**PROFICIENCY TEST IN MOTIVATIONAL INTERVIEWING**

**ACCORDING TO MITI 4.2.1**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Recording id: | Name: | Target: | Date: |
| 46489068 | Nicholas Stanley | Agree to new plan to manage anxiety | 2024-03-04 |

# 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)  3 |
| 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)  4 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Behaviour Counts | Total |
| Giving information | 3 |
| Persuade | 1 |
| Persuade with Permission | 3 |
| Questions | 17 |
| Simple Reflection | 4 |
| Complex Reflection | 3 |
| Affirm | 2 |
| Seeking Collaboration | 1 |
| 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 | = 0.41 | (≥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 | = 0.43 | (≥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 | = 3 | --- | --- |
| 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 | = 3.50 | (≥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:

### *If more suggestions and questions were rephrased into reflections a more balanced partnership might have developed between the client and the counselor, which had affected the Partnership score positively.* *The counselor is directive, for example 18:48 “and with regards to your sleeping – do you think that tonight would be an opportunity to kind of explore …”. This is a Persuade utterance, which has negative impact on the Partnership score.* *For a higher rating of the Partnership score, the counselor could have emphasized the client control more.* *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.* *The Partnership score is positively affected by the practitioner seeking to explore the client's views and opinions, for example 12:27 “… how would you feel about ….?”*

### Important areas for improvement:

### *The counselor asks several evoking questions, eg 6:07 “How do you think that this anxiety has held you back from living …?” and 13:41 “What are your thought about that?” This contributed to the rating of the Cultivating Change talk score in a positive way.* *The counselor makes affirmations that emphasizes that the client understands what she needs to do and keeps trying, for example 9:27 “you have a will to get there …” and 12:14 “… that is something you are looking to kind of take a look at….”* *The counselor demonstrates that she listens to the client and is trying to understand the client's perspective. The counselor makes several Reflections, such as 6:43 “It gets overwhelming” and 8:31 “… the relationship between you and your husband …. because of the financial aspect …”, and 12:02 “…coming into a routine that could benefit not only the relationship between you and your husband but possibly also …”This affects the rating of the Empathy 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.*