To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Jacqueline E. Simmons entitled "A Study of the Effect of Videotape Feedback and Videotape Focused Feedback on the Acquisition of Interpersonal Skills by Case-workers in a Public Welfare Agency". I recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science in Social Work.

Eldon Marshall

Eldon Marshall, Major Professor

We have read this thesis and recommend its acceptance:

P. David Kurtz

Robert Williams

Accepted for the Council:

L. Evans Roth

Vice Chancellor
Graduate Studies and Research

Thesis
78
S246
co. 2

# A STUDY OF THE EFFECT OF VIDEOTAPE FEEDBACK AND VIDEOTAPE FOCUSED FEEDBACK ON THE ACQUISITION OF INTERPERSONAL SKILLS BY CASEWORKERS IN A PUBLIC WELFARE AGENCY

A Thesis

Presented for the

Master of Science in Social Work

Degree

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Jacqueline E. Simmons

June 1978

1358065

## ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to measure the effect of focused and non-focused videotape feedback variables on the acquisition of interpersonal skills taught in a modified microtraining format. A secondary purpose was to establish and measure the usefulness of the training format for inservice training of public welfare caseworkers. The West Virginia Department of Welfare was selected as the agency from which to draw a sample population because of this author's previous involvement in that agency's training effort and the observed need for continued high quality inservice education for its direct service workers. The agency's history of limited usage of its available videotape equipment also prompted the nature of the study. The study was based upon a review of recent literature describing the use of microtraining and videotape feedback in training students and paraprofessionals.

Participants were selected based on the personal criteria of the area office administrator. Nine of the twenty-seven regional state areas were selected for involvement in the research based on equal regional distribution, perceived need for training, availability of an office conference room, and reasonably large service staff (so as not to deplete staff completely during training). Nine subjects were required to be available for training in each of the nine sites. A total of seventy of the original eighty-one selected subjects were ultimately analyzed due to various dropout factors. The nine sites were randomly assigned to $E_1$ experimental, $E_2$ experimental, and control groups. All subjects received interpersonal skill training in a

microtraining workshop. $E_1$ experimental subjects received non-focused videotape feedback. $E_2$ experimental subjects received focused videotape feedback. Control subjects received no videotape feedback.

The results of the study demonstrated that subjects in the $E_1$ experimental, $E_2$ experimental, and control groups did not significantly differ in their acquisition of skills. Of the nine sites involved in the study, however, five showed a significant increase in usage of skills at the .001 alpha level, two showed a significant increase at the .01 alpha level, and one showed a significant increase at the .02 alpha level. One site showed no significant change.

The effectiveness of focused and non-focused videotape feedback in increasing the use of interpersonal skills was not demonstrated in this study. However, the basic microtraining program for inservice training of direct service workers was conclusively shown to be effective in teaching basic interpersonal skills.

TABLE OF CONTENTS


| CHAPTER | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| I. | INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| | Background of Problem | 1 |
| | Purpose of Study | 4 |
| | Rationale | 4 |
| | Questions for Study | 7 |
| | Assumptions | 7 |
| | Definition of Terms | 8 |
| II. | REVIEW OF LITERATURE | 10 |
| | Microtraining Model | 10 |
| | Microtraining Variables | 11 |
| | Research on Microtraining | 13 |
| | Videotape Feedback | 19 |
| | Research on Videotape Feedback | 23 |
| III. | RESEARCH DESIGN AND ANALYSIS | 32 |
| | Nature of Research | 32 |
| | Experimental Design | 33 |
| | Sampling and Data Collection | 33 |
| | Group Comparability Issues | 35 |
| | Nature of Treatments | 36 |
| | Experimental Procedures | 38 |
| | Instrumentation | 39 |
| | Analysis of Data | 40 |
| IV. | PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS | 42 |
| | Analysis of Data and Findings | 42 |
| | Profile Variables | 50 |
| V. | CONCLUSION | 55 |
| | Limitations | 57 |
| | Discussion and Implications | 57 |
| | Future Research | 58 |
| | LIST OF REFERENCES | 61 |
| | APPENDICES | 65 |
| | APPENDIX A. Memo to Area Administrator | 66 |
| | APPENDIX B. Instructions for Interviewer | 67 |
| | APPENDIX C. Instructions for Client | 68 |
| | APPENDIX D. Self-Critique of Video Replay | 69 |
| | APPENDIX E. Participant Information | 70 |
| | APPENDIX F. Memorandum to Participants | 71 |
| | APPENDIX G. Memorandum to Staff Training Coordinator | 73 |

CHAPTER PAGE

VITA..... 74

LIST OF TABLES


| TABLE | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| 4.1 | Analysis of Variance Summary for Group Gain Scores..... | 43 |
| 4.2 | Pre-test and Post-test Gain Scores for Each Site Including T-test Analysis of Site Means..... | 46 |
| 4.3 | Computation of Analysis of Variance (Multiple T-test) for Site Pre-test Means..... | 48 |
| 4.4 | Computation of Analysis of Variance (Multiple T-test)for Site Post-test Means..... | 49 |
| 4.5 | Participant Profiles at Outset of Training Compiled from Participant Information Form..... | 52 |

# CHAPTER I

# INTRODUCTION

## Background of Problem

According to Kaufman (1974), it is unusual for an organization not to provide some kind of continuing education for its professionals. Social service organizations are no exception to this fast growing trend toward providing educational opportunities for professional and paraprofessional employees. The two most common modes of continuing education found in agency practice are graduate-level courses and in-house (inservice) courses (Kaufman, 1974). It is the latter to which this study has addressed itself.

Inservice or in-house courses can provide an important educational means for furthering the development of skill and knowledge essential to effective professional performance development. In social service organizations, inservice training can be the means for upgrading the skills of employees who enter the service sector without a professional service background. Some public welfare agencies, for example, hire caseworkers who have Bachelor's degrees in areas unrelated to casework or counseling. Training can be relied upon in such instances to provide basic casework skill development. Since the amount of time required for training and the need for the new employee to start carrying his share of the burden often means that the needed training is overlooked, a method needs to be developed to efficiently and effectively teach those counseling skills basic to effective performance on the job (Ronnestad, 1977)

As the need for training in basic skill development becomes more

widely accepted and the investment in training programs increases, one would expect that the evaluation of the effectiveness of such training programs would be common (Kaufman, 1974). Kaufman says, however, that such is not the case and that evidence indicates that the lack of any systematic assessment of program effectiveness is more common. He suggests that one method toward developing successful inservice programs is to assess the effectiveness of the program; this would aid in determining the best modes or combinations of modes for training (Kaufman, 1974).

One mode of training that has been developed for professional and paraprofessional counselors is the microtraining model. Microtraining is a systematic approach to training in basic interpersonal helping skills (Ivey, 1971). As an approach to human relations training, the microtraining model evolved from a video-based system designed to train individual helpers in counseling skills. Distinctive features of the model include systematic step-by-step instruction in single skills, emphasis on clear comprehension of those skills taught, observation of video models, and provision for practice and feedback. The systematic process of microtraining follows a structured pattern for training in each skill. While modifications are often necessary to accomodate the needs of the population being trained, the standard microtraining model consists of the following steps (Ivey, 1974):

1. Videotaping a brief counseling session between volunteer client and trainee.
2. Training, including (a) written description of the

skill being taught, (b) video models demonstrating the skill, (c) video feedback of the practice session, (d) supervisory participation.

3. A second brief videotaped counseling session.
4. Reviewing second videotape.

Research provides empirical evidence of the effectiveness of the microtraining model in training students (Moreland, Ivey and Phillips, 1970; Toukmanian and Rennie, 1975) and paraprofessionals (Haase and Di Mattia, 1970; Scroggins and Ivey, 1970) in basic interpersonal helping skills.

The use of a videotape component in training is quite a costly venture because of initial equipment expenditures and maintenance of this equipment. It seems imperative that the effectiveness of the videotape component of training be measured in order to justify the expense. Kaufman, however, has observed that assessment of program effectiveness is rare. In the case of programs that incorporate a videotape component, this absence of assessment can be costly in terms of outlayed expenses as well as learning effectiveness. Although videotape feedback has been used in recent models of systematic skill training (Ivey and Gluckstern, 1974; Ivey, 1971; Berger, 1970), there is little research which empirically tests its effectiveness in teaching basic counseling skills (Bailey, Deardoff, and Nay, 1977; Markey, Frederickson, Johnson, and Julius, 1970; Yenawine and Arbuckle, 1971).

## Purpose of Study

This study investigates the hypotheses that (1) an adaptation of the microtraining model of interpersonal skills development can significantly increase the acquisition of specific interpersonal helping skills of human service workers and (2) that focused videotape feedback will be more effective than non-focused videotape feedback in influencing the acquisition and use of interpersonal skills in a simulated helping interview.

## Rationale

Microtraining research. The literature pertaining to the microtraining model of interpersonal skills amply documents the potential of the model to influence the interpersonal helping behavior of student counselors. Moreland, et al. (1970) evaluated the effectiveness of microtraining in teaching basic interview skills to second year medical students. Their study concluded that microtraining is an effective method of interview skill training. The relative effectiveness of microtraining versus human relations training was examined by Toukmanian and Rennie (1975). Significant increases were measured in the use of empathy, open questions, closed questions, and interpretations and advice in both training methods. Microtraining subjects gain significantly more than human relations training subjects on empathy. Scroggins and Ivey (1970) tested the effectiveness of a microtraining model with college residence hall counselors. Experimental group subjects showed a significant difference over control subjects in the

use of paraphrases, reflection of feeling and summarization.

Videotape feedback research. Investigation of the videotape feedback component frequently incorporated in the microtraining model, is described below. A review of recent literature revealed that little empirical research has been conducted to test the effectiveness of videotape feedback. Populations in which studies were conducted are limited to student teachers and student counselors. The effectiveness of focused videotape feedback versus non-focused videotape feedback remains to be examined, but the following studies provide some evidence of the value of this training tool.

Non-focused videotape feedback has generally been found to be no more effective than other training methods in teaching basic helping skills. Markey, et al. compared the relative effects of audiovisual, audio, and video playback on ratings of student counselor interview performances. No significant difference was observed across the three training methods in the increase of effective counselor behaviors. In their conclusion, the lack of supervision in viewing the taped interviews was considered a possible variable affecting the lack of significant differences in training methods outcome. Focused videotape feedback could provide the needed supervision.

In another study incorporating non-focused videotape feedback, Bailey, et al. (1977) compared role-playing, videotape feedback, and modeling in an effort to separately assess the three training techniques. Results indicated that modeling was generally more effective than videotape feedback, which was in turn more effective than role-playing

in teaching helping skills to undergraduate counseling students. Bailey, et al. described non-focused videotape feedback as being weak and erratic in its effects when used alone. They concluded that the manner of integration of training methods is more important than assessment of individual methods.

Results of studies of focused videotape feedback are also inconclusive in their assessment of the effectiveness of the focused feedback technique. A comparison study of process recording, focused videotape feedback, and modeling in the acquisition of interpersonal skills concluded that modeling and focused feedback were more effective than process recording (Mayadas and Duehn, Note 1). However, modeling was concluded to be generally, although not significantly, more effective than focused videotape feedback.

The effective use of focused videotape feedback was demonstrated in an assessment of the effect of focusing on specific types of teaching behavior. Dawson, Dawson,and Forness (1975) found that two undergraduate student teachers effectively increased appropriate physical posture and decreased inappropriate physical posture.

In an exploratory study of student reactions to focused videotape feedback versus focused audiotape feedback, Yenawine and Arbuckle (1977) concluded that videotape feedback produces open and frank discussion among students not produced by audiotape feedback. Although skill attainment was not measured in this study, evidence is provided that focused videotape feedback can produce an effective atmosphere for learning.

Although results of videotape feedback research studies are inconclusive, focused feedback and non-focused feedback have been effective as methods of training in skill development. Focused videotape feedback produces somewhat more effective results as a training method than does non-focused videotape feedback. The limited number and conflicting results of recent studies indicate the need for continued investigation to determine the differential effects resulting from the video feedback process and procedures.

## Questions for Study

1. Do non-focused and focused videotape feedback significantly increase the acquisition and use of interpersonal skills by social service workers in a simulated helping interview?
2. Does the microtraining model of interpersonal skills development used in the inservice training of social service workers influence the frequency of interpersonal skills used in a simulated interview?

## Assumptions

Reflecting and derived from the previous discussion, the basic assumptions supporting this study consist of the following:

1. The interpersonal skills of helping professionals can be enhanced through the use of the microtraining model of instruction.
2. The microtraining model of skills development can be adapted and used to influence the acquisition and

application of interpersonal skills by social service workers in helping situations.

3. Videotape feedback procedures can be used in training to enhance the learning of interpersonal skills.
4. Focused videotape feedback will be more effective than non-focused videotape feedback procedures in influencing the use of interpersonal skills in helping situations.

Definition of Terms

1. Microtraining is a systematic approach to training in basic interpersonal skills. The model is oriented to teaching specific counselor behaviors in a one-at-a-time format.
2. Interpersonal skills refers to those specific interpersonal helping behaviors taught within the microtraining model. These skills along with their definition are as follows:

   Attending behavior is appropriate physical behavior reflected through constant but not glaring eye contact, relaxed but alert posture, and natural body movements which are not distracting.

   Open questions are those which require more than one word responses.

   Minimal encouragers are small indicators to the client that the interviewer is with him. Non-verbal minimal encouragers include head nodding and the use of silence.

Verbal minimal encouragers are short expressions such as "oh" and "I see" or the repetition of one or two key words.

Paraphrases feed back to the client in a restated form the content of what he has just said.

Reflections of feeling and meaning reflect the surface and underlying emotion and content of the client's words by the helper in a manner that can be clearly grasped by the client.

Summarization pulls together the content themes of the client's verbalization in statement which described the underlying purpose of those themes.

# CHAPTER II

# REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

## Microtraining Model

Microtraining has been described by Ivey (1971) as a structural innovation which provides a framework for teaching behavioral skills of counseling and a method for intensive practice until a skill is mastered. The microtraining paradigm, as defined by Wittimer and Lister (1972), is a realistic, small scale counseling experience permitting immediate, focused feedback of counselor behaviors that aids in the development of a repertoire of effective counseling behaviors. Katz (1975) states that microtraining is a training format which reduces basic interviewing skills to single elements which can be mastered individually and articulated into a total performance.

Ivey has called microtraining a structural or methodological approach to systematic training in basic interpersonal skills. The model evolved from a video-based system designed to train individual helpers in counseling skills. Distinctive features of microtraining include the systematic, step-by-step instruction in single skills in a one-at-a-time fashion, emphasis on cognitive understanding of those competencies taught, observation of video models, and provision for practice and feedback. As a social learning theory-rooted model of instruction, microtraining focuses on the development of observable helping behaviors (skills), assures effective discrimination of those skills to be learned, makes substantial use of modeling and behavior rehearsal, and structures for the reinforcement and shaping of

performance to desired levels of proficiency. As a model for skill development, microtraining attempts to combine the importance of the empathetic counseling relationship with the need for accountability through measurable, directly observable behaviors (Ivey, 1974).

## Microtraining Variables

Several essential characteristic features of the microtraining model deserve highlighting since each makes an important contribution to the development of skills (Ivey, 1971). The process of focusing on single skills tends to lessen the complexity of the interviewing process. The trainee masters one skill at a time rather than attempting to incorporate the effective use of several skills simultaneously. Opportunity is thus provided for the trainee to recognize improvement in one area before moving on to more difficult skill areas and skill integration. Learning theory supports the effective use of "piece-meal" learning, although experimental evidence does not favor either "part" (one-at-a-time) or "whole" (all-at-once) learning practices (Biggs, 1964). Experience tends to confirm that focus on single skills lessens the complexity of the learning process and helps to foster a meaningful level of skill mastery. The individual skill mastery process is taught incrementally and then integrated into a comprehensive skill program. Research indicates that individuals who learn by the "part" method eventually advance to the "whole" method, thus supporting the one-at-a-time introduction to the skills followed by the integration of those skills mastered.

Another aspect of microtraining is the observation of models of appropriate behavioral skills which helps trainees to more ably discriminate between effective and ineffective interpersonal helping skills. Modeling involves the demonstration of these behaviors and is one of the fundamental means by which new behaviors are learned and existing behaviors modified (Bandura,1969). Modeling procedures can be used to promote the effective use of interpersonal behavior skills. Bandura states that virtually all learning which results from direct experience can occur through observation of another person's behavior and through recognizing the consequences of that behavior.

Often used in conjunction with modeling, structured practice and feedback serves to reinforce and shape performance toward levels of greater competency. Feedback is regarded by Bandura as a facilitative condition for modeling. Feedback of appropriate and inappropriate behavior reinforces the development of positive use of skills and the reduction of negative behaviors. New information can build upon prior knowledge through the use of feedback techniques which function as a reward for positive behavior learned (Froelich, 1970). Feedback is generally incorporated with methods of structured practice, such as role-play techniques. The extensive behavior rehearsal occurring through practice provides an opportunity to experiment with new behavioral techniques. This process furthers the building of helping response repertoires and increases the probability that learning will generalize to helping situations outside the training context.

Finally, an important dimension of the training format is the self

observation and confrontation that occurs through videotape self-appraisals. Self-confrontation involves bringing people face to face with themselves (Berger, 1970). In microtraining self-confrontation provides the trainee with the opportunity to immediately review his/her behavior and the client's reactions, providing a guideline for future skill performance. Self-confrontation has been identified as the most powerful aspect of the microtraining model, but why it is such an effective tool remains to be identified (Ivey, 1971). Education research shows that students learn most effectively when the learning situation most closely approximates the actual interview setting. Students will learn most effectively when they are actively involved in the simulated learning experience (Froelich, 1970).

Videotape feedback provides the opportunity for self-confrontation through role play simulation in which real-life interviews can be taped and reviewed. Trainees can observe for themselves their actual performance in a simulated interview. The function and use of videotape feedback will be discussed in greater detail below.

## Research on Microtraining

The microtraining model has been found to be an effective format for training counselors, students, and paraprofessionals. The literature indicates that the term "microcounseling" is often used interchangeably with microtraining.

A comprehensive review of recent literature on microtraining research revealed that no empirical research has been reported on the

effectiveness of microtraining in teaching human service workers interpersonal skills. The studies herein reported describe research conducted with undergraduate and graduate student populations with one exception. The exception involved the training of a paraprofessional support staff.

A study of the training of support personnel in the microtraining paradigm was conducted by Haase and Di Mattia (1970) in an effort to prepare newly hired paraprofessional guidance and resource staff in three basic human relations skills. The subjects were sixteen females with less than a high school education. Selection of subjects was non-randomized and no control group was made available. Subjects were trained on the basic microcounseling format in attending behavior, expression of feeling, and reflection of feeling. Measurements of empathy and counselor effectiveness showed significant change in the three behaviors taught. The authors concluded that the results supported the efficacy of training support personnel using the micro-counseling paradigm and the generalizability of the microcounseling method. The study is important in that it shows an effective use of the microtraining model in inservice interpersonal skill training, but the generalizability of the results is limited by the weakness of the non-random, no control group design.

In a recent study of teaching microcounseling skills to residence hall staff, Scroggins and Ivey (1970) tested the effectiveness of the microcounseling model with college residence hall counselors. The research attempted to answer three questions: As a result of micro-

training (1) Do the counselors learn the skills? (2) What is the effect on their counseling performance? (3) Are the changes in the use of skills maintained a year later? Subjects included one hundred and eighteen graduate and undergraduate student residence hall counselors randomly assigned to either an experimental or control group. The experimental group received twenty hours of training in a two and one-half day workshop followed by one hour of training per week for six weeks. The skills of attending behavior, open questions, minimal encouragers, paraphrases, reflection of feeling, and summarization were taught in a microcounseling format. Control subjects received no training, the results indicated there was a significant difference between the experimental and control groups in the frequency with which paraphrases, reflection of feeling, and summarization were used in staff counseling sessions. Additionally, measures of helping performance indicated that after training, the counselors acted more like a professional group of counselors similarly measured. Performance testing one year later indicated that the skills were generally maintained over that time period. The authors concluded that residence hall counselors can learn the effective use of interpersonal skills taught in brief microcounseling training. The study supports the use of microtraining for inservice training.

A study conducted by Moreland, Ivey, and Phillips (1973) attempted to evaluate the effectiveness of microcounseling for teaching basic interview skills in relation to traditional procedures for teaching those skills. Subjects were twenty-four second year medical students

selected at random from a class of fifty-one students. Selected students were randomly assigned to one of two interview training groups: (1) Interview training group one subjects were taught the six basic interpersonal skills of attending behavior, minimal encouragers, open questions, paraphrases, reflections of feeling, and summarization in a basic microcounseling format. (2) Interview training group two subjects received no specific training on what behaviors to practice but received verbal feedback from the instructor including recommendations to talk less, use more open questions, summarize, and attend to feelings. Subjects in both groups conducted a twenty minute pre-test and post-test training interview with the same selected female psychiatric patient. Results of a frequency count of the six skills taught revealed that subjects receiving microcounseling training had significantly greater improvement in attending behavior and reflection of feeling than the comparison subjects. The study concluded that microcounseling is an effective method of interview skill training and significantly exceeds the effectiveness of a more traditional model in these two important skill areas.

In contrast to these findings, the results of a study comparing microcounseling and reflective listening skills show no significant difference between the groups in skill acquisition (Di Mattia and Arndt, 1974). The purpose of this study was to assess the value of a comparatively less complicated training method which does not require expensive videotape equipment (reflective listening) with the structured, programmed microcounseling technique which generally incorporates a

videotape component. Subjects were fifteen introductory graduate students in counseling who were randomly selected from those students who had had no previous counseling experience or course work and who were assigned to one of two experimental groups: (1) microcounseling or (2) reflective listening. No control group was employed in the project. Students were trained in attending behavior skills. Variables measured in pre-test and post-test were eye contact, verbal following, and body posture. Results indicated significant increase in eye contact and verbal following with no significant change in posture for both experimental groups. The authors concluded that although no significant differences were found between the two methods of training that reflective listening might be a superior method of training in attending behavior because it is less complicated. The absence of a control group must be regarded as a weakness in this study as should the small size of the population. The conclusion drawn from this study may be premature in light of the given limitations and the fact that only attending behavior skills were taught and measured.

Another comparison study was conducted by Toukmanian and Rennie (1975) which investigated the relative effectiveness of microcounseling versus human relations training. Twenty-four volunteer undergraduate psychology students were randomly assigned to either microcounseling, human relations training, or a control group. Each experimental group met for twenty-four weeks, two to three hours per week. Micro-counseling subjects were taught attending behavior, verbal following activity, minimal encouragers, reflection of feeling, and open

questions in a basic microcounseling model which included the use of videotape feedback. Human relations training subjects received training in the seven counselor dimensions of accuracy, empathy, genuineness, respect, concreteness,self-disclosure,confrontation, and immediacy of relationship. The human relations training model used audiotape feedback. Variable measures were empathy, open invitation to talk, interpretations and advice, and closed inquiry. Results indicated significant gain on the six variables measured for experimental subjects in comparison to control subjects. Microcounseling subjects gain significantly more on empathy than human relations training subjects The authors concluded that two potential advantages of the microcounseling model are the amount of practice of skills (twice as much as in human relations training) and the use of videotape feedback rather than audiotape feedback.

The reviewed studies reveal that microtraining is an effective training format for teaching interpersonal skills to students and suggest that format for use in training paraprofessionals. The tendency to measure student populations in microtraining research is understandable given the availability of relatively stable and homogeneous subjects in most universities. The need to generalize the use of microtraining to inservice training populations has been recognized and briefly examined by Haase and Di Mattia, but continues to be a sparsely researched area. Human service workers tend to be composed of diverse educational and experiential backgrounds and the use of the microtraining format in teaching basic interpersonal skills to this

population needs to be examined.

## Videotape Feedback

Unique characteristics. Feedback in the learning process helps in adding new information to prior knowledge by providing the learner with an awareness of and objectivity to his behavior (Froelich, 1970). Numerous processes have been developed to provide feedback to students and instructors for the purpose of realistically evaluating the learning experience. For example, special rooms with one way mirrors, observers trained to take notes on interaction, motion picture film, audiotape, and videotape have been used to capture the audio dialogue and/or the non-verbal behavior of the interview situation. The most common method of feedback in inservice training for human service workers has been through process recording and staff conferences which rely upon what is remembered, selected, and written about the interview. Distortion of the interview interaction can occur based on the subjectivity of the report. Although one-way mirrors, audiotape,and films can aid the supervisor or instructor in gaining direct knowledge of the counselor's behaviors, thereby improving the feedback process, videotape feedback has the following additional advantages (Mayadas and Umiah, Note 4):

(1) Immediate multiple replay allows the interview to be viewed many times as desired.

(2) Ability to view an interaction in the "here and now".

(3) Provision of both audio and visual stimuli allows minimal distortion of reality. Also, focus on either

the visual or audio portion of the tape can be easily manipulated.

(4) Pause or still capability enables the viewer to study a selected segment in detail.

(5) Focus on specific non-verbal stimuli which might go unnoticed in real life can be provided by the zoom-in and zoom-out ability of the camera lens.

(6) Videotapes can be erased and re-used. A behavior can be performed and taped repeatedly without costly replacement of tapes.

(7) Portable, easy to operate equipment is available, eliminating the need for technicians.

(8) No special lighting effects are needed.

Videotape recording is, thus, an excellent mechanism for providing verbal and non-verbal feedback to trainees and instructors. It provides the opportunity to capture a real-life image of an actual or simulated interview with minimal observer interference or time and memory distortion. The basic microtraining dimensions of single skill focus, feedback, supervision and practice can be accomplished without video equipment, but the picture and sound feedback of videotape makes an impressively powerful addition to the process (Ivey, 1971).

Variables influencing videotape feedback. A number of variables which affect the use of the videotape feedback component have been identified and discussed in recent literature (Ivey, 1971; Stoller, 1968; Kagan, 1970; Froelich, 1970; Fuller and Manning, 1973; Bailey, Deardoff,

and Nay, 1977). The psychological aspects of the videotape feedback process must be considered. The initial response of trainees to their first taped sessions is often one of nervousness and concern over physical appearance (Ivey, 1971). Fuller and Manning caution about the stress caused an individual forced to view his own physical image and performance. Vulnerable individuals with limited capacity to change can perhaps be damaged by the videotape feedback process. It may be, then, that several videotape replays will be necessary in order to help trainees feel more comfortable about seeing their own performances. Reluctant trainees may need previous preparation for the videotape feedback process. Stoller has indicated, however, that too much exposure to videotape feedback may lessen its value because the experience will no longer be unique. The above comments seem to suggest a need for balance in the number of videotape replays presented to the viewer in order to make the best use of the videotape replay experience. It is also recommended that the viewer's psychological and emotional capacity to respond positively to the experience should be examined to avoid detrimental results.

Timing is an important factor in the effective use of video feedback. Stoller points out the advantage of immediate playback in presenting clearly defined material. Kagan (1970) supported immediate videotape replay in his observation that a person who is shown a recording of his interaction immediately following the taped session is able to recall in depth and detail the thoughts and feelings he had while the interaction was being recorded. In contrast to the

immediate replay concept, Froelich (1970) suggests that twelve hours is an optimal interval between taping and replay for presenting recorded material. The delay time allows the interviewer to become more detached from his/her role and better able to objectively critique the performance and receive criticism from others. The issue of when is the optimal time to replay a videotaped interview remains in question and probably will vary depending on the specific needs of the trainee.

Much discussion surrounds the videotape feedback variable of focused feedback involving the use of a third person (usually the instructor) who reviews the videotaped performance with the trainee. The instructor emphasizes specific skills enabling the trainee to concentrate on particular areas of performance rather than on the total interview process. Training is focused on one dimension of the trainee's behavior rather than trying to remake the trainee all at once (Ivey, 1971). Stoller (1968) suggests that focused videotaped feedback is essential because so much information is provided in a session that it is necessary to be selective and to focus the individual's attention on particularly relevant aspects of the tape. Stoller warns, however, that focused feedback is likely to increase self-consciousness which can cause a decrease in positive behavioral skills immediately following such a replay session. Fuller and Manning (1973) in their review of self-confrontation research support this idea stating that increased anxiety occurs during focused feedback because of the trainee's fears of being judged. They conclude, however, that there is stronger evidence that focused feedback is more effective in changing behavioral

skills than is non-focused feedback. Non-focused videotape feedback is provided when the trainee views the taped session on his/her own without the benefit of the instructor critique or emphasis. The trainee is in a position, then, of trying to assimilate without guidance the positive and negative aspects of his/her total performance. Bailey, Deardoff, and Nay (1977) called non-focused videotape feedback inconsistent and erratic in its effects when used alone. Although there are some negative aspects identifiable in the use of focused videotape feedback, it is generally supported as being more effective than non-focused video feedback.

Psychological implications, frequency, timing, and focusing have been identified as particularly important variables that effect the videotape feedback component of the microtraining model. Research of focused and non-focused videotape feedback is discussed in depth below.

## Research on Videotape Feedback

The research outlined herein describes the use of focused and non-focused videotape feedback in the training of undergraduate and graduate student counselors and student teachers in specific skills. A review of recent literature revealed no studies of the effective use of videotape feedback in training paraprofessionals in interpersonal interviewing skills.

Non-focused feedback. A study completed by Markey, Frederickson, Johnson, and Julius (1970) compared the relative effects of audiovisual

playback, audio playback, and visual playback on ratings of student counselors' performance. Subjects were thirty-two undergraduate female counseling students. Students were randomly assigned to the experimental and control groups. All subjects interviewed a trained client for twenty minutes and were given a written checklist which described characteristics of a good interviewer as they self-evaluated the feedback tape. Experimental procedures differed in that one group received audio feedback only, one group received video feedback only (videotaped replay with sound turned off), and a third group received audiovisual feedback. The control group received no feedback. The feedback sessions were followed by a second twenty minute interview with another trained client. Changes in observable counselor performance were rated on a counselor evaluation scale, a non-verbal behavior scale, and an audiovisual counseling scale. Results showed that on all three scales there was no significant differences between experimental and control groups. The authors concluded that several aspects of the training procedure may have been involved in the negative findings: (1) one time playback may be insufficient to cause measurable change; (2) the measurement instruments may have been too global; (3) initial counselor apprehension may have blocked the counselor's ability to learn effectively; (4) immediate playback may be less effective than delayed feedback; (5) supervisory feedback during the review process may be essential. Several of the factors recognized as possible influencing variables in the videotape feedback process have already been discussed. In light of the emphasis on the focused versus non-

focused variable, it is significant to note that the lack of supervisory focus was identified as a possible factor in the study outcome.

In another comparison study, Bailey, Deardoff, and Nay (1977) measured the relative effects of role-playing, videotape feedback, and modeling to train students counselors in therapeutic counseling behavior. The purpose of the study was to isolate three training techniques generally used as supportive components in training, and to assess each technique separately. Subjects were forty-eight undergraduate counseling students randomly assigned to three treatment groups and one control group. Each treatment subject completed two twelve-minute "therapist" sessions with a role-played client. Interposed between the two sessions was a twelve minute interval in which the role-playing group merely waited, the videotape feedback group received a replay of session one, and the modeling group watched a modeling tape. Control subject a thirty-six minute waiting period. Three levels of questions rated from therapeutically relevant to irrelevant was one variable measured. Other variables included verbal acceptance behaviors, self references, reflections, filler speech, laughter, and non-verbal behavior. Significant increases were noted in therapeutic question levels two and three in which modeling was superior to feedback and role play. In verbal acceptance there was no difference between modeling and feedback conditions but both were superior to the role playing condition. Although no other significant differences were found modeling increased somewhat across all variables

measured. The authors concluded that modeling was strong and consistent in its effects, videotape feedback was weak and erratic, and role-playing had little impact when used alone. Discussion included suggestions that focused observer feedback was necessary to help identify helper strengths and weaknesses and that an increase in the number of feedback practices might help develop the videotape feedback potential. Again, it is significant that recommended changes in the presentation of videotape feedback include the addition of instructor focus to the process of therapist skill training.

Non-focused videotape feedback was further explored in a study of the effects of modeling, videotape feedback, and a combination of both modeling and videotape feedback on the teaching behaviors of teachers in training (Rutherford, 1973). Subjects were twenty teachers in training randomly assigned to one of the three conditions. No control group was involved. Results indicated that teachers significantly improved positive responses to children in the modeling and combined modeling and feedback treatments, but videotape feedback alone was ineffective. The use of non-focused videotape feedback was again proved ineffective in increasing interpersonal skills.

Ward, Kagan,and Krathwohl (1972) attempted to measure counselor effectiveness in a comparison of videotape feedback and more traditional supervisory training methods. Results of the study were inconclusive due to low inter-rater reliability of the judges, but indicated that no significant differences were found in the effectiveness of non-focused videotape feedback versus supervisory conferences using audio-

tapes of interview sessions.

The findings seem to indicate that non-focused videotape feedback is not as effective as focused videotape feedback. Videotape feedback is seldom more effective, sometimes equally effective, and sometimes less effective when compared with other training techniques. Although videotape feedback is generally assumed to be a viable training technique, research indicates that it is not automatically an effective feedback device.

Focused feedback. In a study comparing videotape feedback with audiotape feedback, Yenawine and Arbuckle (1971) investigated the personal reactions, feelings, and impressions of students in a counseling practicum. This exploratory research incorporated a random assignment of fourteen graduate students to one of two experimental conditions: (1) audiotape feedback and (2) videotape feedback. Subjects met each week for a practicum meeting during which a role-played interview would be video or audio taped depending on the condition. Each tape was replayed and critiqued by the instructor and the group the following week. A counselor log was kept by the students in which they recorded reactions immediately following the practicum meeting. Results indicated that the videotape feedback group was open and frank by the end of the term. The opposite results occurred in the audiotape feedback group. The authors concluded that focused videotape was initially more threatening than audiotape feedback but later resulted in enthusiastic acceptance. Although this study does not examine actual skill attainment through videotape feedback, the results are

important in terms of recognizing the significant variables related to the appropriate use of focused feedback. Anxiety and fear can be expected at the outset of a videotape feedback training component. But the component will produce a meaningful learning atmosphere as the fear dwindles and is replaced by enthusiasm.

Mayadas and Duehn (Note 1) examined the relative effects of three training models on the acquisition of specific interpersonal skills: (1) process recording, (2) focused videotape feedback, and (3) modeling. Subjects were twenty-four first year social work graduate students. Six subjects were assigned to each of the three training methods. No control group was incorporated into the design. The process recording method included subjects writing verbatim interview interactions which were reviewed by instructors prior to supervisory conferences. Instructors concentrated on subjects' acquisition of specific interviewing skills. Subjects assigned to the focused videotape feedback method reviewed selected segments of taped interviews with their instructors. Instructors focused on subjects' specific skill acquisition behavior and positively reinforced those behaviors. Modeling subjects were exposed to videotaped demonstrations of specific skills. After reviewing each skill, students were instructed to practice the behaviors in interviews for supervisory critique. The critique followed the focused feedback format. Variables measured included skills of open and closed questions, content reflection, affect reflection, content expression, and affect expression. Results indicated no significant change across the three methods in use of

open or closed questions. Subjects trained by videotape feedback procedures increased skills in content reflection, affect reflection, and effect expression. Modeling trained subjects increased skills in content and affect reflection and content expression. The authors conclude that although modeling and focused videotape feedback were more effective than traditional process recording, modeling had an overall tendency to be superior to videotape feedback.

When the study by Mayadas and Duehn is compared with the study discussed above conducted by Bailey, et al. (1977) a marked contrast in results is evidenced. Both agree that modeling was an effective technique, however, Bailey, et al. found that non-focused feedback was weak and erratic in its effects. In contrast, Mayadas and Duehn found the level of focused videotape feedback and modeling did not significantly differ although modeling was concluded to be generally more effective.

Two studies investigating the effect of focused videotape feedback in the training of student teachers showed contrasting results in measuring observable teaching behaviors. Dawson, Dawson, and Forness (1975) examined the effect of focusing feedback on two specific types of teacher behavior. Subjects were two undergraduate college students in a teaching practicum. Variables measured were Posture 1, kneeling, or sitting at eye level and the use of hand gestures and animated facial expression, and Posture 2, standing over students and restricted hand motion and facial expression. Both students reviewed videotapes of their performance individually with the instructor. Results

indicated that focused videotape feedback was effective in increasing Posture 1 and decreasing Posture 2 behaviors. The extremely small sample size severely limits the value of the conclusions and precludes generalization of the findings.

In contrast to the above results, Donlan (1974) found focused videotape feedback to be less effective than Flander's Interactional Analysis (FIA), a method by which responses of verbal interaction between teachers and students are categorized and analyzed (DeWayne, 1971), in training student teachers in classroom teaching methods.

Fifty-nine student teachers were randomly assigned to one of three conditions: (1) videotaped microteaching, (2) audiotaped feedback, or (3) FIA. No control group was employed. Each subject presented a five minute lesson in five successive Mondays. Between lessons the performance was reviewed with the instructor and the lesson was revised accordingly. Variables measured included establishing a learning set, using reinforcement, eliciting pupil participation, guiding discovery, and re-teaching to new students. Although growth was highest in the FIA method, the authors concluded that the items measured may not have been appropriate because of the variation in the number of observable behaviors. Although the outcome tended not to favor focused videotape feedback, the results are not conclusive and suggest that further investigation of the videotape feedback training method is warranted.

In conclusion, the research investigating focused videotape feedback is limited to a few studies, some of which have questionable research designs. The results tend to indicate that focused videotape

feedback is more effective than non-focused videotape feedback. Modeling appeared to be generally more effective than either form of feedback. However, since these conclusions are based on a paucity of information, further examination of the use of focused and non-focused videotape feedback is needed.

# CHAPTER III

## RESEARCH DESIGN AND ANALYSIS

This chapter presents the research design including hypotheses, nature of experimental conditions, sample selection, data collection procedures, measurement instruments, and methods of data analysis.

### Nature of Research

The research herein reported investigates the effects of videotape feedback procedures on the interpersonal helping skills of social service workers. Videotape feedback procedures constituted the independent variable and were implemented within a microtraining format. The microtraining model, as adapted in this research, consisted of didactic presentations, modeling procedures, and role-played skill practice sessions. Trainees assigned to one experimental group ($E_1$) completed a simulated videotaped interview and conducted a self critique of their performance. Trainees assigned to the other experimental group ($E_2$) conducted a videotaped simulated interview and observed the taped interview with the instructor who focused feedback on significant aspects of the trainee's performance. Persons assigned to the control group received no videotape feedback.

In order to test the hypotheses, training conditions were created and the following null hypotheses were formulated and tested:

1. Subjects in the $E_1$, $E_2$, and control groups will not manifest significant gain score differences across the three groups in the use of the basic interpersonal skills in a simulated helping interview.

$H_0$: $\Delta_{X_{E_1}} = \Delta_{X_{E_2}} = \Delta_{X_C}$

2. Subjects in the $E_1$, $E_2$, and control groups will not manifest significant gain score differences in the acquisition of basic interpersonal helping skills taught in the training program.

$H_0$: $\Delta_{X_{E_1}} = 0, \Delta_{X_{E_2}} = 0, \Delta_{X_C} = 0$

Experimental Design

A modified pre-test, post-test control group experimental design (Campbell and Stanley, 1963) was implemented in the skill training program. Since the program was offered in different agency settings throughout the state of West Virginia, randomization of individuals assigned to the experimental groups was not possible. However, the sites themselves were randomly assigned to the $E_1$ treatment, $E_2$ treatment, or control conditions.

A one-way analysis of variance of mean gain scores was used to test for experimental effects resulting from the videotape feedback conditions. A T-test design was used to test for significant gain scores in the individual sites.

Sampling and Data Collection

The participants for the research were selected from the casework staff of the West Virginia Department of Welfare. The agency is administratively divided into twenty-seven areas that serve the fifty-

five county state. In determining those ten areas participating in the training program, consideration was given to five criteria including (1) availability of a sufficiently large group of caseworkers from which to draw (so as not to deplete staff), (2) the availability of a conference room at the site, (3) the perceived need for training as determined by previous observations of the staff training unit, (4) assurance of program distribution across the state rather than concentration in one section, (5) willingness of an area administrator to allow staff to participate. A memo (see Appendix A) was sent to each participating area administrator describing the program, guidelines for the selection of participants, and expectations held for the participants. Each area administrator was to assure that there would be nine caseworkers selected who would be available for the entire program and that those caseworkers would be classified as social service workers, according to the state civil service classification. It was also suggested that less experienced persons, those one month to two years tenure, might find the program better suited to their needs. Beyond the aforementioned general guidelines, specific procedures for the selection of participants was not prescribed.

Nine sites included in the training program were assigned randomly, three to the $E_1$ experimental group, three to the $E_2$ experimental group, and three to the control group. The data from a tenth site was not included in the research since modifications were incorporated in the preliminary program demonstrated in the site. Each site was assigned a letter code, A through I, according to the order

in which they would be presented in the workshop.

Group Comparability Issues

The pre-test, post-test design of two experimental groups and a control group using a one-way analysis of variance requires randomization. As stated, sites were randomly assigned. However, the random assignment of intact sites as opposed to random assignment of individual trainees greatly puts at risk the comparability of all sites. This leads to problems in differentiating the learning effect from the actual training as opposed to the effect of initial differences in the groups. While the nine sites participated in the program according to the predesigned schedule, the sites did vary in their application of the selection guidelines. There were two major departures from the recommended guidelines. In some cases participants were not available throughout the program. In other instances participants were not classified as social service workers. Out of the originally projected eighty-one subjects, eighty were available at the outset of the program. Of these eighty participants, ten were subsequently dropped from the research for either one of the following reasons: (1) the subject missed the introductory session during which individual profile characteristics were gathered, (2) the subject did not complete the training program, or (3) the subject's pre-test or post-test taped interview lasted less than three minutes. Only interviews lasting for a minimum of three minutes were included in the research analysis. Of those included in the research, subjects were distributed across

the three groups with twenty-five in the $E_1$ group and twenty-three in the $E_2$ group. The control group consisted of twenty-two trainees.

Nature of Treatments

Subjects assigned to the $E_1$ and $E_2$ experimental groups completed a ten minute videotaped interview with a role-played "client". Subjects selected their "client" from within the office staff. Both interviewer and role-played clients were each given instructions concerning their task in the interview and roles to be assumed (see Appendices B and C). Subjects in the $E_1$ group reviewed their respective videotaped interviews individually and privately. They were given the option to stop the tape at significant intervals, but not to rewind and replay the tape. Using a specially designed form (Appendix D), each subject was asked to conduct a self critique of his/her performance in the interview. Each self critique was completed within a maximum of thirty minutes as instructed.

Subjects in the $E_2$ group were provided focused feedback from the instructor who stopped the tape at significant points three times during the interview and asked leading questions designed to elicit subject perceptions of new or alternative responses and/or to aid the subject in his/her ability to consider the interview interaction from a different perspective. Instances of effective use of those interpersonal skills under study were verbally reinforced by the instructor who also gave examples, where appropriate, of how particular skills might have been more effectively incorporated. Trainees in the $E_2$

group did not complete a written self-evaluation. Each session was completed within a maximum of thirty minutes.

Subjects in each of the three groups ($E_1$, $E_2$, and control groups) participated in a three day interpersonal skills development workshop which was initiated by an introduction to the nature of the research, discussion of time factors, and the completion of a Participant Information Form (see Appendix E). Prior to training, each trainee conducted an audiotaped role-played interview with a coached client. Participants were scheduled at ten minute intervals and were required to be present only during their actual interview time. Both introduction and audiotaped pre-tests were begun and completed in one-half day. The next two full days were spent in structured training sessions in which lecture, modeling,and role-plays were used to teach the desired interpersonal helping skills. The last day of training consisted of pre-scheduled audiotaped interviews (post-test) with a role-played client selected by the participant. "Clients" selected for the post-test were required to be persons other than the person interviewed in the pre-test and persons other than those participating in the research. Analysis of audiotaped interviews provided the basis for assessing the nature of experimental effects.

While subjects in the $E_1$ and $E_2$ groups were each provided videotape feedback, subjects in the $E_2$ group received focused videotape feedback consisting of critique by the instructor who pointed out particular examples of effective and ineffective use of those skills being taught.

Experimental Procedures

The research was conducted over a period of nine consecutive weeks. Workshops were conducted at the respective site headquarters. The one exception to this practice occurred when a particular site was unable to use its own conference room due to an office emergency and was forced to locate space in a local church building. Prior to training,the staff training coordinator in the site was provided a package of orientation materials for each participant including (1) a memo describing the workshop schedule, basic requirements for participants, and instructions for "client" selection (see Appendix F), (2) an interviewer instruction form (see Appendix B), and (3) three "client" instruction forms (see Appendix C). Also included in the orientation package was a memo to the staff training coordinator describing the appropriate way to distribute these materials (see Appendix G).

Each site was required to have available a cassette tape recorder and videotape camera, recorder, and monitor for training and research purposes.

Each pre-test and post-test audiotaped interview was conducted in a private room. Instructions concerning the start and stop operations of the cassette recorder were given at the outset by the instructor. An automatic timer was used to assure that interviews would be conducted consistently for a five minute duration.

Videotaped interviews were conducted in a similar manner. Interviews were conducted in private offices. Each interviewer was given

instructions concerning the start-stop operations of the videotape recorder. An automatic timer was set for ten minutes to insure accurate interview length.

All interpersonal skill workshop sessions were conducted by the researcher, sometimes in the presence of the staff training coordinators, who, on occasions, would assume the "client" role for the instructor who would then model those skills under study.

## Instrumentation

Two measurement instruments were used in the field research project being described. The first instrument was a Participant Information Form (see Appendix E) designed to obtain information regarding the characteristics of each participant, such as levels of education and experience, attitudes toward the workshop, and their participation in it, and so forth. The information from this specially designed questionnaire made it possible to determine and compare the differences between groups in relation to trainee characteristics, experiences, and attitudes.

The Helping Skills Verbal Response System developed by Danish, D'Augelli, and Brock (Note 2) and later modified by Kurtz, Marshall, and Holloway (Note 3) was used to evaluate the pre-test and post-test audiotaped interviews. In the adapted version, verbal responses of interviewers were classified into the following categories: (1) open questions, (2) closed questions, (3) minimal encouragers, (4) content paraphrase, (5) reflection of feeling, and (6) summarization.

Analysis of each audiotaped interview was conducted by an independent rater who classified each interviewer response utilizing the modified Helping Skills Verbal Response System. Having been trained in the use of this instrument, the rater had attained an 80% inter-rater reliability. The researcher conducted randomized checks to determine reliability. In addition to the analysis of individual responses, the independent rater classified each interview in relation to two categories. One category referred to the amount of talking by the client and was designated in three ways: (1) non-verbal, (2) average, and (3) verbose. The second category referred to the level of seriousness. Each interview was classified as (1) superficial, (2) typical, or (3) severe. These categories were established in order to better evaluate the outcome and significance of the interview responses.

Following classification of the responses, the researcher analyzed the level of skill evidenced in each pre-test and post-test interview comparing the total number of skills taught with the total number of responses in the interview. A T-test was then used to test the significance of the gain scores for each site. A one-way analysis of variance was used to test for significant differences between and within the experimental and control groups.

## Analysis of Data

Null hypothesis 1 postulates that subjects in the $E_1$, $E_2$, and control group will not manifest significant gain score differences

across the three groups in the use of basic interpersonal skills in a simulated helping interview. A one-way analysis of variance procedure was used to test the null hypothesis.

Null hypothesis 2 postulates that subjects in the $E_1$, $E_2$, and control groups will not manifest significant gains in the acquisition of basic interpersonal helping skills taught in the training program. A T-test measurement was utilized to test the null hypothesis.

# CHAPTER IV

## PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

### Analysis of Data and Findings

This chapter presents and discusses the analysis of data and finding of the tests of the following null hypotheses:

1. Subjects in the $E_1$, $E_2$, and control group will not manifest significant gain score differences across the three groups in the use of basic interpersonal skills in a simulated helping interview.
2. Subjects in the $E_1$, $E_2$, and control groups will not manifest significant gains in the acquisition of basic interpersonal helping skills taught in the training program.

In testing null hypothesis 1, the researcher attempted to reject the statement that the subjects in the experimental and control groups would manifest no significant relative differences in their use of basic interpersonal skills in a simulated interview setting. It was expected that the variable of videotape feedback for the $E_1$ experimental group and videotape focused feedback for the $E_2$ experimental group would enhance the acquisition by subjects of the basic interpersonal skills taught in the training program such that they would manifest significantly greater usage of the interpersonal skills than would the control group which received no videotape feedback. The research further expected to show that subjects in the $E_2$ experimental group who received videotaped focused feedback, that is, having the added variable of

instructor critique of the video playback, would show a significantly greater increase in the use of interpersonal skills than would the subjects in the $E_1$ experimental groups who received videotape feedback with self-critique only.

A one-way analysis of variance (multiple T-test) was used to measure the differences within and between the three groups. Gain scores of participants at each site were used to conduct a one-way analysis of variance. Where significant differences were found, further T-test analysis would be used to determine between which sites or groups the significant difference lies. The scores for each participant was the percentage of basic interpersonal skill responses used out of the total number of responses given. The analysis of variance of the gain score means for the sites within each group showed no significant difference in the increased use of interpersonal skills (gain scores) between or within groups. Results are shown in Table 4.1.

TABLE 4.1

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY FOR GROUP GAIN SCORES

| | Sum of Squares | Degrees of Freedom | Estimate of Variance | F |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | .036 | N-1 = 8.000 | | .024 |
| Between | .000 | N-1 = 2.000 | .000 | NS |
| Within | .036 | N-K = 6.000 | .006 | |

The findings in Table 4.1 indicate that there was no significant

difference in the increased use of basic interpersonal skills across the control and experimental groups. This is to say that the results of the analysis of variance of group gain scores reveal that null hypothesis 1 is not rejected and subjects in the $E_1$, $E_2$, and control groups did not manifest significant differences in the use of basic interpersonal skills in a simulated interview setting. No further analysis of relative differences in the increased use of the interpersonal skills is necessary since the analysis of variance test pointed out that there were not significant differences between groups or between sites (within groups). The research, then, did not demonstrate any significant effect of the videotape feedback or videotape focused feedback variables on the increased use of basic interpersonal skills in a simulated interview.

Null hypothesis 2 states that subjects in the $E_1$, $E_2$, and control groups will not manifest significant gains in the acquisition of basic interpersonal helping skills taught in the program. The research was expected to demonstrate that significant gains in the use of basic interpersonal skills would be manifested in the subjects involved in the training program. The training package was a workshop that taught basic interpersonal skills in a microtraining format. The design was adapted to meet the needs of time efficiency and cost-effectiveness. The effectiveness of the workshop in increasing the use of interpersonal skills for all participants was measured. A T-test was used to determine the significance of differences between the mean of the pre-test and the mean of the post-test for each site. Scores

for each participant pre-test and post-test were obtained by calculating the percentage of taught skills used out of the total number of responses made during each videotaped simulated interview. Results of the T-test measurement for significant gain scores for participants in each site are presented in Table 4.2. The outcome indicates that real change in the acquisition of skills did take place in eight of the nine sites receiving training.

Table 4.2 presents the results of a T-test analysis of the means of the pre-test and post-test scores for participants in each site. As shown, all but one of the sites evidenced significant increases in the use of those interpersonal skills being taught at an Alpha level of less than .02. More than half the sites reflected increases in the use of basic interpersonal skills at an Alpha level less than .001.

The results of this T-test indicate that null hypothesis 2 which states that subjects in the $E_1$,$E_2$, and control groups will not manifest significant gains in the acquisition of basic interpersonal helping skills taught in the training program, was rejected. The modified micro-training model of teaching basic interpersonal skills to social service workers has therefore been demonstrated to be effective in facilitating an increase in the use of those skills in a simulated interview.

Table 4.2 also is a summary of the mean scores for each site of the participant pre-test and post-test measurements. The mean pre-test and post-test score for each site was obtained by averaging the pre-test and post-test score for all participants in that site. The pre-test and post-test score for each participant is the percentage of basic

TABLE 4.2

PRE-TEST AND POST-TEST GAIN SCORES FOR EACH SITE INCLUDING

T-TEST ANALYSIS OF SITE MEANS

| Sites | Pre-test | Post-test | Gain | T-test |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Control Group | | | | |
| A | .261 | .696 | .435 | < .001 |
| F | .409 | .723 | .314 | < .02 |
| G | .282 | .701 | .420 | < .001 |
| | .317 | .707 | .390 | |
| $E_1$ Experimental Group | | | | |
| D | .372 | .841 | .470 | < .001 |
| E | .422 | .793 | .371 | < .001 |
| I | .428 | .715 | .287 | < .01 |
| | .407 | .783 | .376 | |
| $E_2$ Experimental Group | | | | |
| B | .313 | .729 | .416 | NS |
| C | .327 | .763 | .436 | < .01 |
| H | .442 | .744 | .302 | < .001 |
| | .361 | .745 | .385 | |

interpersonal skills responses out of the total number of responses made by the participant in the simulated interview. Site A is described as having a pre-test score of .261 which signifies the mean of the participant pre-test scores for site A. The post-test score for site A is .696, signifying the mean of the participant post-test scores for site A. The gain score for site A is .435 which is the numerical difference between site A pre-test and post-test scores. The T-test for site A reflects the significance level of differences between pre-test and post-test scores. The average pre-test, post-test, and gain scores are computed for all subjects within the control group sites, $E_1$ experimental group sites, and $E_2$ experimental group sites respectively.

A useful comment can be made here with regard to the value of the T-test measure of significance in interpreting data. Site B in Table 4.2 shows no significant difference in the increase of interpersonal skills used by site B participants. The gain score, however, is .416 which appears significant in light of the other site scores. Without the use of T-test of significance, (or other appropriate tests), a researcher could easily be lead to believe that a reasonable gain in skill usage had been made by site B participants.

As can be seen in Table 4.2, there appears to be a tendency for sites with a low pre-test score to have a greater gain score. A one-way analysis of variance (multiple T-test) was completed on site pre-test scores to determine the nature and extent to which there was a difference between sites in pre-test scores. The results of this computation are outlined in Table 4.3.

TABLE 4.3

COMPUTATION OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE (MULTIPLE T-TEST)

FOR SITE PRE-TEST MEANS

| | Sum of Squares | Degrees of Freedom | Estimate of Variance | F |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | .036 | N-1 = 8.000 | | 1.474 |
| Between | .012 | K-1 = 2.000 | .006 | NS |
| Within | .025 | N-K = 6.000 | .004 | |

Accordingly, no significant difference was found either between or within groups in pre-test scores indicating that the beginning level of skill functioning across the groups was comparable and that mean scores for the sites which appeared low were not significantly lower than the mean scores of all other sites. Furthermore, the results would suggest that in spite of the lack of random assignment of subjects to $E_1$, $E_2$, and control groups, subjects within those groups were not significantly dissimilar in their pre-training use of basic interpersonal skills. Although other unmeasured and uncontrolled-for variables may have influenced outcomes, it is significant that their pre-test measurements were alike. Some of these intervening variables will be alluded to later in the chapter.

To prove a point about the invalidity of a method of data analysis which is often used in research of this kind, an analysis of variance was conducted on the mean post-test scores of the sites. Had such a test been applied to the data in this research, similar conclusions would have

been drawn but with much less accuracy. This test is completed to show the inappropriateness of such a test (Campbell and Stanley, 1963) as compared to the analysis of variance of the gain scores. Such a test would have the potential for measuring the effect of differences in post-test scores as a result of differences in pre-test scores confounded with treatment effect. Table 4.4 shows results of an analysis of variance of post-test means.

TABLE 4.4

COMPUTATION OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE (MULTIPLE T-TEST)

FOR SITE POST-TEST MEANS

| | Sum of Squares | Degrees of Freedom | Estimate of Variance | F |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | .018 | N-1 = 8.000 | | 2.887 |
| Between | .009 | K-1 = 2.000 | .004 | NS |
| Within | .009 | N-K = 6.000 | .002 | Alpha= @ .16 |

Table 4.4 indicates that the difference in post-test scores is insignificant (.05 Alpha) but significant at the .16 Alpha level. The analysis of variance of gain scores (Table 4.1, p. 43) approaches a level of significance at a much greater Alpha level. It is important to note that significance is reached at the Alpha level of .16 which is not greatly different from the .05 level of significance. One sees then a trend toward rejection of the null hypotheses as opposed to a clear non-

rejection. Thus, there could be circumstances in research of this nature in which the failure to use the appropriate test (the analysis of variance of gain scores rather than that of post-test scores) could lead to drawing opposite conclusions. As illustrated by this research, analysis measuring post-test only, as in Table 4.4 rather than gain scores as in Table 4.1, demonstrates the potential for different conclusions.

## Profile Variables

One of the major questions about the conclusiveness of findings in field research involves the lack of experimental controls in the research design. As discussed above, this researcher recognizes the need for good controls in research which intends to assess fine points of training method effectiveness. Therefore, an investigation of the differences of the three groups in terms of variables that interact with the treatment effect was conducted.

Literature reviewed in this research was limited by time constraints and the necessity of establishing boundaries to a review of microtraining and videotape feedback research. A review of the literature that investigates variables affecting learning processes would be useful in establishing the significance of particular variables. Profile variables incorporated in this assessment were selected according to the researcher's intuitive knowledge and experience of factors influencing the training process. Variables were chosen because they were likely to confound group comparability. Several variables describe motivational influences and Kaufman (1974) has identified a need for proper motivation of

professionals to insure that they will take advantage of training offered. Two areas of motivation discussed by Kaufman are the need to feel that training will be relevant to work requirements and the need for periodic change in the job position in order to maintain a desire for self-improvement.

Table 4.5 is summarized data from the Participant Information Form which was completed by subjects at each site prior to the pre-test. Item one, previous training, indicates that the percent of individuals in each site who described themselves as having had previous training in (1) microcounseling or (2) interpersonal skills. Item two reveals the mean number of years experience with the present agency. Item three refers to the educational level of participants within each site, indicating the percent of individuals above, below, and at the bachelor level of education. Item four gives the indicated reason for participating in the training. This information was collapsed into two broad categories, those participating because they were required to do so, and those expressing desire for further professional development. A description of the expressed gain expected from the training is divided into two categories in item five, those expecting some type of skill improvement and those unsure of what to expect or expressing another unrepeated expectation. In item six the number of participants is defined for each site. Each item is described for each site, for each group (the mean for the three sites), and for the total of the groups (the mean of the group means).

For example, in control site A, 71% of the participants indicated

TABLE 4.5

PARTICIPANT PROFILES AT OUTSET OF TRAINING COMPILED FROM PARTICIPANT INFORMATION FORM

| Profile Variable | Control Sites | | | Group Mean | $E_1$ Sites | | | Group Mean | $E_2$ Sites | | | Group Mean | Groups Averaged |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | A | F | G | | D | E | I | | B | C | H | | |
| 1. Previous training | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Microcounseling | 71% | 43 | 12 | 42 | 25 | 25 | 33 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 7 | 26 |
| Interpersonal skills | 57% | 57 | 12 | 42 | 50 | 75 | 44 | 56 | 25 | 17 | 78 | 40 | 47 |
| 2. Years employed at agency (avg.) | 1.55 | 4.56 | 1.48 | 2.53 | 1.90 | 1.46 | 1.78 | 1.71 | 3.55 | 2.18 | 4.64 | 3.46 | 2.57 |
| 3. Educational level | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bachelor | 100% | 43 | 63 | 69 | 64 | 75 | 78 | 72 | 38 | 33 | 56 | 42 | 61 |
| Below Bachelor | 0% | 29 | 38 | 22 | 13 | 13 | 0 | 8 | 63 | 17 | 11 | 30 | 20 |
| Above Bachelor | 0% | 29 | 0 | 10 | 25 | 13 | 22 | 20 | 0 | 50 | 33 | 28 | 19 |
| 4. Reason for participating | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Required | 100% | 14 | 12 | 42 | 75 | 50 | 100 | 75 | 75 | 50 | 22 | 49 | 61 |
| Professional development | 0% | 86 | 88 | 58 | 25 | 50 | 0 | 25 | 25 | 50 | 78 | 51 | 39 |
| 5. Expected gain | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Skill improvement | 67% | 100 | 100 | 89 | 75 | 88 | 89 | 84 | 38 | 100 | 89 | 76 | 81 |
| Unsure/Other | 33% | 0 | 0 | 11 | 25 | 12 | 11 | 16 | 63 | 0 | 11 | 25 | 19 |
| 6. Number of participants | 7 | 7 | 8 | 7.3 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 8.3 | 8 | 6 | 9 | 7.7 | 7.8 |

Note: See Appendix E for Participant Information Form.

that they had received previous microcounseling training and 57% indicated previous interpersonal skill training. They had been employed by the West Virginia Department of Welfare an average of 1.55 years. One hundred percent of control site A participants had a bachelor's degree and 100% were required to participate in the training. Skill improvement was expected by 67% of site A participants and 33% were unsure of what to expect or indicated another unrepeated expected gain. Data was evaluated for seven participants.

Table 4.5 indicates that there are differences across groups in most variables measured. Previous microcounseling training shows a variation in group means of 42 for control, 28 for $E_1$ experimental and 7 for $E_2$ experimental. There are also differences in the group means for educational level, reason for participating, and expected gain.* The relative difference across groups on profile variables suggests that because of the absence of randomization, program participants were not similarly distributed across the $E_1$, $E_2$, and control groups.

Therefore, it can be seen that the lack of comparability which confounds the research necessitates questioning the validity of conclusions drawn from the study. This evidence is especially significant in reviewing the results of Hypothesis 1 which examines the effectiveness of the videotape feedback technique. It is possible that given the required controls for similarity, the training groups might

---

*Obviously a more clear evaluation would involve T-tests for an assessment of actual significant differences. Time, energy, and length of the study did not permit this further evaluation.

have exhibited a difference in outcome caused by the videotape feedback component.

# CHAPTER V

## CONCLUSION

The study being reported was designed to investigate the effect of videotape feedback on the acquisition of interpersonal helping skills of human service workers and to compare the effects of videotape focused feedback procedures with self-critique of videotaped interviews. In addition, given the nature of the research, it was possible to partially test the effectiveness and cost efficiency of an interpersonal skill training program.

While some inservice training programs have been oriented to the development of the interpersonal skills of trainees, limited attention has been given to determining the effect of different procedures used in training (Kaufman, 1974).

The relative merits and potential of videotape feedback have been empirically tested in a limited number of studies. Non-focused videotape feedback was found to be no more effective than audio feedback, visual feedback, or traditional supervisory conferences (Markey, et al; Ward, et al., 1972) in training students in teaching and counseling skills. Modeling was generally more effective in training for selected skills than were either non-focused or focused videotape feedback (Bailey, et al., 1977; Rutherford, 1973; Mayadas and Duehn, Note 1). Videotape focused feedback was used effectively in teacher and counselor training in studies conducted by Yenawine and Arbuckle (1971) and Dawson, et al. (1975).

Substantial research documents the effectiveness of the micro-

training model of interpersonal skill development (Haase and Di Mattia, 1970; Scroggins and Ivey, 1970; Moreland, et al. 1973; Toukmanian and Rennie, 1975). However, no studies have been found that investigate the effect of videotape feedback procedures taught in a microtraining model of instruction.

The literature has indicated key issues that may have a significant bearing on the inconclusive results of the videotape feedback research. The number of replays, the time between taping and replay, inappropriate measurement instruments, and anxiety of trainees may have a marked effect on the outcome of the variables measured. This study recognizes the need for good controls in the absence of a true random design.

In relation to the two questions (1) Is a microtraining format effective in increasing human service workers acquisition of interpersonal skills? and (2) Do non-focused and focused videotape feedback significantly increase skill acquisition? which this research proposed to study, the following conclusions can be offered:

Both control and experimental subjects participating in an interpersonal skill training program using the microtraining model did evidence significant gains in the use of interpersonal skills in a simulated helping interview.

Control subjects, those receiving videotape focused feedback, and those receiving only non-focused videotape feedback did not differ significantly in their use of those interpersonal skills taught in the training program.

## Limitations

The major limitation of this research is its inability to exert needed controls on the experimental and control groups. In the absence of the randomization required for this design, it was necessary to control for differential effects of participant dissimilarity. As discussed in Chapter IV, a marked dissimilarity was present in several variables measured confounding the comparability of groups.

## Discussion and Implications

The failure to reject null hypothesis 1, which questioned the relative effectiveness of non-focused and focused videotape feedback on the acquisition of interpersonal skills taught in a microtraining model, is not particularly meaningful because of the failure of the research to meet the randomization requirements of the design (Campbell and Stanley, 1963). Hypothesis 2, however, which questioned the effectiveness of the microtraining model in teaching interpersonal helping skills to human service workers, was clearly rejected. The issue here is that although evaluation of a method of training can be broadly studied in field research, the lack of control for group comparability makes it impossible to measure fine points of training techniques such as non-focused and focused videotape feedback.

The problems in conducting field research no doubt clearly influenced the outcome obtained in this research. In fact, the question must be raised concerning whether or not certain kinds of

empirical research can adequately be conducted in field studies. It is possible, however, that reasonably accurate field research can be conducted where there are greater differences in the treatments presented to the field subjects. The purposefulness of conducting such studies should be examined by researchers. Several rationale could be offered to support the conduct of field research. First, the availability of subjects in the real world makes research easier and less expensive to conduct than laboratory controlled research. Secondly, laboratory conditions are difficult to generalize to the realities of the real world where the training must ultimately take place. Third, the need for evaluation of inservice training has been growing since training has become more acceptable and expenditures for training have increased (Kaufman, 1974). Human service agencies need not only to justify their training expenses but also to consciously provide the most effective and efficient training for their employees for the ultimate benefit of their clients. Laboratory research for human service worker training has been quite limited and agencies may not be wise to wait for those results. It is suggested, then, as a result of this study that attempts at field research for inservice training be continued, carefully considering the need for good control for comparability of groups in the absence of true randomization and the need to measure broad differences in training procedures.

## Future Research

Further research in the area of non-focused and focused videotape

feedback must address the issue of appropriate controls for treatment and control groups. Although the difficulties of imposing strict controls in field research experiments is recognized and understandable, any results of research conducted which avoids such controls will be necessarily inconclusive. Lack of comparability of groups confounds the effects of training with the effects of the initial differences in the groups.

Other implications for research based on the experience encountered in conducting the research herein described can be offered.

1. Those instruments used need to be adequate for the measurement task.
2. Studies investigating the effects of videotape feedback procedures on skill acquisition should assure sufficient exposure to the training conditions, i.e., the frequency and duration of feedback.
3. Consideration should be given to exploring the relationship between outcome and trainee motivation.
4. Attention might also be given to investigating the effects of training locations on the nature of skill learning. For example, research might explore the relative effect of training conducted in the employee's office versus training conducted at a distance from the office where the worker generally cannot be reached by client or supervisor. Does the cost effectiveness of training at the home office justify

the constraints that may be imposed on the worker? Is training more acceptable to the employee when he or she does not have to travel and/or spend nights away from home?

In attempting to research any of these four suggested variables, it is essential to consider the need for good controls as discussed in Chapter IV, without which no evaluation of variables can be conducted effectively.

# LIST OF REFERENCES

LIST OF REFERENCES


Bailey, K.G., Deardoff, P. and Nay, W.P. Students play therapist : Relative effects of role-playing, videotape feedback, and modeling in a simulated interview. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1977, 45, 257-266.

Bandura, A. Principles of behavior modification. New York : Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1969.

Berger, M.M. Confrontation through videotape. In M.M. Berger (ed.), Videotape techniques in psychiatric training and treatment. New York : Brunner/Mazel, 1970.

Bigge, M.L. Learning theories for teachers (3rd ed.). New York : Harper and Row, 1976.

Campbell, D.T. and Stanley, J.C. Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research. Chicago : Rand McNally, 1963.

Danish, S.J., D'Augelli, A.R. and Brick, G.N. Helping skills verbal response system. Unpublished manuscript, Pennsylvania State University, 1974.

Dawson, P.J., Dawson, K.E., and Forness, S.R. Effect of videotape feedback on teacher behavior. Journal of Educational Research, 1975, 68, 197-201.

DeWayne, W.M. Interactional analysis in the counseling interview. Bowling Green, Kentucky : Western Kentucky University, 1971. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ED 089 184).

DiMattia, D. and Arndt, G. A comparison of microcounseling and reflective listening techniques. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1974, 14, 61-64.

Donlan, D. Observed versus unobserved behavior in three types of micro-teaching. Phi Delta Kappa, 1974, 55, 707-708.

Froelich, R.E. Teaching psychotherapy to medical students through videotape simulation. In M.M. Berger (ed.) Videotape techniques in psychiatric training and treatment, New York:Brunner/Mazel, 1970.

Fuller, F.F. and Manning, B.A. Self-confrontation reviewed : A conceptualization for video playback in teacher education. Review of Educational Research, 1973, 43, 469-512.

Haase, R.F. and DiMattia, D.J. The application of the microcounseling paradigm to the training of support personnel in counseling. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1970, 10, 16-22.

Ivey, A.E. Microcounseling: Innovations in interview training. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1971.

Ivey, A.E. Microcounseling and media therapy: State of the art. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1974, 13, 172-183.

Ivey, A.E. and Gluckstern, N.B. Basic attending skills. Amherst, Massachusetts: Microtraining Associates, Inc., 1974.

Kagan, N. Television in counselor supervision--Educational tool or toy? In M.M. Berger (ed.), Videotape techniques in psychiatric training and treatment. New York:Brunner/Mazel, 1970.

Katz, D. Videotape programming for social agencies. Social Casework, 1975, 56, 44-51.

Kaufman, H.G. Obsolescence and professional career development. New York:Amacom, 1974.

Kurtz, D., Marshall, E., and Holloway, R. Development of a model interpersonal helping skills training program. Unpublished manuscript, University of Tennessee, 1977.

Markey, M.J., Frederickson, R.H., Johnson, P.W., and Julius, M.A. Influence of playback techniques on counselor performance. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1970, 9, 178-182.

Mayadas, N.S. and Duehn, W.D. The Effects of training formats and interpersonal skill discrimination in the education for clinical social work practice. Unpublished manuscript, the University of Texas at Arlington, 1977.

Mayadas, N.S. and Umiah, D. Step by step--An instructional program in basic interviewing skills. University of Texas at Arlington, Human Resource Center, undated.

Moreland, J.R., Ivey, A.E., and Phillips, J.S. An Evaluation of micro-counseling as an interviewer training tool. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1973, 41, 294-300.

Ronnestad, M.H. The effects of modeling, feedback, and experimental methods on counselor empathy. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1977, 16, 194-201.

Rutherford, R.B., Jr. The effects of a model videotape and feedback videotapes on the teaching styles of teachers in training. The Journal of Experimental Education, 1973, 42, 64-69.

Scroggins, W.F. and Ivey, A.E. Teaching and maintaining microcounseling skills with a residence hall staff. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1978, 19, 158-162.

Stoller, F.H. Focused feedback with videotape : Extending the group's functions. In G.M. Gazda (ed.), Innovations in group psychotherapy. Springfield, Illinois : Charles C. Thomas, 1968.

Toukmanian, S.G. and Rennie, D.L. Microcounseling versus human relations training : Relative effectiveness with undergraduate trainees. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1975, 22, 345-352.

Ward, R.C., Kagan, N., and Krathwohl, D.R. An attempt to measure and facilitate counselor effectiveness. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1972, 11, 179-186.

Wittimer, J. and Lister, J. Microcounseling and microcounseling consultation via videotape. Counsel on Education and Supervision, 1972, 11, 238-240.

Yenawine, G. and Arbuckle, D. Study of the use of videotape and audiotape as techniques in counselor education. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1971, 18, 1-6.

# APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

MEMORANDUM TO AREA ADMINISTRATOR

DATE: June 16, 1977

TO: Area Administrator

FROM: Thomas L. Llewellyn, Director, Division of Personnel

SUBJECT: Interpersonal Interviewing Skills Training

A two-day workshop designed to teach the effective use of interpersonal interviewing skills will be presented to ten areas this summer involving a total of ninety social service workers in training. The areas selected for this training program are areas 1,3,8,9,15,17, 21,22,25, and 26. The purpose of the program is to increase social work effectiveness through learning and using helpful interpersonal skills. The sessions will be presented in each area by one trainer who will spend approximately four days in the area from Monday noon through Friday noon. In addition to presenting the two-day workshop, the trainer will spend about 1½ hours with each participant in pre-scheduled interview taping procedures. The program has been designed to minimize actual participant time involvement and to increase training cost-effectiveness. The trainer for this program is Ms. Jacqueline Simmons, Social Service Supervisor, Area 22, who is currently working toward an M.S.S.W. degree at the University of Tennessee and who is presently assigned to the Division of Personnel for this special training project.

Nine social service workers (I through IV classifications) should be selected as participants at the area administrator's discretion. The program is, however, better suited to meet the needs of the less experienced worker, those with one month to two years tenure. Participants must be present for workshop training all day Tuesday and Wednesday of the training week, and must be available for a brief taping session on Monday afternoon, Thursday, and Friday morning. These taping sessions will be scheduled with workers during the training week so that regular assignments can be attended to the rest of the day.

A conference room large enough to accomodate ten individuals will be essential for the entire week of the training session. Additionally, the area's videotape recorder and monitor, cassette tape recorder, and the regional video camera, will be needed for the sessions. Staff training coordinators will be contacted and provided more detailed information prior to the training sessions.

Attached is a schedule of the training sessions as planned. Please let us know if this schedule presents a problem for your area.

If you have any questions or need more information, please contact Sharon L. Winkler, State Staff Training Coordinator at 348-3350.

Attachment

APPENDIX B

INSTRUCTIONS FOR INTERVIEWER

## Client Characteristics

Assume that the client you are about to interview has voluntarily requested help with a personal problem or problems from the Department of Welfare.

## Nature of Interview

This is your first interview and you do not know the client. The interview will be of a five or ten minute duration, as clarified by the trainer prior to the interview.

## INSTRUCTIONS

1. Proceed to interview the client until time is called by the trainer. Be as helpful as possible during the time you have available.

2. Assume that this interview is real despite the limited time you have been given to help the client.

3. Assume that the problem is real as presented by the client.

## APPENDIX C

## INSTRUCTIONS FOR CLIENT

### Client Characteristics

You are a client who has voluntarily sought help from the Department of Welfare for help with a personal problem or problems.

### Nature of Interview

Assume that this is your first interview and that you do not know the interviewer. The interview will be of a five or ten minute duration, as clarified by the trainer prior to the interview.

### INSTRUCTIONS

1. Allow the interviewer to start and terminate the interview.

2. Present a problem or problems that are realistic, and are appropriate to the setting. You may discuss a problem of your own, an imagined problem, or one which you have heard a client or acquaintance express.

3. Present behavior which would be appropriate for a first interview and maintain appropriate realness.

4. Do not go out of your way to present extreme or unnatural situations.

## APPENDIX D

## SELF-CRITIQUE OF VIDEO REPLAY

1. What do you see as strong points in your use of Interpersonal Skills in the taped interview?

2. What do you see as weak points in your use of Interpersonal Skills in the taped interview?

3. What might have been better responses in those portions of the interview that you considered weak?

APPENDIX E

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION

1. Have you had any previous microcounseling training?

   YES _____ NO _____

2. Have you had any previous interpersonal skill training?

   YES _____ NO _____

   If yes, please describe briefly:

3. Department of Welfare Classification:

4. Amount of time you have worked for the Department of Welfare:

   YEARS _____ MOS. _____

5. Educational level:

6. Why are you participating in this program?

7. What do you expect to gain from this training?

APPENDIX F

MEMORANDUM TO PARTICIPANTS

DATE: June 17, 1977

TO: Interpersonal Interviewing Skills Training Participants

FROM: Jacqueline E. Simmons, Trainer

SUBJECT: Preparation for Training Session

In order to aid you in rearranging your work schedule during the Skill Training Week and to facilitate the workshop implementation, the following schedule has been prepared:

MONDAY

| | |
|---|---|
| 1:00 - 1:30 PM | Meeting of all participants. Scheduling of individual taped interviews. |
| 1:30 - 4:00 PM | Each participant will complete a five minute audio (cassette) tape of role-played interview. Role-play "clients" will be pre-selected by participant. The participant will need to be present only for his/her own interview which will have been scheduled at the 1:00 PM meeting. |

TUESDAY

| | |
|---|---|
| 9:00 AM - 12:00 Noon | Orientation<br>Attending Behavior, Minimal Encouragers<br>Open Questions |
| 1:00 - 4:00 PM | Responding to Feeling and Meaning |

WEDNESDAY

| | |
|---|---|
| 9:00 AM - 12:00 Noon | Paraphrasing skill<br>Summarization skill |
| 1:00 - 4:00 PM | Skill Integration<br>Evaluation by participant group<br>Scheduling for interviewing tapes |

THURSDAY

| | |
|---|---|
| 8:30 - 11:30 AM | Each participant will complete a ten |

| | |
|---|---|
| THURSDAY (CON'T) | minute videotape of a role-played interview. Role-played "clients" will be pre-selected by the participant. The participant will need to be present only for his/her own interview which will have been scheduled Wednesday P.M. |
| 12:00 - 4:30 PM | Each participant will replay and review his/her videotaped interview within a 30 minute period. The participant will need to be present only for his/her video replay which will have been scheduled Wednesday P.M. |
| FRIDAY | |
| 9:00 AM - 12:00 Noon | Each participant will complete a five minute audio (cassette) tape of a role-played interview. Role-played "clients" will be pre-selected by the participant. The participant will need to be present only for his/her interview which will have been scheduled Wednesday P.M.<br><br>The participants will also complete a brief written evaluation of the training session. |

Selection of Role-Played "Clients"

Each trainee should select individuals from the office staff to act as a client in each role played interview. A different person should be chosen for each interview, thus a total of three individuals will be required for each participant. The same staff person may act as "client" for different individuals, however, as often as that person chooses to volunteer.

Enclosed are "client" instructions and interviewer instructions for the role-plays. Instructions should be read and understood before the interviews, but no discussion of the interview should ensue between the interviewer and the "client".

If you have any questions, please consult your Staff Training Coordinator.

cd

APPENDIX G

MEMORANDUM TO STAFF TRAINING COORDINATOR

DATE: June 17, 1977

TO: Staff Training Coordinator

FROM: Jacqueline E. Simmons, Trainer

SUBJECT: Informational Material for Skills Training Program

Enclosed is participant information for preparation for the Skills Training Program. Each of the nine participants should receive one memo, "Preparation for Training Session", one interviewer instruction form, and three "client" instruction forms. Each participant will need to select three employees, not involved in this training, as role-played "clients" and distribute one "client" instruction form to each of them. Please emphasize that there should be no discussion about the interview between the trainee and the "client". If you have any questions please feel free to call Sharon Winkler, State Staff Training Coordinator, 348-3350, Division of Personnel.

cd

# VITA

Jacqueline E. Simmons was born in Providence, Rhode Island on March 30, 1949. She attended St. Brendan School, St. Mary's Academy, and East Providence Senior High School, graduating in June 1967. In September of 1967 she entered the University of Rhode Island in Kingston, Rhode Island and, in June 1972, received a Bachelor of Arts Degree in English literature.

Ms. Simmons has been employed by the West Virginia Department of Welfare since April 1973 and presently holds a Social Service Supervisor position with that agency. In September 1976, Ms. Simmons was awarded an Educational Leave Contract from the West Virginia Department of Welfare and entered the University of Tennessee School of Social Work at Nashville. In June 1978 she received the Master of Science in Social Work degree with a specialization in administration and planning.

The author is a member of the National Association of Social Workers, the National Association of Christians in Social Work, and the American Public Welfare Association.