = 0.43 | (≥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 | = 0.22 | (≥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 | = 1 | --- | --- |
| This is the total number of utterances or interactions within the encounter that were consistent with MI |  |  |  |
| Total MI Non Adherent  = Confront + Persuade | = 1 | --- | --- |
| This is the total number of utterances or interaction within the encounter that were inconsistent with MI |  |  |  |
| Relational Component:  Empathy + Partnership  2 | = 3.00 | (≥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:

### *The counselor sometimes after having made a reflection asks a question to check that he has understood. The question reduces how the client may respond on the reflection and affects therefore the Partnership score negatively, for example 05:42 ”…Is that correct?”* *The clinician is asking for problems with quit smoking, for example 06:00 ”What would be the barriers…” It affects the Softening Sustain Talk Score negatively.* *The clinician is enhancing the positive aspects of smoking by doing a Complex Reflection, for example 08:20 ”So it was the social aspect…” It affects the Softening Sustain Talk Score negatively.* *10:50 - 12:15 The clinician is dominating the conversation by talking for almost 1,5 minute without involving the client. It affects the Partnership Score negatively.* *The clinician is giving advice without asking for permission by doing a Persuade, for example 21:28 ”Try to also find alternatives…” It affects the Partnership Score negatively.* *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 clinician is enhancing the reasons for making a change by doing a Complex Reflection and enhancing the client’s ambitions by doing an Affirm, for example 09:40 ”…That’s a big motivator… You probably want to be like a role model for him…” The Reflection affects the Cultivating Change Talk Score positively and the Affirm affects the Partnership Score positively.* *The clinician is enhancing the client’s ideas by doing an Affirm, for example 23:20 ”Those are all great ideas…” It affects 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.*