

**AN EVALUATION OF A  
JOB SEEKING SKILLS PROGRAMME  
FOR PRISON INMATES**

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of  
the requirements for the degree of  
Master of Arts in Psychology  
at Massey University

**Lucille M. Young**  
**1990**

## ABSTRACT

This research is concerned with the evaluation of a Job Seeking Skills (JSS) programme at Manawatu Prison. Three groups of four JSS participants responded to questionnaire measures of self-esteem, social anxiety and fear of negative evaluation at pretest, posttest and at a six week follow-up. Self-esteem increased but no change occurred on measures of social anxiety and fear of negative evaluation. Subjects also took part in videotaped simulated job interviews at pretest and posttest. Subjects decreased their response latency, but no significant changes were noted on other behavioural measures. Despite this, subjects were rated as significantly more socially skilled and more employable at their posttest interviews. Improvements were also noted on ratings of appearance and question answering. Although subjects reported a decrease in anxiety in interview, ratings of anxiety by external raters did not indicate significant improvement.

## DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to the memory of my late father, Maurice Young.

And to the memory of Jeff Cheyne whose creativity will always be an inspiration.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Most heartfelt thanks are due to my supervisor, Shannon Roache, for her patience, encouragement and guidance at every step along the way.

I would like to thank Dr John Spicer for guidance regarding statistical analyses.

For assistance in the data collection process I would like to thank Brian Hodson, Phillipa Cairns, Paul Higgins, Allistair and Mr Rasterik, all of Manawatu Prison. My gratitude is also due to those inmates who are the subjects of this research. Their cooperation and openness is sincerely appreciated.

Thanks go to Peter Bickers and Elaine Heath for making themselves available as raters, and also to Graeme Beaumont and my good friend, Bev Hong, for their constructive comments on earlier drafts.

A big thank you to Glenda Shaw of the Computer Centre at Massey University. Glenda's optimism, encouragement and patient tuition brought me into the 'nineties' and gave me the confidence to overcome 'computer phobia'. Thanks also to Les Conway for also helping in this regard.

The skills and time of the technical staff of the Psychology Department are much appreciated.



I would like to thank Kathy Hamilton for the word-processing of tables and the more difficult layout tasks.

Thanks to Roy Bowden for believing in me and providing encouragement at various stages of my academic career.

Last, but not least, a very special thank you to my mother, brother and sisters, without whose financial support and morale boosting this thesis might still be in the ten year plan. My heartfelt thanks also go to Grant for being there.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract .....	ii
Dedication .....	iii
Acknowledgments .....	iv
Table of Contents .....	vi
List of Tables .....	viii
List of Appendices .....	x

### CHAPTER

1	INTRODUCTION .....	1
	Definitions of social skill .....	3
	Molecular-behavioural approach to social skill .....	5
2	SOCIAL ANXIETY .....	9
	Theories about social anxiety .....	11
	Response inhibition model .....	11
	Social skills deficit model .....	13
	Summary .....	15
3	SOCIAL ANXIETY AND COGNITION .....	17
	Negative evaluation of own performance .....	17
	Self-esteem .....	18
	Selective attention to negative social feedback .....	19
	Negative cognitions .....	19
	Issues involved in the use of social skills training with socially anxious clients .....	20
4	SOCIAL SKILLS RESEARCH WITH OFFENDER GROUPS .....	24
	Social skills training with offender groups .....	27

5	JOB INTERVIEW TRAINING .....	30
6	THE PRESENT STUDY .....	34
7	METHOD .....	37
	Design .....	37
	Subjects and Sample .....	37
	Materials .....	38
	Procedure .....	43
8	RESULTS .....	49
	Questionnaire measures .....	50
	Social Situations Questionnaire (SSQ) .....	50
	Repeated measures questionnaires .....	53
	Global ratings of videotapes .....	57
	Interobserver agreement .....	60
	Behavioural ratings of interviews .....	62
	Relationship between behavioural measures and global ratings .....	65
	Relationship between social anxiety and self-esteem .....	66
	Relationship between social anxiety and social skill .....	68
	Relationship between social anxiety and self-rated social skill .....	69
	Relationship between self-esteem and self-rated social skill .....	70
9	DISCUSSION .....	71
	REFERENCES .....	82
	APPENDICES .....	92
	Appendix A .....	92
	Appendix B .....	110
	Appendix C .....	116

# LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Behaviours found to have significant relationships with global ratings of social skill and anxiety .....	21
Table 2	Percentage of subjects scoring moderate or worse difficulty on retrospective ratings of items on the Social Situations Questionnaire (SSQ) .....	51
Table 3	Mean scores for items rated as most difficult on the Social Situations Questionnaire (SSQ) .....	52
Table 4	Means scores for questionnaire measures .....	54
Table 5	T-tests for questionnaire measures .....	54
Table 6	Differences between mean pre and posttest global ratings of job interview roleplays .....	58
Table 7	Interobserver agreement for global ratings by independent raters .....	61
Table 8	Interobserver agreement for behavioural ratings by independent raters .....	62
Table 9	Differences between mean pre and posttest rates of behaviour in job interviews .....	63
Table 10	Comparison of ratings for talk time with ratings for anxiety and social skill performance .....	65
Table 11	Comparison of ratings for response latency with ratings for anxiety and social skill performance .....	66

Table 12	Pearson product moment correlations between social anxiety (SAD) and self-esteem (TSBI and SEI) .....	67
Table 13	Relationship between scores on SAD and ratings for social skills performance .....	69
Table 14	Pearson product moment correlations between self-esteem and social skill self-ratings .....	70

## LIST OF APPENDICES

### Appendix A

A1	Social Situations Questionnaire .....	93
A2	Social Avoidance and Distress scale .....	98
A3	Fear of Negative Evaluation .....	100
A4	Self-Esteem Inventory - Adult form .....	102
A5	Texas Social Behavior Inventory - A .....	104
	Texas Social Behavior Inventory - B .....	107

### Appendix B

B1	Description of Job Seeking Skills Programme .....	111
B2	Subjects' global rating scale .....	112
B3	Interviewer's global rating scale .....	113
B4	Independent raters' global rating scale .....	114
B5	Definitions of behavioural measures .....	115

### Appendix C

Table C-1	Individual and mean scores on SAD .....	117
Table C-2	Individual and mean scores on FNE .....	118
Table C-3	Individual and mean scores on SEI .....	119
Table C-4	Individual and mean scores on TSBI .....	120
Table C-5	Subjects' self-ratings for anxiety and social skill in simulated job interviews .....	121
Table C-6	Interviewer's ratings of anxiety and social skill in simulated job interview .....	122
Table C-7	Independent rater's judgments of anxiety and social skill in simulated job interview .....	123
Table C-8	Independent rater's judgments of employability, appearance and question answering in simulated job interview .....	124

## CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

According to Bellack and Hersen (1977) the beginning of the Social Skills training (SST) movement can be traced to the work of Wolpe (1958) and Lazarus (1971) who promoted the training of assertive behaviour primarily as an intervention for anxiety problems. Bellack and Hersen also cite as very influential the studies of Zigler and Phillips (1961, 1962). In these studies it was shown that the prior social competence of psychiatric patients was a better predictor of length of hospital admission and likelihood of readmission, than was their diagnosis, or the type of treatment received. From these beginnings, the Social Skills Training (SST) movement has been characterized by rapid growth in practice and in research. SST programmes have been conducted in a wide variety of settings and with a wide variety of client populations, for example: delinquent adolescents (Hazel, Schumaker, Sherman & Sheldon-Wildgen, 1982; Spence, 1981), chronic psychiatric patients (Goldsmith & McFall, 1975; Trower, Bryant & Argyle, 1978), and socially anxious outpatients (Hollandsworth, Glazeski & Dressel, 1978).

The term 'Social Skills Training' refers to a vast range of therapeutic endeavours. A range of SST programmes with quite different foci have been described in the literature - from those which have a focus on the subject's presentation in terms of a number of specific 'microbehaviours' (e.g. increased eye contact, reduced fiddling, etc.) through to programmes which explore and train subjects in alternative ways to respond in problematic social situations. The latter programmes typically have a conflict negotiation or resolution theme.

While behavioural SST programmes focus on the training of discrete microbehaviours, it has been stressed that in reality, most programmes touch on a number of aspects of social performance, including what would in the past have been termed 'etiquette' (Curran, Farrell & Grunberger, 1984; Huff, 1988).

An important aspect of social competence is the implicit rules and conventions which dictate expected, accepted or prohibited behaviour within particular social situations or settings (Argyle, Furnham & Graham, 1981, cited in Furnham, 1985). Trower et al. (1978) have devoted attention to these implicit rules and have recommended that social skills research and training be concerned with making such rules explicit. This opinion is shared by McFall (1982) who states "the study of social behaviour, to a large extent, represents an attempt to discover and build formal models of these structures and rules" (p. 17).

Along similar lines Argyle et al. (1981, cited in Furnham, 1985) point out that most social behaviour is goal directed and that rules are generated in social situations in order to regulate and coordinate behaviour so that various goals may be attained. These authors argue that SST should familiarize clients with the etiquette and conventions of specific situations, as well as the functions of those rules and when they are applied. Argyle et al. have highlighted the importance of awareness of the specific social roles that people are required to play in particular situations, for example, the different behaviours which are expected of interviewer versus applicant in a job interview.

While the range of SST programmes offered differ in emphases and goals, the methods tend to follow a similar style, termed the 'Psychoeducational approach' (Bagarozzi, 1985). Based on learning principles, this approach utilizes behavioural techniques such as modelling, behaviour rehearsal, positive reinforcement and feedback. Verbal and



written instruction are included. The feedback process commonly makes use of audio or videotape as well as trainer and/or peer feedback.

The present study focuses on a specialized variety of SST programme which is ultimately targeted to the very concrete and pragmatic goal of job attainment. Job Seeking Skills (JSS) programmes exemplify a highly situation-specific type of SST which functions largely to train participants to skillfully play the social role of job applicant. JSS programmes train the prospective job applicant in expected or prescribed behaviour for an interviewee, in addition to improving physical, verbal and nonverbal presentation. To identify the specific social skills which are important in an interview, JSS trainers have drawn from the broader social skill literature (Christoff & Kelley, 1985). Therefore the following review includes an exploration of issues and problems which concern the practice of social skills training of a more general nature.

### **Definitions of social skill**

Despite the growth of interest in SST and its application with a wide variety of client populations there is a lack of consensus as to what is actually meant by 'social skills'. Debate continues regarding which behaviours to focus on in judgments of 'socially skilled behaviour', 'social adequacy' or 'social competence'. There continues to be a lack of a generally accepted model of social skills or social competence (McFall, 1982; Trower, 1984).

Part of the difficulty in reaching agreement as to the definitions or models of social competence is cultural. It has been suggested that ideas as to what constitutes socially skilled behaviour are profoundly influenced by one's culture and subculture, at both the

lay and researcher-clinician level (Furnham, 1985; McFall, 1982; Phillips, 1985; Trower, 1984). In particular, it has been noted that Americans tend to define social skill in terms of assertiveness whereas the British definitions of social skill tend to be broader and to focus more on the ability to develop and sustain relationships (Furnham, 1985).

Phillips' definition (Phillips, 1978, cited in Phillips, 1985) of social skill is perhaps the most value-laden of definitions which has been ventured so far. He states:

A person is socially skilled to the extent to which he or she can communicate with others in a manner that fulfils one's rights, requirements, satisfactions or obligations to a reasonable degree without damaging the other person's rights, requirements, satisfactions or obligations, and shares these rights, etc. with others in free and open exchange (p. 8).

In Phillips' view the individual who can successfully influence others to meet his/her own goals while taking advantage of others, for instance, a salesman knowingly selling substandard merchandise, would not be considered to be socially skilled. Such a definition appears to be too moralistic to be readily accepted by social scientists in general.

Bellack and Hersen's (1977) definition of social skill includes the concept of adaptability. These authors refer to social skill as "an individual's ability to express both positive and negative feelings in the interpersonal context without suffering consequent loss of social reinforcement... (involving) the coordinated delivery of appropriate verbal and nonverbal responses" (p. 145). In Bellack and Hersen's view an important aspect of social skill is the ability to cope with the demands of a wide variety of social situations.

McFall (1982) clearly differentiates between social skill and social competence, two terms which have been used synonymously. Competence is defined as "a general evaluative term referring to the quality or adequacy of a person's overall performance in a particular task" whereas social skills are defined as "the specific abilities that enable a person to perform competently at particular social tasks" (p. 13). In McFall's view, although a person's overall competence may vary across different social tasks, skills should be fairly stable and generalizable characteristics of individuals.

The definitions outlined above are all very broad. Each could be subject to varying interpretations, for different situations and according to different individuals. A more detailed approach is the molecular behavioural model of social skills.

### **Molecular - behavioural approach to social skill**

The behavioural social skills literature has focused attention on the training of what are termed "microbehaviours" basic to social interaction, especially in dyads. McFall (1982) has termed this the Molecular Model approach, and states that "within this model social skills are construed in terms of specific, observable units of behaviour, which are the building blocks of the individual's performance in each interpersonal situation" (p. 7).

Examples of molecular behaviours of interest include nonverbal behaviours such as smiles, eye contact and posture shifts, and verbal and paraverbal behaviours such as asking questions, making self-disclosures and speech latency. Ralph (1988) asserts that the value of micro-level measures lies in the potential identification of specific behaviours, which if modified, will be associated with noticeable improvements in performance at a global level.

In the typical study utilizing the molecular approach the subject's behaviour is observed in either a roleplay situation or in an interview with confederates. The subject's performance is recorded by video or audiotape, and judges are instructed to make subjective ratings of their impressions of the subject's social skills and in some cases, anxiety. In addition, sophisticated computer programmes may be used to compute the frequency and/or duration of component behaviours such as gaze and talk time. Tapes of the interaction are rated by trained raters and performance is analysed in terms of molecular behaviours or microskills relating to various nonverbal, verbal and paraverbal dimensions of behaviour.

The molecular model has attracted a number of criticisms. It's attention to fine details is considered by some as taking too mechanistic and simplistic an approach to the complex process of social interaction. The selection of behaviours coded and rated varies considerably across studies. This lack of consistency has been criticized on the grounds that this makes it difficult to compare results across studies (McFall, 1982; Millbrook, Farrell & Curran, 1986). The molecular approach has, however, undoubtedly provided an important contribution to the understanding of social behaviour, especially at the level of dyadic interaction.

Several studies have used both global and molecular ratings of social performances and have attempted to identify behaviours associated with judges' ratings of level of social skills. From this research some consistent findings have emerged, especially with respect to various measures of gaze behaviour, silence and amount of talk time.

In Millbrook et al.'s (1986) study directed gaze, mutual gaze, talk time and silence were significantly correlated with global ratings of social skill. For gaze behaviours the correlation was positive; subjects who engaged in a high proportion of gaze and who were

able to elicit gaze from their partners were considered to be highly socially skilled. Speaking for a long time was associated with high social skill ratings, whereas long or frequent silences were associated with low social skill ratings. Frequent leg movements were also associated with low social skill ratings. Silence and leg movements emerged as having significant positive correlations with global ratings of anxiety. There was a significant negative correlation between gaze behaviours and anxiety; a low rate of gazing in the direction of the subject's partner was interpreted by raters as indicative of anxiety.

Millbrook et al. cite other studies in which significant relationships have emerged between global ratings of social competence and the following molecular behaviours: gaze, talk time and silence (Conger & Farrell, 1981; Pilkonis, 1977; Trower, 1980); timing of remarks (Fischetti, Curran & Wessberg, 1977), voice, form of conversation and affect (Barlow, Abel, Blanchard, Bristow & Young, 1977); smiles, gestures and posture shifts (Trower, 1980), and personal attention statements (Kupke, Hobbs & Cheney, 1979). These types of investigations appear useful to the extent that they help to uncover the mechanical aspects associated with making a good impression.

Bellack, Hersen and Lamparski (1979) have cast doubt on the ecological validity of the roleplay assessment format typically used in behavioural social skills research. Bellack et al. have demonstrated that the match between roleplay performance and behaviour in the natural environment is far less than perfect. Such investigations have highlighted the need to devote research and training attention to factors inhibiting performance. For instance, Arkowitz (1981) noted that although heterosocially anxious males performed adequately within heterosocial roleplay situations, many reported that they failed to initiate dating behaviour after training. Arkowitz attributed this to subjects' fears of rejection.

Recent trends in social skills research and practice include a call for greater specificity in the assessment of social skill deficits in order to identify as clearly as possible the stages or processes during which social performance breaks down (Arkowitz, 1981; McFall, 1982; Schlundt & McFall, 1985; Trower, 1982; Trower et al., 1978).

A greater range of deficits/skills are now considered relevant to social competence over a range of social situations. Attempts have been made to include these in assessment and to tailor training to the individual's pattern of deficits (Arkowitz, 1981).

McFall has suggested that:

two persons with topographically similar performance may have different patterns of skills deficits. In one case the problem might be related to a deficit in interpreting social messages, for example, and in the other case the problem might be due to an absence of an appropriate response programme in the person's repertoire. A different skills training programme would be required in each of these cases (p. 30).

The cognitive-behavioural movement has drawn attention to the role of anxiety in performance inhibition. Different writers emphasize different things that should be included in the assessment of social competence. Arkowitz (1981) lists the following as crucial: information about the situations in which the subject is inadequate, as well as the relevant antecedents, consequences and mediating cognitions. He proposes that "the relative contributions of social skill deficits, unrealistic social anxiety and maladaptive cognitions about social performance also need to be assessed before we can select the best treatment strategy for an individual" (p. 298). Social anxiety has become one of the most studied performance inhibiting factors.

## CHAPTER TWO: SOCIAL ANXIETY

Social anxiety has been described as "a highly prevalent condition characterized by emotional distress in anticipation of, or involvement in an interpersonal encounter" (Turner & Beidel, 1985, p. 384). It has been cited as more debilitating and distressing than other commonly studied forms of anxiety disorder (Curran, 1977, cited in Smith, Ingram & Brehm, 1983).

While most people will experience social anxiety at least occasionally in a few situations (Pilkonis, 1977; Zimbardo, 1977), for some it represents a debilitating problem which has a marked impact on daily life. For example, it has been suggested that high levels of social anxiety may predispose some people to alcohol and/or substance abuse (Kraft, 1971; Pilkonis, Feldman & Himmelhoch, 1981).

Leary (1983) argues that since there are great differences among individuals in the frequency with which the state of social anxiety is experienced, there is some merit in regarding individual differences in the tendency to experience social anxiety as a meaningful trait variable.

Research investigating the relationship between social skill and social anxiety has tended to rely on questionnaire measures such as the widely used Social Avoidance and Distress (SAD) scale, (Watson & Friend, 1969), to classify subjects' level of social anxiety. Watson and Friend state that "social avoidance and distress measured by the SAD, may be a general reaction for some people, while for others it may be specific to certain situations, such as dealing with authorities or members of the opposite sex" (p. 457). A low score on a scale such as SAD may be more indicative of low frequency of distress in



social situations or low frequency of avoidance. Although low scorers may experience fewer social situations to be problematic, their intensity of distress, in certain situations, may not necessarily differ from that suffered by high scorers. Even for the highly socially anxious, the intensity of distress experienced varies considerably across a range of interpersonal situations (Turner, Beidel & Larkin, 1986).

Some social situations have been identified as being particularly problematic, even for individuals who do not generally describe themselves as socially anxious in the trait sense which Leary (1983) describes. Among these situations are: being with members of the opposite sex or with strangers and delivering a speech (Pilkonis, 1977; Turner et al., 1986). The job interview was, surprisingly, not listed by Pilkonis amongst the more problematic social situations. It could be argued, however, that when the interviewer is a stranger, and seen as potentially an authority, the job interview is a situation in which a number of elements of problematic social situations are combined.

Some authors (e.g. Pilkonis, 1977; Turner & Beidel, 1985) have attempted to provide classifications of subtypes of socially anxious individuals. It has become apparent that people complaining of high levels of social anxiety differ in the ways in which they experience the state of social anxiety. Social anxiety, as with other forms of anxiety, has been studied with respect to physiological arousal, negative cognitions and overt behaviour, all of which have been suggested as important parameters of the condition (Beidel et al., 1985; Lucock & Salkovskis, 1988).

The centrality of negative cognitions as a feature of social anxiety has been highlighted by Turner and Beidel (1985). They obtained evidence of differential patterns of responding in socially anxious individuals when engaged in an anxiety-arousing social



task. Although negative cognitions were characteristic of both patterns, the main distinguishing feature was the presence of absence of heightened physiological reactivity.

Pilkonis (1977) performed a cluster analysis on the results of a Shyness survey with 100 college students who were asked to rank the degree to which various subjective and behavioural aspects of shyness were a problem for them. On the basis of this analysis Pilkonis constructed a Public - Private shyness dimension. Publicly shy people indicate that they are concerned about behaving awkwardly and failing to respond appropriately, whereas privately shy individuals indicate that they are bothered more by internal somatic sensations and apprehension about being evaluated negatively.

### **Theories about Social Anxiety**

Theoretical attempts to explain the etiology of social anxiety have previously centred around two competing models: the Classical Conditioning/Response Inhibition model (e.g. Wolpe, 1969), and the Social Skills Deficit model (e.g. Trower et al., 1978). These have been outlined and critically examined by Leary (1983) and Lucock and Salkovskis (1988) who point out that neither view is totally consistent with research findings.

#### **Response Inhibition Model**

Within the Response Inhibition model social anxiety is seen to be a classically conditioned response arising from repeated exposure to aversive experiences in social

situations. Hence people experience anxiety in social situations and choose to avoid social interaction because they anticipate that their social behaviour will be punished.

Associated with this model is the use of Assertion Training whose advocates, for example, Wolpe (1969), argue that assertive behaviour builds up reciprocal inhibition of anxiety. Percell, Beruck and Beigel (1974) demonstrated that assertion training resulted in improved self-concept and a reduction of anxiety. However, they omitted to include a follow-up in this study, raising the question of maintenance of treatment effects. Trower (1984) has commented on the frequent failure of Assertion Training to produce generalized and long-term gains.

The Response Inhibition model has also been associated with the use of Systematic Desensitization in which one of the major treatment goals is the reduction of autonomic arousal. Sole reliance on systematic desensitization as an intervention with the socially anxious has been questioned recently. For example, McCann, Woolfolk and Lehrer (1987) exposed interpersonally anxious subjects to either rational restructuring, behavioural rehearsal or progressive muscle relaxation. Progressive muscle relaxation did not produce greater reductions in physiological responsivity to an interpersonal stressor than the other treatments investigated. Since high levels of autonomic reactivity are not characteristic of all individuals reporting high social anxiety (Turner & Beidel, 1985) emphasis on progressive muscle relaxation in treatment programmes is not likely to be effective.

### **Social Skills Deficit Model**

According to the Social Skills Deficit model, social anxiety is a consequence of a failure to respond appropriately in social situations due to deficits in the individual's repertoire of social skills. Much research effort has gone into seeking to determine whether or not socially anxious people can be differentiated from the nonanxious on measures of social skill or competence. Leary (1983) has argued that if the skills deficit approach to social anxiety is correct in its assumption that social anxiety results from social skill deficits, then we would observe distinct differences in the social skill level of people who are classified as high versus low in social anxiety. However research pertaining to these differences fails to lead to any firm conclusions. Dimensions which have been studied may be divided into: Global ratings, and microbehavioural ratings, nonverbal behaviours, and verbal and paraverbal behaviours.

#### **Global ratings**

Much of the social skills research includes ratings of social competence which rely totally on the subjective impressions of independent observers. At this level differences between high and low social anxiety groups have been reported by a number of investigators (e.g. Beidel et al., 1985; Bellack & Hersen, 1979; Borkovec, Stone, O'Brien & Kaloupek, 1974; Curran, 1977). Some of these authors point out that such findings are not clear cut, however. For example, Beidel et al. (1985) found that global social skill ratings differentiated between high and low anxiety groups for interactions with confederates, but not for an impromptu speech. Curran (1977) emphasized that some of the high anxiety subjects were actually rated very high in social skill.

Some investigators (e.g. Glasgow & Arkowitz, 1975; Rehm & Marston, 1968) have found no differences between high and low anxiety groups on globally rated social skill. Daley (1978) failed to find any differences between groups on globally rated skill in a high school student population, although his high social anxiety subjects obtained lower ratings for eye contact and response frequency.

### **Microbehavioural ratings**

Investigations regarding differences at the level of isolated microbehaviours reveal a clouded and confusing picture. For example, among nonverbal behaviours, gaze or eye contact has received much research attention in the investigation of social skill differences between high and low anxiety groups. Glasgow and Arkowitz (1975) and Rehm and Marston (1968) failed to find any differences between high and low social anxiety groups for various dimensions of gaze behaviour. These findings have not been supported, however, in more recent studies. Daley (1978) found that high social anxiety subjects engaged in less eye contact than did their low social anxiety peers. Pilkonis (1977) revealed that high anxious males engaged in significantly less eye contact, but no significant differences were found for females. Beidel et al. (1985) also revealed that appropriate gaze was significantly lower in high anxious males, but that no differences were found for females.

There is general consensus in the literature that head nods and gestures do not seem to be important indicators of anxiety. For example, Glasgow and Arkowitz (1975) and Rehm and Marston (1968) failed to find any significant differences between high and low social anxiety groups on these microbehaviours.

Research findings on the relationship between social anxiety and verbal and paraverbal behaviours, however, are not clear cut. For example, Glasgow and Arkowitz (1975) and Rehm and Marston (1968) failed to identify any significant differences between high and low anxious groups for response frequency, response latency or response duration. In contrast to these findings, differences in response frequency, with high social anxiety subjects responding less often, have been identified by Daley (1978). Borkovek, Stone, O'Brien and Kaloupek (1974) found that highly anxious males tended to speak less during brief heterosocial interactions than subjects with low anxiety, but this difference was not significant.

### **Summary**

The results of investigations into social skill differences between high and low social anxiety groups have been quite equivocal. A number of investigators have reported that highly socially anxious subjects are judged on the basis of global ratings to be significantly less socially skilled than low anxious subjects. Some of these investigators (e.g. Beidel et al., 1985; Curran, 1977) urge that a cautious approach should be taken to these findings, and point out that differences are dependent on such factors as the type of social situation studied, and gender of the subjects.

Investigations of microbehavioural differences have also resulted in mixed findings. Some investigators have been unable to find any significant differences between high and low social anxiety groups on the basis of behavioural measures and global ratings (Glasgow & Arkowitz, 1975; Rehm & Marston, 1968). Others (e.g. Daley, 1978) have found behavioural skill differences between high and low anxiety groups, but these differences have not been potent enough to influence global ratings.

On the basis of research findings little evidence has been presented to validate the social skills deficit model of social anxiety. The picture might possibly be clarified if standardized assessment formats were used so that there is greater consistency in the selection of behaviours investigated. Beidel et al. (1985) have also stressed that the types of situations in which the behaviour of high and low social anxiety groups have been studied have been very limited in number; they have recommended that assessment should involve a greater variety and number of social situations.

### CHAPTER THREE: SOCIAL ANXIETY AND COGNITION

In the light of inconclusive findings with respect to the existence of social skill differences between socially anxious and nonanxious individuals, attention has turned to the investigation of cognitive differences.

It has been suggested that more evidence exists for cognitive differences than for behavioural differences between high and low socially anxious persons (Galassi & Galassi, 1979).

Amongst the cognitive differences proposed are: negative evaluation of one's own performance, self-esteem and selective attention to negative social feedback. Negative cognitions during social interaction have also been investigated.

#### **Negative evaluation of own performance**

Arkowitz (1981) has observed that a person may have adequate social skills but evaluate them overly negatively and hence avoid social situations. This was illustrated in a study by Curran, Wallander and Fischetti (1980) who identified two groups of socially anxious subjects whose performance was observed during interaction with an opposite sex confederate. Some subjects evidenced behavioural social skill deficits and their self-ratings of skill indicated that they accurately perceived their skill deficiency. The performance of another group of socially anxious subjects was judged by external raters to be highly skilled, but these subjects viewed their own performance critically, underestimating their level of social ability compared with judges' ratings.

Beidel et al. (1985) found that although socially anxious individuals were concerned that their distress may be evident to others, the heightened distress experienced by the anxious group was not always apparent to independent raters. It appears that socially anxious individuals are anxious about the possibility of being seen to be anxious but that some are more skilled than others at concealing this anxiety.

Curran et al.'s (1980) finding that many socially anxious people tend to underestimate their level of interpersonal skills has been supported by other investigations (e.g. Endelmann, 1985, cited in Lucock & Salkovskis, 1988; Trower, 1981). It is possible that this may stem from a generalized tendency amongst the socially anxious to view themselves negatively. That is, social anxiety may be a reflection of low self-esteem. To date few authors have directly investigated this idea.

### **Self-esteem**

Clark and Arkowitz (1975) found significant differences between scores for high and low social anxiety subjects on both the Fear on Negative (FNE) scale and the Self-Esteem Inventory (Coopersmith, 1967). They found a moderate to high negative correlation between highly socially anxious subjects' scores on the Social Avoidance and Distress (SAD) scale and the Self-Esteem Inventory (Coopersmith, 1967). Leary (1983) has suggested that low self-esteem among the socially anxious is related to a perception of social anxiousness as a socially undesirable characteristic. In support of this he has cited Zimbardo (1977) whose Shyness Survey respondents indicated that they saw their shyness as socially undesirable.



### **Selective attention to negative social feedback**

Some investigators have found that socially anxious subjects selectively attend to negative social feedback. Lucock and Salkovskis (1988) cite the findings of Halford (1979) and Smith and Sarason (1975) who found that highly socially anxious people evaluated standardized interpersonal feedback more negatively than did low socially anxious persons. It has also been shown that these subjects are more likely to remember negative interpersonal reactions (O'Banion & Arkowitz, 1977, cited in Lucock & Salkovskis, 1988). Socially anxious individuals have also been shown to evidence a specific type of cognitive excess - ruminations about what others think of them, when placed in a social evaluative situation (Smith & Brehm, 1983).

### **Negative cognitions**

Thought listing procedures have been used to identify the cognitions of high and low socially anxious persons when taking part in laboratory-based social interactions. Much of this research has focused on heterosocial anxiety. For example, Cacioppo, Glass and Merluzzi (1979) found that while anticipating a discussion with an unfamiliar woman, highly socially anxious men generated more negative self-statements, rated themselves more negatively, and reported more state anxiety than did men who were low in social anxiety. Cognitions of the heterosocially anxious have also been studied retrospectively. Glass, Merluzzi, Biever and Larsen (1982) reported that heterosocially anxious males and females had fewer positive thoughts and more negative ones during a heterosocial interaction than did their nonanxious peers. These cognitive differences have been reported across a range of brief roleplay situations by Halford and Foddy (1982) who

also found that their socially anxious subjects were rated as less assertive in these roleplays than were the nonanxious subjects.

Turner et al. (1986) had socially anxious and non-socially anxious subjects participate in three social tasks: an interaction with a same sex confederate, an interaction with an opposite sex confederate and a speech. Turner et al. found that although the socially anxious group reported more negative thoughts and fewer positive ones, the nature of the task was important. All subjects, including the socially anxious, reported more positive thoughts during the same sex interaction than during the opposite sex interaction, and more positive thoughts during the opposite sex interaction than during the speech.

The research reviewed above gives general support for the view that socially anxious individuals differ from non socially anxious individuals in the way they evaluate their own performance in social situations. These evaluations are not necessarily consistent with the appraisals made of their performance by others.

### **Issues involved in the use of Social Skills Training with socially anxious clients**

A recent trend directly arising from the practice of social skills training has been concerned with the social validation of various behaviours which commonly form the targets for these programmes. Recently a number of authors (e.g. Millbrook et al., 1986; Spence, 1981) have used both global ratings and microbehavioural measures of social skill and anxiety in the hope of identifying specific behavioural components which contribute to creating a favourable impression on others in terms of judgments of social skill and anxiety.

Spence (1981) reports that there is a tendency for raters to assign low social skill ratings to subjects whom they perceive to be anxious. The high correlation noted between global ratings of social skill and global ratings of anxiety (Conger & Conger, 1982; Millbrook et al., 1986; Spence, 1981) implies that it is in the interest of people to alter their behaviour in such a way as to conceal outward manifestations of anxiety. Management of the outward appearance of anxiety can thus be viewed as a skill in itself - an important aspect of social competence.

A summary of behaviours found by Millbrook et al. (1986) and Spence (1981) to have significant relationships with global ratings of skill and anxiety can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1

Behaviours found to have significant relationships with global ratings of social skill and anxiety

Behaviour	Social skill	Anxiety
<b>Nonverbal</b>		
Eye contact	Positive	Negative
Smiling		Positive
Head movements	Positive	Negative
Gestures	Positive	Negative
Leg movements	Positive	
Self manipulations	Positive	
<b>Verbal/paraverbal</b>		
Talk time/amount spoken	Positive	Negative
Silence	Negative	Positive
Response latency	Negative	Positive

The investigations of Millbrook et al. (1986) and Spence (1981) present the following picture of persons most likely to be judged to be anxious within social situations: they engage in little eye contact and rarely smile or move their heads; they do not emphasize conversational points with gestures; they speak little and take a long time to respond to questions, and are also likely to fiddle and to jiggle their legs. The picture is mainly one of a lack of behaviour, perhaps conveying an impression of unresponsiveness. This could, in part, explain the high correlations which are generally found between global ratings of anxiety and social skill (Conger & Conger, 1982; Spence, 1981). In the light of this finding an important objective of social skills training programmes is to enable participants to appear less anxious in social situations.

For those individuals who experience social anxiety frequently and across a range of different social situations the job interview is likely to be a difficult experience. Curran et al. (1980) have demonstrated that highly socially anxious persons tend to regard their social performance as unskilled although independent raters may assign high social skill ratings to many of these people. It is likely that those who are judged to be highly socially skilled have not only learned how to emit socially appropriate behavioural responses, but have also learned to conceal the appearance of anxiety.

Job interview training programmes train individuals in the conventions of the job interview. They focus in particular on verbal content and on the delivery of verbal and nonverbal responses in such a way as to present favourably in the interview and to conceal anxiety.

It has been noted that cognitive biases, such as underestimation of one's performance, negative cognitions, and the absence of positive cognitions appear to inhibit socially appropriate behaviour regardless of a person's repertoire of socially skilled responses

(Arkowitz, 1981; Trower, 1981, cited in Lucock & Salkovskis, 1988; Turner et al., 1986). Trower argues that unless these cognitive biases are modified, treatment for socially anxious persons is unlikely to produce generalized and long-term change. Anxiety-provoking social situations are likely to be avoided if social avoidance has been part of the social anxiety syndrome for the individual.

If highly socially anxious persons find the job interview to be particularly difficult this could have major implications such as avoidance of job interviews, and thus unemployment. Once it has been established that a socially anxious person possesses the requisite social skills to present favourably within the job interview it would appear to be advantageous to discuss the possibility of maladaptive cognitions which might maintain avoidance.

## CHAPTER FOUR: SOCIAL SKILLS RESEARCH WITH OFFENDER GROUPS

Henderson and Hollin (1983) point out that the application of any therapeutic technique makes the assumption that the target population is either totally or partially lacking in the specific skills, behaviours or insights the particular method purports to train. In particular, psychiatric patients and prison inmates have received much attention within the SST literature. Convicted offenders have been assumed to be socially unskilled, and hence it has become 'fashionable' to employ SST to remedy such perceived deficits. A growing number of studies have found offender populations to be significantly less socially skilled than matched non-offender comparison groups (Freedman, Rosenthal, Donahoe, Schlundt & McFall, 1978; Spence, 1981). Unfortunately the majority of studies comparing the social competence of offenders and non-offenders have focused on adolescent males, necessitating extrapolation to adult groups.

One study which has focused on adult prison inmates was by Kirchner, Kennedy and Draguns (1977, cited in Bornstein et al., 1979), whose research involved investigation of the response strategies of offenders when presented with interpersonal situations which were characterized by their potential for conflict. Kirchner et al. found that although the offenders behaved as assertively as non-offenders, they used considerably more aggression in the expression of their rights and feelings when placed in conflict situations. This tendency toward aggressive responses has also been noted with adolescent offenders. Freedman et al. (1978) presented offenders with an inventory of problematic social situations. Subjects were asked how they would respond to these social scenarios. In comparison with a matched sample of non-delinquents the delinquent adolescent males reported use of a more limited range of response strategies,

which tended to be aggressive. Freedman et al have conceptualized delinquent behaviour as a manifestation of situation-specific behaviour skills deficits. Consistent with this formulation some SST programmes have been aimed specifically at teaching the social skills involved in interacting with authority figures (Golden, Twentyman, Jensen, Karan & Kloss, 1980).

On the basis of clinical experiences with adult probationers Golden et al. (1980) have noted that many of their clients typically reacted with either an awkward silence or open hostility when in situations which required an active justification of their actions or when petitioning. These authors state that in many of these situations their clients had legitimate reasons for their actions that they did not present or had suggestions which they failed to make. Golden et al. assert that often their clients reacted in socially unacceptable ways because they felt anger toward a system which they believed to be unresponsive to their needs.

Stermac and Quinsey (1986) found that the performance of adult offenders in 22 audiotaped roleplays dealing with heterosocial situations was rated by blind raters as significantly less skilled than that of community subjects. In this study the behaviour of the offenders in two five minute conversations with confederates (one male and one female) was also rated as significantly less skilled than that of the non-offenders. No differences between groups were revealed for self-ratings or judges' ratings of the subjects' anxiety.

Differences between offenders and non-offenders have also been investigated at a more molecular level. Behaviourally oriented investigations have identified differences between offenders and matched non-offender groups on a number of behavioural components. The situations or contexts within which such differences have been studied



have been those types of situations which lend themselves to analysis at the molecular level, for example, roleplay and interview situations.

Spence (1981) investigated the interview and roleplay behaviour of 18 institutionalized young male offenders and 18 boys without criminal records, matched for age, academic performance and social background. Assessment of social skills entailed subjects participating in a standardized interview which was followed by a roleplay which involved returning a defective item to a shop. Videotapes of these interactions were analyzed in terms of 13 specific behavioural measures, and were rated by independent raters on the following global measures: social skills performance, anxiety, employability and friendliness. The offender group engaged in significantly less eye contact, head movements and speech, and they engaged in more fiddling and gross body movements. Significant differences, again favouring the non-offenders were also found on the global ratings of social skills performance, anxiety and employability.

Within a job interview roleplay situation Twentyman et al. (1978) found that adult offenders were rated as significantly poorer than unemployed controls for the following categories: appearance, appropriateness of appearance, slouching, mentioning specific qualifications, eye contact, skillfulness during the interview and likelihood of obtaining employment. The probationers appear to have been conscious of their deficits; they rated themselves as significantly less likely to obtain employment and less socially skilled in the interview than did the unemployment control group. No differences between groups were found on anxiety ratings. This is in contrast with Spence's finding that adolescent offenders were judged to be more anxious than non-delinquents. Findings of Twentyman et al.'s study must be interpreted cautiously, however, because the probationers all had a history of psychiatric referral.



The studies reviewed above provide some support for the common assumption that male offender groups are less skilled in social situations than non-offenders. In all of the investigations reviewed above the raters were blind as to which subjects were derived from offender populations. Offenders have been demonstrated to show limitations in their ability to select effective response strategies when placed in problematic social situations (Freedman et al., 1978; Kirchner et al., 1977, cited in Bornstein et al., 1979). In addition to making less favourable impressions on raters at the level of global ratings of social skill (Stermac & Quinsey, 1986), offenders have also been shown to display deficits at the molecular level of behaviour (Spence, 1981; Twentyman et al., 1978).

### **SOCIAL SKILLS TRAINING WITH OFFENDER GROUPS**

Trower et al. (1978) attempt to describe the basic idea behind SST: "that is, that patients or others deficient in skills can be taught directly a new and more socially accepted repertoire of skills, which will enable them to attain basic personal goals" (p. 50). They cite Goldsmith and McFall (1975) who contrast SST with therapies aimed primarily at the elimination of maladaptive behaviours and skills training, emphasizing the positive, educational aspects of treatment. This view of SST and the optimism underlying it is echoed by those advocating SST with delinquent and criminal offender populations (e.g. Hazel et al., 1982). The rationale underlying this approach is that once these people learn to function effectively within social systems they will not resort to illegal means to attain their goals.

The more enthusiastic promoters of SST with offenders believe that the effect of SST will be to reduce crime as acceptable ways are found to meet one's needs and goals. Hence

such programmes have often been evaluated in terms of recidivism rates. Implicit in this approach is the view that social skill deficits lead to criminal behaviour.

A rather different interpretation has been offered by Spence (1981). She suggests that socially unskilled offenders may receive less favourable sentences from the courts than do their more socially adept peers. Hence those who reach prison may be an unrepresentative sample of the criminal population. It is also possible that any lowering of recidivism rates following SST may be due not to a reduction in offending, but to the offenders' newly learned ability to avoid unfavourable attention or to talk themselves out of difficult legal situations.

Active researchers in the SST field with offenders caution that SST should still be regarded as an experimental procedure. This is in spite of documented success in the training of discrete behavioural components (Spence & Marzillier, 1981). Others (e.g. Huff, 1988) point out that cognitive factors are often overlooked and argue that cognitive changes are essential to ensure generalization and maintenance of treatment effects. Often it seems that too much is expected of a short programme. Bagarozzi (1985) questions just how much a short programme can be expected, realistically, to alter the behaviour of institutionalized patients or offenders. However, few have joined Furnham (1985) in asking how successful can we expect SST programmes to be when the social systems in which the subject must continue to exist do not support change and often require quite different styles of interpersonal behaviour. Within an institutional setting such as a prison the subject must face the reality of stresses and a social system quite unlike life on the 'outside'. Assertiveness is unlikely to be welcomed by prison authorities who are used to requiring and expecting unquestioned compliance.

Within the context of discussing the rehabilitative aims of vocational training within prisons Kennedy (1976, cited in Golden et al., 1980) has recommended that such programmes be augmented by training in social and interpersonal skills. Training in skills required for cooperation with colleagues, conflict resolution and interacting with authorities may assist offenders to maintain the employment for which vocational training programmes have prepared them. In order to attain employment initially, however, a number of additional skills must be mastered, not the least of which are those social skills required to present favourably within a job interview.

## CHAPTER FIVE: JOB INTERVIEW TRAINING

Job interview training may be viewed as a type of SST programme targeted toward a specific situation which many people experience to be anxiety provoking. Conger and Conger (1982) have emphasized the goal directedness of social behaviour and have distinguished between social behaviour which is instrumental and that which is guided by purely social goals. The job interview is a social activity which most applicants must go through in their quest of the instrumental goal of job attainment.

Bagarozzi (1985) has advocated that potential SST participants will be more likely to be drawn to SST programmes if they can see that training will result in pragmatically useful results. The specific nature of Job Seeking Skills (JSS) programmes targeted to the instrumental goal of job attainment would appear to be attractive from the client's point of view when seen in terms of the specific abilities which such courses enable clients to master. For example, JSS programmes may be concerned with the following skills: filling in job application forms, preparation of curricula vitae, conversing with business representatives over the telephone to secure an interview, in addition to training in appropriate behaviour in the interview setting (Twentyman et al., 1978).

Christoff and Kelley (1985) have reviewed a number of studies concerned with job interview training (Barbee & Keil, 1973; Furnman, Geller, Simon & Kelley, 1979; Kelly, Laughlin, Clairborne & Patterson, 1979; Kelley, Wildman & Berler, 1980 and Pinte, 1979). On the basis of this analysis they list the components of job interview skills noted in the literature. These include: eye contact, appropriate affect, speech loudness, clarity and fluency, concise, direct answers to interviewer's questions, job-relevant questions

asked of the interviewer, positive self-statements regarding past education, training, work experiences, interests, hobbies or activities, and expressions of enthusiasm and interest in the position applied for.

Successful interview training programmes have been reported from a number of different populations: an anxious college graduate (Hollandsworth, Glazeski & Dressel, 1978); school leavers (Hood, Lindsay & Brooks, 1982); probationers with a history of psychiatric referral (Twentyman et al., 1978) and incarcerated young male delinquents (Braukman, Fixen, Phillips, Wolf & Maloney, 1974). However 'success' has been defined in different ways across studies due to differences in assessment and evaluation procedures. The ultimate criterion of the success of JSS programmes (at least from the client's perspective) is job attainment. Not all studies have, however, incorporated follow-up periods to find out whether the client has secured employment. Hollandsworth et al. (1978) incorporated a two week follow-up and found that their single subject received three job offers during this time. Twentyman et al. (1978) found that significantly more of the training group participants had attained jobs by follow-up than had subjects in a matched monetary incentive comparison group.

The failure of many authors to assess employment status at follow-up is understandable considering that successful performance within an interview is only one of the many factors involved in hiring decisions. Training groups are unlikely to be homogeneous with respect to types of jobs desired and sought, and the qualifications and/or previous experience in the job/s of their choice. In the light of such difficulties most authors have opted to use measures of global and behavioural component skills within simulated job interviews to assess degree of change as a result of training. In these studies significant pre to post training improvements have been reported (e.g. Hood et al., 1982; Braukmann et al., 1974).

Spence (1981) investigated the relationship between four subjective global rating scales used by independent raters (anxiety, friendliness, social skills and employability), and ratings for thirteen specific behaviours within an interview setting. Three behaviours: latency of response, eye contact and head movements were significantly correlated with ratings on all four global scales. With regard specifically to employability, latency of response was the behaviour which was most highly correlated with the global employability rating. Eye contact, amount spoken, head movements and smiling were significantly correlated with both social skill and employability ratings.

There was a high degree of correlation between the four global rating scales, suggesting a strong degree of interdependence. For example, social skills were found to correlate highly with social anxiety ( $r = -.83$ ) and friendliness ( $r = .79$ ) scales. Relationships were established between ratings for employability and social skills ( $r = .88$ ), between employability and social anxiety ( $r = -.73$ ), and between social anxiety and friendliness ( $r = -.58$ ).

The findings of Spence's (1981) study suggest which behavioural components are important within an interview setting in terms of their power to convey particular impressions, for example, of a friendly, socially skilled and not overly anxious person. The high correlation between social skill and employability ratings also suggests that research regarding SST programmes of a more general and less situation-specific nature may be directly relevant to job interview training programmes.

Clearly, in isolation, training in microbehaviours cannot be expected to transform somebody into a socially adept person. The scope of SST needs to be broad but the breadth of its focus is dependent upon the aims and goals of the particular programme offered. For circumscribed situations where a person's behaviour is assessed within a

limited context and time frame, like a job interview, the skillful execution of such microbehaviours goes a long way to creating a favourable impression. The result of this is that it may maximize the possibility of gaining access to resources. The superficiality of the molecular approach does not detract from the value of devoting attention to this level. It is best viewed as a necessary but not necessarily sufficient aspect of training in social competence.

## CHAPTER SIX: THE PRESENT STUDY

The Psychology Department at Massey University was approached by the Psychological Services division of the Justice Department to conduct an independent evaluation of two social skills training programmes conducted at Manawatu Prison. These programmes were: Job Seeking Skills and Flatting Skills. The evaluation of the Job Seeking Skills (JSS) programme forms the basis of the present study.

The task of evaluation provided an opportunity to examine the relationship between social anxiety and social skill within a job interview context, with a criminal offender population.

Apart from the evaluation of the JSS programme the major focus of the present study is to:

1. Investigate the relationship between social anxiety and self-esteem in a sample of New Zealand prison inmates. Clark and Arkowitz (1975) demonstrated that for highly socially anxious subjects there was a moderate to high correlation between scores on the Social Avoidance and Distress (SAD) scale and the Coopersmith Inventory which assesses self-esteem. It is predicted that this finding will be replicated with a New Zealand adult male criminal offender population.
2. Explore the relationship between social anxiety scores on the SAD and ratings of social skills in the interviews. It is predicted that there will be a significant



relationship between these measures consistent with the Social Skills Deficit model of social anxiety.

3. Analyze the relationship between subjects' self-ratings of social skill and their social anxiety scores on the SAD. Curran et al. (1980) found that socially anxious subjects assigned low social skills scores to themselves although raters judged some of these subjects to be highly skilled. It is predicted that subjects' evaluation of their own performance will be significantly (inversely) related to their level of social anxiety.
4. Clarify the relationship between self-esteem (measured by the TSBI and by the SEI) and self-ratings of social skill. Socially anxious individuals have been demonstrated to rate themselves as low in social skill (Curran et al., 1980). A moderate inverse correlation has been demonstrated between social anxiety and self-esteem (Clark & Arkowitz, 1975). It is therefore predicted that there will be a significant positive relationship between self-esteem and subjects' evaluation of their own performance. To test this prediction two self-esteem measures will be analyzed separately.

In summary, the present study incorporates three types of measures:

1. Behavioural measures of job interview social skills. It is predicted that there will be significant improvements for the behavioural measures rated.
2. Global ratings of social skill and anxiety in interview. These ratings will be made by the subjects themselves, the independent rater and the interviewer. The independent rater and the interviewer will also rate the subjects' employability.

Global ratings of appearance and question answering will be made by the independent rater. It is expected that there will be significant improvements on the global dimensions rated.

Using both global ratings and the behavioural measures, an attempt will be made to identify specific behaviours associated with high ratings of social skill and high ratings of anxiety.

3. Questionnaire measures of self-esteem, social anxiety, and fear of negative evaluation. Predictions associated with these measures have been outlined above.

## **CHAPTER SEVEN: METHOD**

### **DESIGN**

A repeated measures design was used in the research. Subjects completed a set of questionnaires in the week preceding the Job Seeking Skills (JSS) programme (pretest), during the week following its conclusion (posttest) and six weeks after posttest (follow-up). Behavioural ratings were also made for each subject on videotaped simulated job interviews filmed on the first (preprogramme) and last (post programme) days of the JSS programme.

### **SUBJECTS AND SAMPLE**

The sample was derived from three consecutive JSS groups at Manawatu Prison. The groups were held in July, August and September 1988.

All subjects were male. They ranged in age from 17 - 30, with a mean age of 21 years, 8 months. Nine of the subjects were Maori, two were Pakeha and one was Samoan.

Each JSS group consisted of four subjects.

## MATERIALS

An important consideration in the present study was the need to select questionnaire measures appropriate for the inmate sample. The Education Officer at the Prison had advised the researcher that many of the inmates had a low level of educational achievement and marked difficulties in reading. Poor reading skills have been noted by Andrew (1977) and Fitzhugh (1973) who demonstrated a tendency for delinquents to score more highly on performance I.Q. than verbal I.Q. Such considerations indicated the need for measures which were relatively brief and not too verbally complex.

For the purposes of future programme planning a modified form of the Social Situations Questionnaire (SSQ) (Bryant & Trower, 1974) was used to identify social situations perceived to be problematic by a criminal offender population. The SSQ was completed at pretest only.

The cognitive assessment battery included measures of social- evaluative anxiety: The Social Avoidance and Distress (SAD) scale, (Watson & Friend, 1969), and the Fear of Negative Evaluation (FNE) scale, (Watson & Friend, 1969).

Selection of a self-esteem measure proved difficult. The Self-Esteem Inventory (SEI-Adult form),(Coopersmith, 1981) was selected because of its' widespread use, and low level of verbal complexity. The Texas Social Behaviour Inventory (TSBI - short form), (Helmreich & Stapp, 1974), which purports to assess social self-esteem was selected for its' specific focus on the individual's evaluation of his social self.

Copies of all questionnaires used in the research are included in Appendix A.

### **Social Situations Questionnaire (SSQ)**

The original form of the SSQ (Bryant & Trower, 1974) asks subjects to respond to 30 stimulus situations. The social situations are quite varied, ranging from 'walking down the street' to 'going out with someone you are sexually attracted to' and 'talking to someone about your feelings'.

The original forms asks respondents to rate the degree of difficulty experienced in each social situation listed using a five point scale with 0 = no difficulty to 4 = avoidance if possible. Subjects also rate how often they encounter each situation. Subjects respond to both difficulty and frequency tasks for each of two time periods: the present time, and the equivalent time a year ago.

Bryant and Trower (1974) provided no information about reliability or validity.

Modifications for the present study included the use of a ten point scale with verbal descriptors at 0 = not at all hard for me and 9 = extremely hard for me.

The time period was changed to the twelve months prior to the present period of incarceration. Since the subjects were not currently exposed to many of the situations due to their incarceration, ratings were not requested of present difficulty.

The frequency task was not included in the modified SSQ used in the present study.

### **Social Avoidance and Distress (SAD)**

The SAD was developed by Watson and Friend (1969) as a measure of social evaluative anxiety. It assesses both avoidance (including the desire for avoidance) and subjectively experienced distress in social encounters. The SAD consists of 30 statements, with a True/False response format. It is evenly divided between true and false items. The maximum score, indicative of the highest level of social avoidance and distress is 30.

Watson and Friend (1969) reported a one month test-retest product moment correlation of .68. This was based on a sample of 154 University of Toronto students.

Norms provided for the SAD are based on a sample of 205 University of Toronto students. Male N = 60, Female N = 145. The overall mean based on the total N was 9.11, the median was 7, and the mode was zero. Standard deviation was 9.01. Watson and Friend described this as a 'rectangular' distribution. The male mean, at 11.20 was higher than the female mean of 8.24.

### **Fear of Negative Evaluation (FNE)**

The FNE (Watson & Friend, 1969) assesses the degree to which people experience apprehension at the prospect of receiving negative evaluation from others. The FNE consists of 28 statements, with a True/False format. It has 17 true and 13 false items. Maximum score is 28.

Watson and Friend (1969) report a one month test-retest reliability correlation of .78 (N = 154).

Norms provided for the FNE are based on a sample of 205 University of Toronto students (N = 205; Male N = 60; Female N = 145). Overall mean = 15.47; Male mean = 13.97, Female mean = 16.10.

In an experimental study Watson and Friend (1969) demonstrated that high FNE subjects (scores above 18) reported being more nervous under an evaluative condition than did low FNE subjects (scores less than 9).

### **Self-Esteem Inventory (SEI-Adult form)**

The SEI-Adult form (1981) is an adaptation of Coopersmiths' (1967) widely used measure of self-esteem, which for the purposes of this inventory is defined as a personal judgment of worthiness expressed in the attitudes a person holds toward the self.

The SEI was originally developed for use with school children. The Adult form is used with persons aged 16 and above. It consists of 25 items adapted from the school short form. The subject responds to statements about the self which are answered as either 'like me' or 'unlike me'. The maximum score, indicative of highest self-esteem is 100.

Little information is provided about the reliability and validity of the adult form. The SEI manual (1981) cites Bedeian, Geagud and Zmud (1977) who computed test-retest reliability estimates for 103 college students who were administered the short form. Coefficients were .80 for males and .82 for females. These authors reported internal consistency (KR 20's) of .74 for males and .71 for females.

### **Texas Social Behaviour Inventory (TSBI - short forms)**

The TSBI was originally developed as a 32-item measure of self-esteem by Helmreich, Stapp & Ervin (1974). For the purposes of the present study the shortened (16-item) equivalent forms were used (Helmreich & Stapp, 1974). The TSBI (short form) has been described by its authors as "a validated measure of self-esteem or social competence" (p. 473). Helmreich & Stapp (1974) report that the two short forms are highly correlated ( $r = .894$ ). Correlations between each short form and the original 32-item scale are .97.

According to Helmreich and Stapp (1974) factor analysis of the 32-item scale produced one large factor, but oblique rotation yielded four correlated factors. For males these were: confidence, dominance, social competence and social withdrawal. For females the factors were: confidence, social competence and relations to authority figures.

The TSBI has also been found to strongly correlate with the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (Spence, Helmreich & Stapp, 1974, cited in Helmreich & Stapp, 1974). For males the TSBI yielded correlations of .81 and .83 with the masculinity subscale for males, and females respectively, and correlations of .42 and .44 with the femininity subscale.

The response format requires subjects to endorse the extent to which each statement characterizes them. A five point scale is used, from a = 'not at all characteristic of me' to e = 'very characteristic of me'.

For the purposes of the present study a ten point scale was used with verbal descriptors at each end point: 0 = 'not at all like me', 9 = 'very much like me'. These modifications, that is, the change from letters to numbers, and the use of a ten point scale were made in



the interests of simplifying the task for the respondents who were requested to respond to several questionnaires at each testing session. The wording of the verbal descriptors was modified for ease of comprehension as the inmate sample studied was known to contain a number of men with difficulties in verbal and written comprehension as well as limited vocabularies.

## PROCEDURE

### Pretest

Up to two weeks before each JSS group began the JSS instructor interviewed each subject to discuss the aims and the content of the programme. At this time she informed the subjects that the researcher would like to conduct a confidential interview with them in which they would be asked to complete a number of questionnaires. It was explained to them that participation in this interview would be voluntary.

During the week prior to the beginning of the JSS programme each subject participated in a two-hour interview with the researcher. Subjects were requested to fill out a number of questionnaires, the purpose of which was described as "helping to find out what the inmates' needs are". During this interview the subjects completed five questionnaires: SAD, SEI, SSQ, FNE, and TSBI(A).

Since previous research had suggested that a number of inmates had literacy problems (Andrew, 1977; Fitzhugh, 1973) the standard procedure adopted was for the researcher to give a copy of each questionnaire to the subject, and to read each item out loud.

If a subject experienced difficulty with the meaning of words in an item, clarification was provided. An effort was made to standardize these rephrasings.

To minimize fatigue, a short recess was taken.

The JSS programme ran for ten days. On the first day of the programme each subject was interviewed by the Prison's Executive Officer for a hypothetical job of the participant's choice. The interviewer used a semi-structured interview format which included questions about school and educational/ training background, hobbies, previous employment and personal qualities. All interviews were videotaped.

A description of the JSS programme is contained in Appendix B.

On the final day of the JSS programme each subject participated in another simulated job interview with the Executive Officer. As with the pretest interview, this interview was videotaped with the consent of subjects.

### **Posttest**

In the week following JSS the participants met with the researcher to complete the TSBI(B), FNE, SEI and SAD. The sequence in which questionnaires were completed was the reverse of the pretest order.

### **Follow-up**

Six weeks after the conclusion of JSS a follow-up interview was conducted, at which time subjects completed the SAD, SEI, FNE and TSBI(A).

Two days after the follow-up interviews the researcher met individually with each subject to replay each subject's own job interview videotapes. The order of viewing pretest and posttest interviews was counterbalanced, such that half of the subjects saw their pretest interview followed by their posttest interview, and half saw their interviews in the opposite order.

Prior to playing the tapes the subjects were asked to complete Anxiety ratings on a likert scale, which asked them to rate on a ten point scale how anxious/nervous/tense they had felt during their first videotaped job interview, and during their final videotaped interview.

After each subject had viewed each of his taped interviews he was asked to rate his performance on an eleven point likert scale.

A copy of the scale used by JSS subjects to rate their interviews can be seen in Appendix B.

The researcher requested the permission of each subject to have his tape viewed and rated by independent raters. Subjects were given a verbal guarantee that access to the videotapes would be restricted to the raters, the researcher and her supervisor. It was emphasized that raters would not be permitted to discuss the tapes, that the tapes would be held at Massey University, and would be wiped once ratings were completed. It was also stressed that Justice Department employees would not be permitted to view the tapes. Subjects then signed a consent form agreeing to the viewing and rating of the interview tapes by raters at Massey University.

## **Global ratings**

Due to technical errors pre and post training job interview videotapes were available for only nine out of the twelve subjects. Three out of four subjects in group three's pre JSS interview tapes were inadvertently wiped by prison personnel in the process of taping post JSS interviews. From this group one subject's pre and post training interviews were available for rating. The remaining three Group Three subjects' interview tapes were rated by the interviewer, but these ratings were not further analysed.

The interview tapes were viewed in randomised order. The Executive Officer viewed each interview once and rated each subject on the following dimensions: Anxiety, social skills/performance, and employability. An eleven point (0 - 10) likert scale was used, where zero was the least favourable and ten was the most favourable rating for social skills/performance and employability, and in the case of anxiety ratings zero was the most favourable rating, with ten being the least favourable rating.

The researcher was present at the rating session to operate the videorecorder and to code each completed rating form as to pre/post status, subject number, and tape number. The interviewer was not told whether he was viewing pre or post interviews, and each sequence of four rating forms was coded with a separate symbol.

The rating session was completed in three hours with a twenty five minute break after the first eleven interviews in the sequence had been viewed and rated by the interviewer.

After the rating session the interviewer was questioned as to which behaviours he had based his anxiety ratings on. He indicated that fiddling, leg tapping movements, amount spoken and response latency were key indicators of anxiety to him.

An independent rater made global ratings of the JSS subjects' interviews on the same scales used by the interviewer. In addition, he rated subjects' appearance and quality of question answering on seven point scales (0 - 6).

The rating scales used by the interviewer and the independent rater are included in Appendix B.

### **Behavioural ratings**

An independent rater was employed to make global ratings and behavioural recordings of the simulated job interviews.

Training of the independent rater was based on the posttest interviews of two subjects from the third JSS group. The pretest interviews of these subjects were taped over in error by prison personnel, therefore their posttest interviews were not evaluated by the independent rater.

As a reliability check a second rater who was trained with the main independent rater made global and behavioural ratings of three pretest and two posttest interviews. Interobserver agreement figures are therefore based on twenty seven percent of the interviews rated by the main independent rater. Both raters received approximately six hours of training.

The behaviours rated were as follows:

- response latency - seconds per response (average latency)
- talk time - seconds per minute
- fiddling - seconds per minute
- facial regard - seconds per minute
- appropriate
- head movements - number per minute

Definitions of each of these measures are included in Appendix B5.

## CHAPTER EIGHT: RESULTS

Of the twelve subjects comprising the three consecutive Job Seeking Skills groups, complete data for the questionnaire measures is available for eleven subjects. One subject from the third group declined to take part in posttest and follow-up interviews, therefore analysis of the results of questionnaire measures is based on eleven subjects.

A repeated measures design was used, with t-tests employed for analysis of results of questionnaire measures, and behavioural and global ratings based on pretest and posttest simulated job interviews.

The Social Situations Questionnaire (SSQ) was administered at pretest only.

Pretest simulated job interview videotapes of three out of four group three subjects (C2, C2 and C4) were taped over by prison personnel in error. The posttest interview tapes for these subjects were therefore not used in the analysis of results, thus leaving behavioural ratings and subjective ratings for nine subjects. The posttest interview videotapes of subjects C2 and C4 were used in training of the independent raters.

Complete behavioural data was not available for subject B3 because during the pretest interview he sat at such an angle that only half of his body and face were visible. This subject subsequently revealed that this had been a deliberate move on his part, motivated by self-consciousness about being filmed.

An independent rater was employed to make behavioural observations and global ratings of the simulated job interviews. Each subject had two interviews, totalling eighteen videotaped interviews. As a reliability check an additional rater who was trained with the independent rater rated three pretest and two posttest interviews. Interobserver agreement figures are therefore available for twenty-seven percent of the interviews rated.

The interviewer who took part in the simulated job interviews completed global ratings on eleven point likert scales on the following dimensions: Social skill/performance, anxiety and employability. Subjects rated themselves on social skill/performance and anxiety.

## **QUESTIONNAIRE MEASURES**

### **Social Situations Questionnaire (SSQ)**

The SSQ was administered once only (at pretest) to determine which social situations presented most difficulty to the JSS subjects. Such information was sought for the purposes of planning future social skills training programmes within a prison setting.

Results of SSQ are presented in Table 2 according to the percentage of subjects who rated each situation as five or above on a zero to ten scale of difficulty. Several of the situations share the same percentage of subjects ratings them five or above; in these cases situations have been listed in rank order from the highest to lowest mean rating.

Bryant and Trower (1974) who developed the SSQ used a five point scale (zero to four). They presented their results according to the percentage of subjects who gave each situation a difficulty rating of two or above, which they defined as moderate difficulty or worse.



Table 2

Percentage of subjects scoring moderate or worse difficulty on retrospective ratings of items on the Social Situations Questionnaire (SSQ) (N = 12)

Item	Situation <sup>a</sup>	Percentage	Bryant and Trower (1974) <sup>b</sup>
30	People looking at you	91	(26)
29	Talking about self and feelings	83	(26)
25	Taking initiative in conversation	83	(44)
26	Looking at people in the eyes	83	(26)
19	People you don't know well	83	(37)
18	Meeting strangers	66	(28)
17	Going into a room full of people	66	(30)
21	Approaching others	58	(51)
11	Being in a group/opposite sex	58	(35)
24	Getting to know others in depth	50	(29)
8	Going out/opposite sex	50	(38)
22	Making decisions affecting others	50	(31)
10	Being in a group/mean and women	50	(18)
16	Being with younger people	41	(19)
12	Entertaining in your own home	41	(19)
28	People standing/sitting very close	41	(14)
27	Disagreeing/putting own view	33	(23)
6	Mixing with people at work	33	(16)
15	Being with older people	33	(8)
13	Going into restaurants/cafes	33	(10)
14	Going to dances/discos	33	(45)
7	Making friends of your own age	25	(20)
9	Being in a group/same sex	16	(18)
23	Being with just one other person	16	(9)
3	Using public transport	16	(3)
4	Going into pubs	8	(17)
5	Going to parties	8	(42)
2	Going into shops	0	(5)
1	Walking down the street	0	(4)
20	Being with friends	0	(1)

<sup>a</sup> Some situations quoted in abbreviated form. <sup>b</sup> Percentages of Bryant and Trowers' subjects rating items moderate (or worse) difficulty are included in parentheses (N = 223).

In comparison with Bryant and Trower's (1974) Oxford University students a much greater percentage of JSS subjects rated each situation moderate difficulty or worse (five or above on the ten point scale). In Bryant and Trower's study the highest percentage of subjects

rating a situation as moderate difficulty or worse was fifty one percent. In the present study thirteen out of thirty situations were rated to be moderate difficulty or worse by fifty percent or more subjects. Examination of these thirteen situations reveals two main types of situations found to be difficult: those requiring contact with strangers, including crowd situations (e.g. items 10, 11, 17, 18, 19); and those requiring a relatively more intimate level of interaction (e.g. items 7, 26, 29, 30).

Table 3 shows the mean scores of Social Situations Questionnaire items rated as most difficult by JSS subjects.

Table 3

Mean scores for items rated as most difficult on the Social Situations Questionnaire (SSQ) (N = 12)

Item	Situation	Score	S.D.
29	Talking about self and feelings	7	2.27
30	People looking at you	6.4	1.49
25	Taking initiative in conversation	6.08	2.09
18	Meeting strangers	5.75	2.25
19	People you don't know well	5.58	1.8
26	Looking at people in the eyes	5.58	1.8
11	Being in a group/opposite sex	5.42	2.56
21	Approaching others	5.4	2.63
24	Getting to know people in depth	4.83	2.3
17	Going into a room full of people	4.83	2.3

Inspection of Table 3 reveals that the two situations rated as most difficult are items requiring a high level of intimacy: talking about yourself and your feelings (item 29) and people looking at you (item 30).

When the items in Table 3 are considered in terms of specific social skills which these situations require verbal/conversational skills and eye contact emerge as important. A common component in a large proportion of the items rated as most difficult is the requirement for verbal/conversational skill, as in items 29, 25, 18, 19, 21 and 24.

Eye contact was also rated as problematic by JSS subjects, with item 30 (people looking at you) rated as slightly more difficult than item 26 (looking at people in the eyes).

### **Repeated measures questionnaires**

For description of measures including normative data (where relevant), and the maximum score, the reader is referred to the Method section.

For all questionnaires mean is based on eleven subjects. In the later section which compares subjective ratings based on the videotaped roleplays with scores on the SAD, SEI and TSBI the mean for these measures is based on nine subjects. This is the total number of subjects who had both pretest and posttest interviews which could be rated.

Individual and mean scores for SAD, FNE, SEI and TSBI are presented in Tables C-1, C-2, C-3, and C-4 in Appendix C.

Mean scores for SAD, FNE, SEI and TSBI are presented in Table 4.

Results of  $t$  test analyses for these measures are shown in Table 5.

Table 4

Mean scores for questionnaire measures (N = 11)

Questionnaire	Pretest	Posttest	Follow-up
Social Avoidance and Distress (SAD)	13.18	12.82	12.55
Fear of Negative Evaluation (FNE)	15.54	14.45	16.27
Self-Esteem Inventory (SEI)	54.36	60.36	68.00
Texas Social Behaviour Inventory (TSBI)	72.54	77.09	79.90

Table 5

T-tests for questionnaire measures (N = 11)

Questionnaire	Pre-Posttest	Pre-Follow-up	Post-F.U.
Social Avoidance and Distress (SAD)	1.006	0.580	0.215
Fear of Negative Evaluation (FNE)	0.695	0.322	0.756
Self-Esteem Inventory (SEI)	-1.272	-2.607**	-1.420
Texas Social Behaviour Inventory (TSBI)	-1.112	-2.090*	-0.590

\*  $p < .050$ . \*\*  $p < .025$ .

## **Social-evaluative Anxiety**

Two questionnaires were used to assess social- evaluative anxiety. These were the Social Avoidance and Distress (SAD) scale, (Watson & Friend, 1969) and the Fear of Negative Evaluation (FNE) scale, (Watson & Friend, 1969). See appendix A for copies of these measures.

### **SAD**

Table 4 reveals little change in mean scores across the three assessments with the mean of 13.18 at pretest decreasing to 12.82 at posttest and to 12.55 at follow-up. Changes between pre and posttest ( $t = 1.006$ ) and pre and follow-up ( $t = 0.580$ ) did not reach significance.

### **FNE**

Inspection of group means in Table 4 shows little change in scores on the FNE between pretest, posttest and follow-up. Analysis by  $t$ -test did not reach significance. However, changes in the scores of individual subjects warrants closer consideration. These can be seen in Table C-2. Subject A2 initially showed a decrease (Pre - Post) but by follow-up his score had almost reverted to pretest level, indicating that this change was not maintained. Subjects C1 and C4 increased their fear of negative evaluation, a change which was maintained to follow-up. In the case of subject C4 this represents a movement from the lowest-equal position in the sample on this dimension to the highest-equal (most pathological) position.

## Self-esteem

In the present study two measures were used to index changes in self-esteem. The Self-Esteem Inventory (SEI-Adult form; Coopersmith, 1981) is a general measure, whereas the Texas Social Behaviour Inventory (TSBI; Helmreich & Stapp, 1974) is more specific in that it confines itself to the assessment of social self-esteem. It was expected that as a social skills type intervention, if JSS was to have an impact on subjects' self-esteem this would have been more apparent with the TSBI than with the SEI. In fact, on both measures, a gradual increase in self-esteem took place.

### SEI

As Table 4 indicates mean scores on the SEI increased from 54.36 at pretest to 68 at follow-up. Table 5 shows that this increase is significant ( $t = 2.607$ ;  $p < .025$ ). The rate of change appears to have been steady and gradual with the gains which occurred between pretest and posttest being maintained. Follow-up scores show that self-esteem continued to increase after the subjects completed the JSS programme, although the increase between posttest and follow-up did not reach significance ( $t = 1.420$ ).

### TSBI

TSBI scores followed the same general trend as scores on the SEI. As Table 5 shows a significant increase in self-esteem took place between pretest and follow-up ( $t = 2.090$ ;  $p < .05$ ). Table 4 illustrates a gradual increase in mean scores from 72.54 at pretest to 77.09 at posttest, with a further increase to 77.09 at posttest, with a further increase to 79.90 at follow-up.

## GLOBAL RATINGS OF VIDEOTAPES

After viewing pretest and posttest job interview roleplay videotapes in counterbalanced order, subjective rating scales were completed by the JSS subjects, the interviewer and the independent rater.

Social skills/performance and anxiety ratings were completed by the subjects of their own interviews. The interviewer and the independent rater also rated subjects on these dimensions, in addition to employability.

Rating forms used for these scales appear in Appendix B.

Results of subjective ratings completed by the JSS subjects, interviewer and independent rater are shown separately in Appendix C in Tables C-5, C-6, C-7 and C-8. In the interests of clarity and conciseness, however results for all raters are presented in Table 6. Social skill/performance, anxiety and employability ratings, which were completed by more than one rater will be discussed together.

### **Social skill/performance**

Taking into account the ratings of the JSS subjects themselves, the interviewer and the independent rater, there was a consensus in the view that JSS subjects had become significantly more socially skilled from pretest to posttest.

As shown in Table 6 the JSS subjects perceived themselves to have improved from a mean rating of 3.4 at pretest to 7.2 at posttest ( $t = -4.576$ ;  $p < .005$ ). This was confirmed by the

independent rater whose mean social skill rating rose from 6.66 at pretest to 7.55 at posttest ( $t = -1.960$ ;  $p < .05$ ).

Table 6

Differences between mean pre and posttest global ratings of job interview roleplays (N=9)

Dimension	Rater	Pretest	Posttest	$t$
Social Skill	Self	3.4	7.2	-4.576 ****
	Independent	6.66	7.55	-1.960 *
	Interviewer	4	4.77	-2.113 *
	Combined	5.33	6.05	-6.457 *****
Anxiety	Self	5.5	3.66	2.797 **
	Independent	3.77	3.44	0.886
	Interviewer	5.55	4.55	1.809
	Combined	4.61	4	2.471 **
Employability	Independent	6.66	7.66	-2.683 **
	Interviewer	3.77	4.88	-1.816
	Combined	5.33	6.277	3.000 ***
Appearance	Independent	5	5.66	-2.683 **
Question Answering	Independent	4.88	5.66	-2.807 **

\*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .025$ . \*\*\*  $p < .01$ . \*\*\*\*  $p < .005$ . \*\*\*\*\*  $p < .0005$ .

The interviewer's ratings were markedly lower than those of the independent rater, although at pretest his mean social skill rating at 4 was slightly higher than subjects' self-rated mean of 3.4. The interviewer's posttest mean rose to 4.77. Although significant ( $t = -2.113$ ;  $p < .05$ ), his posttest rating is considerably lower than the mean posttest ratings by the JSS subjects and by the independent rater.



## **Anxiety**

JSS subjects rated themselves to have felt significantly less anxious during their posttest interviews than at pretest. Mean anxiety decreased from 5.5 at pretest to 3.66 ( $t = 2.797$ ;  $p < .025$ ).

The independent rater and the interviewer also assigned lower mean anxiety ratings to posttest interviews than to pretest interviews; mean decreased from 3.77 to 3.44, and from 5.55 to 4.55 for the independent rater and the interviewer respectively. Neither of these decreases were significant, however.

## **Employability**

As Table 6 shows the independent rater judged subjects to have been significantly more employable at posttest than at pretest, with the mean rating increasing from 6.66 at pretest to 7.66 at posttest; ( $t = -2.683$ ;  $p < .025$ ).

As in the case of social skill/performance ratings, the interviewer assigned lower mean employability ratings to JSS subjects than did the independent rater. At pretest the interviewer assigned a mean employability rating of 3.77; this increased to 4.88 at posttest, an improvement which was not significant.

## **Question Answering and Appearance**

For these two dimensions only the independent rater assigned judgments. The independent rater rated the JSS to have improved their appearance, as reflected in the increase in mean

appearance rating from 5 to 5.66. Although this appears to be only a modest increase  $t$ -test analysis revealed that this increase was significant ( $t = -2.683$ ;  $p < .025$ ).

Question answering was also judged by the independent rater to have improved, from a mean of 4.88 at pretest to 5.66 at posttest. This represents a significant improvement ( $t = -2.807$ ;  $p < .025$ ).

### INTEROBSERVER AGREEMENT

As a reliability check a second independent rater rated one interview for each of five subjects (three pretest, two posttest) on the behavioural and global measures rated by the independent rater. This constituted twenty seven percent of all interviews.

The procedure adopted for the calculation of interobserver agreement was that advocated by Cooper, Heron and Heward (1987). For each of the behavioural and global measures percentage agreement was computed by dividing the smaller total of the two raters by the larger total and multiplying by 100.

Example: talk time

$$\frac{174 \text{ secs/min}}{193 \text{ secs/min}} \times 100 = 90.155\% \text{ agreement}$$

193 secs/min

In this way interobserver agreement was computed for ratings of five subjects. Percentage interobserver agreement was taken as the mean of the percentage agreement figures for five subjects for each dimension rated.

### Interobserver agreement for global ratings

Mean interobserver agreement percentages for the global measures are shown in Table 7.

Table 7

Interobserver agreement for global ratings by independent raters (N = 5)

Dimension	Mean agreement	S.D.
Anxiety	73.33%	30.77
Social skill	82.99%	11.71
Employability	67.42%	16.42
Appearance	96.00%	8.94
Question answering	83.61%	12.02

Of all the global measures employability resulted in the lowest interobserver agreement at 67.42%. For anxiety agreement was 73.33%. High levels of interobserver agreement were achieved for social skill (82.99%), question answering (83.61%) and appearance (96%).

### Interobserver agreement for behavioural measures

Table 8 shows interobserver agreement figures for the behavioural ratings; these ranged from a very high level of agreement (96.27%) for talk time to a low of 51.21% for facial regard.

Table 8

Interobserver agreement for behavioural ratings by independent raters (N = 5)

Behaviour	Rate	Mean agreement	S.D.
Facial Regard	Secs/Min.	51.21%	34.04
Fiddling	Secs/Min.	54.19%	33.58
Appropriate Head Movements	No./Min.	86.13%	9.42
Talk Time	Secs/Min.	96.27%	3.85
Response Latency	Average latency	88.26%	11.67

The level of interobserver agreement reached for facial regard (51.21%) and fiddling (54.19%) is unacceptable. The poor reliability of ratings on these dimensions may be attributable, in part, to technical problems such as poor film quality, etc.

In contrast to the low level of agreement for fiddling and facial regard, high interobserver agreement was achieved for appropriate head movements (86.13%), talk time (96.27%) and response latency (88.26%).

### BEHAVIORAL RATINGS OF INTERVIEWS

Differences between mean pre and posttest rates of behaviour in the job interviews are shown in Table 9.

Table 9

Differences between mean pre and posttest rates of behaviour in job interviews (N=9)

Behaviour	Rate	Pretest	Posttest	T
Facial Regard	Secs/Min.	16.72	17.73	-0.367
Fiddling	Secs/Min.	16.39	11.51	0.545
Appropriate head movements	No./Min.	3.14	2.41	1.210
Talk time	Secs/Min.	20.67	22.32	-0.695
Response Latency	Average latency	1.96	0.94	2.306*

\*  $p < .025$ .

Bearing in mind the low interobserver agreement achieved for facial regard and fiddling, changes on these measures must be interpreted cautiously. In all of the behaviours measured, except for appropriate head movements, differences between rates of behaviour at pretest and posttest were in the expected direction.

### **Response latency**

A highly significant reduction in average response latency occurred. Subjects halved the time taken to respond to the interviewer's questions, from 1.96 seconds at pretest to .94 by posttest ( $t = 2.306$ ;  $p < .025$ ). This change occurred together with a significant improvement in the quality of responses to the interviewer's questions (see global ratings section above).

**Talk time**

Subjects spent a higher proportion of interview time talking at posttest than they had at pretest. The average duration of talk time increased from 20.67 to 22.32 seconds per minute. This increase was not significant, however.

**Facial regard**

Subjects increased the number of seconds per minute engaged in facial regard from 16.72 at pretest to 17.73 at posttest. This increase was not significant.

**Fiddling**

A reduction in fiddling occurred from 16.39 seconds per minute at pretest to 11.51 seconds at posttest; this change was not significant.

**Appropriate head movements**

Contrary to expectations, subjects decreased rather than increased the frequency of appropriate head movements. Frequency of appropriate head movements decreased from an average of 3.14 per minute at pretest to 2.41 per minute at posttest. This did not prove to be a significant change.

### Relationship between behavioural measures and global ratings

A series of Pearson product-moment correlations were computed in an attempt to determine which specific behaviours investigated were associated with high ratings for anxiety and social skill.

For appropriate head movements, fiddling and facial regard no significant relationships were found between rates of these behaviours and judgements of anxiety and social skill.

The verbal measures: talk time and response latency emerged as important, having significant relationships with ratings of both anxiety and social skill.

The relationship between talk time and global ratings are is shown in Table 10.

Table 10

Comparison of ratings for talk time with ratings for anxiety and social skill performance (N=9)

Rater	Anxiety	Social Skill
Independent rater	-0.645	0.578
Combined judges	-0.677 *	0.786 **
Self-ratings	0.702 *	0.324

\*  $p < .05$ .    \*\*  $p < .02$ .

As Table 10 shows talk time had a positive correlation with social skill and a negative correlation with anxiety; that is, those subjects who spoke for a longer proportion of the interview were rated as high in social skill and low in anxiety.

The relationship between response latency and global ratings is shown in Table 11.

Table 11

Comparison of ratings for response latency with ratings for anxiety and social skill performance (N = 9)

Rater	Anxiety	Social Skill
Independent rater	0.742 *	-0.714 *
Combined judges	0.698	-0.559
Self-ratings	0.049	0.059

\*  $p < .05$ .

There was a negative correlation between response latency and social skill for ratings by the independent rater and the combined judges. For these raters there was a positive correlation between response latency and anxiety; subjects who took a long time to respond to the interviewer's questions tended to be rated as high in anxiety and low in social skill.

#### Relationship between social anxiety (SAD) and self-esteem

In the present study the researcher predicted that Clark and Arkowitz's (1975) finding of a moderate to high correlation between social anxiety and self-esteem would be



demonstrated with a criminal offender population. Specifically, it was predicted that there would be a significant negative correlation between social anxiety (SAD) scores and self-esteem as measured by the SEI and the TSBI.

To determine the relationship between SAD and self-esteem Pearson product-moment correlations were computed with SAD scores and SEI and TSBI scores separately.

The Pearson product-moment correlations between SAD scores and TSBI and SEI scores are shown in Table 12.

Table 12

Person product moment correlations between social anxiety (SAD) and self-esteem (TSBI and SEI) (N = 9)

Measure	Time	r
TSBI	Pretest	-.811 *
TSBI	Posttest	-.783 *
TSBI	Follow-up	-.758 *
SEI	Pretest	-.226
SEI	Posttest	-.526
SEI	Follow-up	-.287

\*  $p < .01$ .

As Table 12 shows, no significant relationship was found between SEI and SAD scores. When the TSBI was used to assess self-esteem there was a significant negative correlation between social anxiety (SAD) and self-esteem. The relationship held over the three time

periods, that is, at pretest, posttest and follow-up. Although at each time point the correlation reached the same level of significance, the strength of the correlation decreased over time.

### **Relationship between social anxiety (SAD) and social skill**

In the present study it was predicted that a significant negative correlation would be found between social anxiety (SAD) scores and social skill ratings.

To test this hypothesis Pearson product-moment correlations were computed between SAD scores and social skill rating for two time periods: pretest and posttest. The social skill ratings used were those made by the independent rater; and a combined judges category which was formed by taking the mean of the social skill ratings by the independent rater and the interviewer.

The Pearson product-moment correlations between SAD scores and social skill ratings are shown in Table 13.

As Table 13 shows, no significant relationship was found between social anxiety (SAD) and ratings of social skill. These findings fail to provide evidence to support the social skills deficit model of social anxiety.

Table 13

Relationship between scores on SAD and ratings for social skills performance (N = 9)

Time	Rater	r
Pretest	Independent rater	.076
Pretest	Combined raters	.076
Posttest	Independent rater	-.064
Posttest	Combined raters	.004

Relationship between social anxiety (SAD) and self-rated social skill

It was predicted that there would be a significant negative correlation between social anxiety (SAD) scores and self-ratings of social skill, as observed by Curran et al. (1980).

To test this prediction follow-up SAD scores were used. This time period was selected because it was during the follow-up period that subjects completed retrospective self-ratings of anxiety and social skill of the interviews they had participated in at pretest and posttest.

The correlation between SAD follow-up scores and social skill self-ratings of the posttest interviews was  $r = -.374$ ; the correlation between SAD follow-up scores and social skill self-ratings of the pretest interview was  $r = .073$ . Neither of these correlations were significant. However, the relationship between SAD follow-up scores and self-rated social skill for the posttest interview was in the expected direction. Social anxiety (SAD) and self-rated social skill at posttest were inversely related, indicating a slight tendency for socially anxious subjects to rate themselves as low in social skill.

### Relationship between self-esteem and self-rated social skill

In the present study the researcher sought to clarify the relationship between self-esteem and subjects' evaluation of their own social skill performance. It was expected that a significant positive correlation would be found between self-esteem and social skill ratings.

For the purposes of testing this prediction follow-up self-esteem scores were used. Pearson product-moment correlations were computed between these scores and social skill self-ratings at pretest and posttest. The results of these analyses are shown in Table 14.

Table 14

Pearson product moment correlations between self-esteem and social skill self-ratings<sup>1</sup>  
(N=9)

Self-esteem measure	Social skill rating period	r
SEI	Pretest	.408
	Posttest	.399
TSBI	Pretest	.075
	Posttest	.618

Note: SEI and TSBI follow-up scores were used.

As Table 14 indicates no significant relationship was found between self-esteem and self-ratings of social skill. With the exception of pretest self-ratings of social skill and the TSBI, correlations were in the expected direction; that is, a nonsignificant positive correlation was found between self-esteem and self-ratings of social skill. The correlation between TSBI and social skill self-ratings for the posttest interview ( $r = .618$ ) approached significance.

## CHAPTER NINE: DISCUSSION

The subjects in the present study were perhaps a more homogeneous sample than is usually studied in social skills research. Subjects tended to share common social backgrounds and family experiences. Most had left school early without attaining formal qualifications, and few had stable employment histories. Imprisonment placed them all in a controlled all-male environment which limited their exposure to a number of usual social experiences.

As a general rule inmates participated in JSS shortly before becoming eligible for work parole. Participation in the programme was therefore scheduled so as to be of most current relevance. Participants were soon to have been faced with the prospect of job interviews in which they might be asked if they had any criminal convictions. They might also be called upon to explain gaps in their employment record. The prospect of being presented with such awkward questions is likely to have increased the potential for the job interview to be an anxiety-arousing experience.

Results of the SSQ reveal that situations in which verbal/conversational skills are important were amongst those rated as most problematic by subjects in the present study. Eye contact was also rated as difficult. Bearing these in mind the job interview is likely to have been an anxiety-provoking experience. Self-ratings of anxiety for the pretest interview showed that the job interview was associated with a high level of anxiety.

The rectangular distribution of Social Avoidance and Distress (SAD) scores reported for a sample of Canadian students by Watson and Friend (1969) was not found for subjects in

the present study. Many of the JSS participants were classifiable as high in social anxiety on the basis of SAD scores. The extent to which this could be a function of their present circumstances versus a longstanding problem for them is unknown.

In the present study for most subjects there was no change in social anxiety as measured by the Social Avoidance and Distress (SAD) scale. As a result of a social skills training programme which focuses upon a specific social situation one might expect a reduction in anxiety experienced in that specific situation; self-report ratings of anxiety in the interview situation demonstrated that this did occur for JSS subjects. Measures of social anxiety such as the SAD cover a range of social situations, and a reduction in anxiety experienced in the trained context would, therefore not be reflected in overall social anxiety scores.

Similarly, the JSS programme did not result in any significant change in subjects' fear of negative evaluation as assessed by the Fear of Negative Evaluation (FNE) scale. One somewhat surprising outcome was that some subjects actually increased their scores on the FNE scale. Explanations for this can only be purely speculative. One possible explanation is that the programme brought participants to a new awareness of the effect that their social behaviour in the interview might have on an employer's decision to hire them. Thus, as positive evaluation was viewed as being tied to something as tangible as a job, fear of negative evaluation subsequently increased.

The validity of direct comparison of results for the Social Situations Questionnaire (SSQ) in the present study with the findings of Bryant and Trower's (1974) study using Oxford University students is compromised by three main factors. Bryant and Trower's sample comprised both men and women whereas all JSS subjects were male. Secondly, the scale was altered from a five point scale to a ten point scale in the present study. Thirdly,

Bryant and Trower's subjects made difficulty ratings for two time periods: the present time, and the equivalent time one year ago; in the present study subjects made ratings of difficulty experienced in the twelve months prior to the present period of incarceration, which varied from subject to subject.

On the basis of a principal components analysis of their results Bryant and Trower (1974) suggested the existence of two groups of people whose social experiences were quite distinct: those who are reticent in initial social contacts but are able to deepen relationships, and those who find initial contact relatively easy but find intimate situations more difficult. In the present study the highest ranking situations tended to be those requiring a relatively intimate level of interaction. The situations rated as difficult by a high percentage of JSS subjects included both situations involving relatively intimate levels of interaction, and also situations involving strangers and crowds. Situations like going to dances and to pubs were lower down in the rank order of difficulty for JSS subjects than they were for Bryant and Trower's subjects.

Ratings of the pretest and posttest interview by the independent rater revealed a small but increase in the proportion of the interview subjects spent talking. Although this quantitative rating did not indicate significant change the qualitative global rating of question answering did reveal a significant improvement.

One positive outcome of JSS was that a significant increase in self-esteem took place between pretest and follow-up. This increase in self-esteem as a result of the programme is consistent with previous findings regarding the effect of JSS within prisons (e.g. Spence & Spence, 1980). Spence and Spence found that this increase in self-esteem occurred with a discussion comparison group as well as for the behaviourally oriented SST group. They suggested that the attentional aspects of both programmes were

responsible, and noted that the increases in self-esteem were not maintained. In the present study time constraints prevented the use of a follow-up period longer than six weeks, whereas Spence and Spence assessed self-esteem at a three month follow-up. Bearing this in mind, the maintenance of self-esteem gains in the present study may still be considered a positive treatment outcome.

In the present study an increase in self-esteem occurred despite the failure of JSS to change subjects' level of social anxiety as measured by the SAD. The subjects reported feeling significantly less anxious in the interview situation and saw their social skills performance level as improved in posttest interviews as compared with pretest interviews. The experience of feeling they had mastered the skills required for job interviews may have contributed to the increase in self-esteem.

The increase in self-esteem found in the present study is validated to some degree by examination of global ratings of the interviews completed by the subjects themselves, the independent rater and the interviewer. For anxiety, social skills and employability, ratings made by the interviewer were less favourable than those made by the independent rater; this was observed for ratings of both pretest and posttest interviews. Ratings made by JSS subjects of social skill and anxiety for the pretest interviews resembled those made by the interviewer, whereas at posttest their self-ratings resembled more those made by the independent rater.

Global ratings of the job interviews revealed significant improvements for social skill. Employability was rated as significantly improved by the independent rater, but not by the interviewer. JSS subjects rated themselves as experiencing significantly less anxiety in the posttest interview than in the pretest interview. Although ratings of anxiety made by the independent rater and the interviewer revealed their perceptions that subjects



anxiety had decreased, this reduction was not significant. Global ratings of the subjects' appearance and question answering (rated only by the independent rater) revealed significant improvements on these dimensions.

JSS resulted in a significant reduction in average response latency. The importance of low response latency within an interview context was illustrated by Spence (1981). Spence found that of thirteen behaviours assessed, response latency was the best predictor of global social skills ratings.

Subjects spent a larger proportion of the interview speaking at posttest than they had at pretest, but this change did not reach a significant level.

Fiddling decreased and facial regard (eye contact) increased; neither of these changes were significant. The rate at which these behaviours occurred proved difficult to accurately record, as evidenced by the low interobserver agreement achieved for these measures.

A nonsignificant reduction in the frequency of appropriate head movements occurred. This behaviour was not focused on in training. The decision to assess appropriate head movements in the present study was based upon the findings of Spence (1981). Spence demonstrated that appropriate head movements were positively correlated with global ratings of social skill, employability and friendliness, and significantly correlated in a negative direction with global ratings of anxiety.

Despite little change in the rate at which the behaviours assessed occurred as a result of JSS, global ratings of social skill increased significantly. This perception of improvement was shared by the participants themselves, the independent rater and the interviewer. It

appears that the combined effect of the small improvements for talk time, facial regard and fiddling, together with the significant improvement in response latency were potent enough to influence changes in globally rated social skill. Although talk time increased only slightly the quality of the answers subjects gave to the interviewer's questions was judged to have improved.

Correlational analyses were performed to identify the relationships between each of the behaviours assessed and external ratings of social skill and anxiety. The paraverbal measures (talk time and response latency) emerged as important, having significant correlations with both anxiety and social skill global ratings. In light of these findings the fact that external ratings of global social skill showed improvement but that ratings of anxiety did not, is puzzling.

Talk time was the only behaviour which significantly correlated with self-ratings of anxiety. Surprisingly, the correlation between talk time and self-rated anxiety was in a positive direction, suggesting that those who talked for a longer proportion of the interview rated themselves as being more anxious in the interview than the relatively less vocal subjects. This is in direct contrast to the impressions of the external raters for whom a negative correlation was found between talk time and anxiety, such that they tended to view the more vocal subjects as relatively nonanxious as compared with those who spoke less. The negative correlation between ratings of talk time and global ratings of anxiety completed by external raters found in the present study was also reported by Spence (1981) and Millbrook et al. (1986).

### **Relationship between social anxiety and self-esteem**

Clark and Arkowitz's (1975) finding of a significant inverse relationship between social anxiety and self-esteem was demonstrated with a group of prison inmates in the present study. However, this relationship was demonstrated only with the Texas Social Behavior Inventory (TSBI), a measure of social self-esteem. The relationship did not hold with the more general and multi-dimensional measure, the Self-Esteem Inventory (SEI).

Although self-esteem increased over the course of the programme social anxiety as assessed by the Social Avoidance and Distress (SAD) scale did not decrease. This suggests a weakening of the relationship between self-esteem and social anxiety.

Self-esteem as measured by the SEI increased over the course of JSS; this measure was sensitive to treatment effects. However the validity of this instrument with an adult male, predominantly Maori population is questionable. Very little evidence has been provided regarding the validity of the Adult form of the SEI. In the present study some subjects indicated that many of the SEI questions had been very difficult to answer in that some of the items did not appear relevant to their current situation. This point was most often raised in relation to questions about family. Some subjects reported that they had had no contact with family members for several years.

The SEI manual (1981) refers to a study by Cress and O'Donnell (1975) in which the SEI was used with Oglala Sioux Indian adolescents. Cress and O'Donnell concluded that for some cultural or ethnic groups the SEI may not be a valid measure of self-esteem, because of the differing values placed on power and success. In the SEI the individual endorses agreement or disagreement with a series of statements about the self. From the total of scores obtained a numerical value is given to supposedly represent the person's

attitude toward the self. Value judgments complicate the issue, however, such that selection of items is important. If the items selected are of no great salience or relevance to the subject, a misleading view of the subject may result. This is particularly likely to happen when a forced-choice response format is used, as in the SEI, as opposed to a use of a scale as in the TSBI.

### **Social anxiety and social skill**

The researcher had originally planned to use chi square analyses to determine whether the externally rated social skill, and self-rated social skill levels of high socially anxious subjects differed from those of low anxious subjects. The use of Geist and Borecki's (1982) categorization of SAD scores into low, medium and high categories revealed that a disproportionately low number of JSS subjects could be classified as low anxious. Of the nine subjects for whom both pretest and posttest interviews could be rated, no pretest SAD scores could be classified as low, six were medium, and three were high. At posttest there were two low SAD subjects, four medium, and three high. By follow-up six subjects were high SAD according to Geist and Borecki's criteria, one was medium, and two were low. This clustering of scores in the medium-high range, together with the accidental wiping of three interviews by prison personnel made chi-square analyses impossible. Attempts were therefore made to investigate theoretical questions through the use of *t*-tests.

In the present study attempts to clarify the relationships between social anxiety and social skill, and between social anxiety and self-rated social skill were unsuccessful. No significant findings emerged to provide support for either the Social Skills deficit model

of social anxiety, or the hypothesis that there will be an inverse relationship between social anxiety and self-ratings of social skill.

No relationship could be found at all between social skill and SAD scores.

For the pretest interviews there was no discernible relationship between SAD scores and self-ratings of social skill. The JSS group as a whole assigned low social skill ratings to their pretest interviews. These low ratings concurred with those of the interviewer who consistently gave considerably less favourable ratings than those of the independent rater. For the posttest interviews self-rated social skill was inversely correlated with SAD scores, but this relationship was not statistically significant. This finding does, however, suggest that there may be a tendency for socially anxious subjects to rate their social skills unfavourably.

The clustering of SAD scores in the medium and high ranges, and the technical error which reduced the already small sample size prevented an adequate investigation of the relationships between social skill and social anxiety, and between social anxiety and self-rated social skill.

### **Self-esteem and self-ratings of social skill**

Subjects' low self-ratings of social skill for the pretest interviews have been noted above; they did not appear to have been related to subjects' level of anxiety or self-esteem. These low self-ratings may have been a consequence of disappointing experiences with past employment seeking, in general, and job interviews in particular.

All subjects shared a history of criminal conviction. The conviction process and entry into prison entails a series of interviews with police and prison personnel. Incarceration may have been viewed by some subjects as partially a consequence of their failure to impress their interviewers. Hence, an initial (preprogramme) view of their interview performance as unskilled. Posttest self-ratings of social skill indicated that JSS altered such views for many subjects.

At posttest there was a moderate positive correlation between self-esteem (as assessed by the TSBI) and self-ratings of social skill. Although there was a significant inverse correlation between social anxiety (SAD) scores and TSBI scores, there was a much weaker relationship between SAD scores and self-ratings. In the present study social self-esteem (TSBI) appeared to be a more important predictor of self-ratings of social skill.

In a competitive job market there is an expectation for the job interviewee to promote his/her own skills, abilities and work habits. Programmes such as that described in the present study assist the applicant to market him/herself as effectively as possible given the limitations in his/her employment history, skills and habits. In the case of the subjects in the present study the issue of dealing with awkward questions about criminal convictions was also dealt with. The task of marketing oneself effectively within the job interview might conceivably be accomplished by persons with low self-esteem. However, it appeared in the present study that those subjects whose self-esteem was relatively low doubted the effectiveness of their performance within the interview. Such findings suggest the need for those working with the long-term unemployed to assess client's self-esteem.

The perception of the long-term unemployed person of his/her interview performance as unskilled may well result in discouragement about job seeking, and also in half-hearted attempts to find work. If the client's self-esteem is found to be low therapeutic efforts to increase self-esteem are likely to prove useful. For those clients with low self-esteem the ultimate effect of a job seeking skills programme which results in more skillful performance within the job interview, is likely to be compromised unless the fundamental issue of low self-esteem is dealt with.

## REFERENCES

- Andrew, J.M. (1977). Delinquency: Intellectual imbalance? *Criminal Justice and Behaviour*, 4, 99-100.
- Arkowitz, H. (1981). Assessment of Social Skills. In M. Hersen & A.S. Bellack (Eds.), *Behavioral Assessment. A practical handbook* (2nd ed.), (pp. 296-327). U.S.A.: Pergamon Press Inc.
- Bagarozzi, D. (1985). Implications of social skills training for social and interpersonal competence. In L. L'Abate & M.A. Milan (Eds.). *Handbook of social skills training and research* (pp. 604-618). New York: Wiley.
- Beidel, D.C., Turner, S.M. & Dancu, C.V. (1985). Physiological, cognitive and behavioral aspects of social anxiety. *Behavior Research and Therapy*, 23, 109-117.
- Bellack, A.S. & Hersen, M. (1977). *Behavior modification: An introductory textbook*. Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins.
- Bellack, A.S. & Hersen, M. (1979). *Research and practice in social skills*. New York: Plenum.



- Bellack, A.S., Hersen, M. & Lamparski, D. (1979). Role play tests for assessing social skills: Are they valid? Are they useful? *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 47*, 335-342.
- Borkovek, T.D., Stone, N.M., O'Brien, G.T., & Kaloupek, D.G. (1974). Identification and measurement of a clinically relevant target behaviour for analogue outcome research. *Behavior Therapy, 5*, 503-513.
- Bornstein, P.H., Winegardner, J.T. Rychtarik, R.G., Paul, W.P., Naifeh, S.J., Sweeney, T.M. & Justman, A. (1979). Interpersonal skills training. Evaluation of a program with adult male offenders. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 6*, 119-132
- Braukmann, C.J., Fixen, D.L., Phillips, E.L., Wolf, M.M., & Maloney, D.M. (1974). An analysis of a selection interview training package for predelinquents at achievement place. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 6*, 119-132.
- Bryant, B. & Trower, P.E. (1974). Social difficulty in a student sample. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 44*, 13-21.
- Cacioppo, J.T., Glass, C.R. & Merluzzi, T.V. (1979). Self-statements and self-evaluations: A cognitive response analysis of heterosocial anxiety. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 3*, 249-262.
- Christoff, K.A. & Kelly, J.A. (1985). A behavioral approach to social skills training with psychiatric patients. In L. L'Abate & M.A. Milan (Eds). *Handbook of social skills training and research*. (pp. 361-387). New York: Wiley.

- Clark, J.V. & Arkowitz, H. (1975). Social anxiety and self-evaluation of interpersonal performance. *Psychological Reports*, 36, 211-221.
- Conger, J.C. & Conger, A.J. (1982). Components of heterosocial competence. In J.P. Curran & P.M. Monti (Eds.), *Social skills training. A practical handbook for assessment and treatment* (pp. 313-347). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Coopersmith, S. (1981). *SEI. Self-Esteem Inventories*. California: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.
- Curran, J.P. (1977). Skills training as an approach to the treatment of heterosexual-social anxiety. A review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 84, 140-187.
- Curran, J.P., Farrell, A.D. & Grunberger, A.J. (1984). A critique and a rapprochement. In P. Trower (Ed.), *Radical Approaches to Social Skills Training*, (pp. 16-46). New York: Methuen, Inc.
- Curran, J.P., Wallander, J.L., & Fischetti, M. (1980). The importance of behavioral and cognitive factors in heterosexual-social anxiety. *Journal of Personality*, 48, 285-292.
- Daley, S. (1978). Behavioural correlates of social anxiety. *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 17, 117-120.
- Fitzhugh, K.B. (1973). Some neurological features of delinquent subjects. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 36, 494.

- Freedman, B.J., Rosenthal, L., Donahoe, C.P., Schlundt, D.G. & McFall, R.M. (1978). A social-behavioral analysis of skills deficits in delinquent and nondelinquent adolescent boys. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 46, 1448-1462.
- Furnham, A. (1985). Social skills training: A European perspective. In L. L'Abate & M.A. Milan (Eds.), *Handbook of social skills training and research*, (pp. 555-580). U.S.A.: Wiley.
- Galassi, J.P. & Galassi, M.D. (1979). Modification of heterosexual skills deficits. In A.S. Bellack & M. Hersen (Eds.), *Research and practice in social skills training* (pp. 131-187). New York: Plenum Press.
- Geist, G.R. & Borecki, S. (1982). Social avoidance and distress as a predictor of perceived locus of control and level of self-esteem. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 38, 611-613.
- Glasgow, R.E. & Arkowitz, H. (1975). The behavioural assessment of male and female social competence in dyadic heterosexual interactions. *Behavior Therapy*, 6, 488-498.
- Glass, C.R., Merluzzi, T.V., Biever, J.L. & Larsen, K.H. (1982). Cognitive assessment of social anxiety: Development and validation of a self-statement questionnaire. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 6, 37-55.

Golden, K., Twentyman, C.T., Jensen, M., Karan, J. & Kloss, J.D. (1980). Coping with authority. Social skills training for the complex offender. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 7, 147-159.

Goldsmith, J.B. & McFall, R.M. (1975). Development and evaluation of an interpersonal skill training program for psychiatric patients. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 84, 51-58.

Gross, A.M., Brigham, T.A., Hooper, G. & Balogna, N.C. (1980). Self-management and social skills training. A study with predelinquent and delinquent youths. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 7, 161-184.

Halford, K. & Foddy, M. (1982). Cognitive and social skills correlates of social anxiety. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 21, 17-28.

Hazel, J.S., Schumaker, J.B., Sherman, J.A. & Sheldon-Wildgen, J. (1982). Group training for social skills. A program for court-adjudicated, probationary youths. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 9, 35-53.

Helmreich, R., & Stapp, J. (1974). Short forms of the Texas Social Behaviour Inventory (TSBI), an objective measure of self-esteem. *Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society*, 4 (5a), 473-475.

Henderson, M. & Hollin, C. (1983). A critical review of social skills training with young offenders. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 10, 316-341.

- Hollandsworth, J.C., Glazeski, R.C., & Dressel, M.E. (1978). Use of social skills training in the treatment of extreme anxiety and deficient verbal skills in the job-interview setting. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 11, 259-269.
- Hood, E.M., Lindsay, W.R. & Brooks, N. (1982). Interview training with adolescents - A controlled group study incorporating generalization and social validation. *Behavior Research and Therapy*, 20, 581-592.
- Huff, G. (1987). Social skills training. In B.J. McGurk, D.M. Thornton & M. Williams, (Eds.). *Applying Psychology to imprisonment. Theory and practice*. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
- Kolko, D.J. & Milan, M.A. (1985). Conceptual and methodological issues in the behavioral assessment of heterosocial skills. In L. L'Abate & M.A. Milan (Eds.). *Handbook of social skills training and research* (pp. 50 - 76). New York: Wiley.
- Kraft, T. (1971). Social anxiety model of alcoholism. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 33, 797-798.
- Kupke, T.E., Hobbs, S.A. & Cheney, T.H. (1979). Selection of heterosocial skills 1. Criterion related validity. *Behavior Therapy*, 10, 327-335.
- Leary, M.R. (1983). *Understanding social anxiety. Social, personality and clinical perspectives*. U.S.A.: Sage.

- Lindsay, W.R., Symons, R.S. & Sweet, T. (1979). A programme for teaching social skills to socially inept adolescents: description and evaluation. *Journal of Adolescence*, 2, 215-218.
- Lucock, M.P. & Salkovskis, P.M. (1988). Cognitive factors in social anxiety and its treatment. *Behavior Research and Therapy*, 26, 297-302.
- McCann, B.S., Woolfolk, R.L. & Lehrer, P.M. (1987). Specificity in response to treatment: A study of interpersonal anxiety. *Behavior Research and Therapy*, 25, 129-136.
- McFall, R.M. (1982). A review and reformulation of the concept of social skills. *Behavioral Assessment*, 4, 1-33.
- Millbrook, J.M., Farrell, A.D. & Curran, J.P. (1986). Behavioral components of social skills: A look at subject and confederate behaviors. *Behavioral Assessment*, 8, 203-220.
- Ollendick, T.H. & Herssen, M. (1979). Social skills training for juvenile delinquents. *Behavior Research and Therapy*, 17, 547-554.
- Percell, L.P., Berwick, P.T. & Beigel, A. (1974). The effects of assertive training on self-concept and anxiety. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 31, 502-504.
- Phillips, E.L. (1985). Social skills: history and prospect. In L. L'Abate & M.A. Milan (eds.), *Handbook of social skills training and research* (pp. 3-21). New York: Wiley.

- Pilkonis, P.A. (1977). Shyness, public and private, and its relationship to other measures of social behavior. *Journal of Personality*, 45, 585-595.
- Pilkonis, P.A., Feldman, H. & Himmelhoch, J. (1981). Social anxiety and substance abuse in the affective disorders. *Comprehensive Psychiatry*, 22, 451-457.
- Ralph, A. (1988). Social skills training: How can we tell if it works? *Australian Psychologist*, 23, 305-314.
- Rehm, L.P. & Marston, A.R. (1968). Reduction of social anxiety through modification of self-reinforcement: An instigation therapy technique. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 32, 565-574.
- Schlundt, D.G. & McFall, R.M. (1985). New directions in the assessment of social competence and social skills. In L. L'Abate & M.A. Milan (Eds.). *Handbook of social skills training and research* (pp. 22-49). New York: Wiley.
- Smith, T.M., Ingram, R.E. & Brehm, S.S. (1983). Social anxiety, anxious self-preoccupation, and recall of self-relevant information. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44, 1276-1283.
- Spence, S.H. (1981). Differences in social skills performance between juvenile male offenders and a comparable group of boys without offence records. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 20, 163-171.

- Spence, S.H. & Marzillier, J.S. (1981). Social skills training with adolescent male offenders - II. Short-term, long-term and generalized effects. *Behavior Research and Therapy*, 19, 349-368.
- Spence, A.J. & Spence, S.H. (1980). Cognitive changes associated with social skills training. *Behavior Research and Therapy*, 18, 265-275.
- Stermac, L.E. & Quinsey, W.L. (1986). Social competence among rapists. *Behavioral Assessment*, 8, 171-185.
- Trower, P. (1980). Situational analysis of the components and processes of behavior of socially skilled and unskilled patients. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 48, 327-339.
- Trower, P. (1982). Toward a generative model of social skills: A critique and synthesis. In J.P. Curran & P.M. Monti (Eds.), *Social skills training. A practical handbook for assessment and treatment* (pp. 339-428). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Trower, P. (1984). A radical critique and reformulation: From organism to agent. In P. Trower, (Ed.), *Radical approaches to social skills training*, (pp. 48-88). New York: Methuen, Inc.
- Trower, P., Bryant, B. & Argyle, M. (1978). *Social skills and mental health*. London: Methuen.



- Turner, S.M. & Beidel, D.C. (1985). Empirically derived subtypes of social anxiety. *Behavior Therapy*, 16, 384-392.
- Turner, S.M., Beidel, D.C. and Larkin, K.T. (1986). Situational determinants of social anxiety in clinic and nonclinic samples: Physiological and cognitive correlates. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 54, 523-527.
- Twentyman, C.T., Jensen, M. & Kloss, J.D. (1978). Social skills training for the complex offender: Employment seeking skills. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 34, 320-326.
- Watson, D. & Friend, R. (1969). Measurement of social-evaluative anxiety. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 33, 448-457.
- Wolpe, J. (1969). *The practice of behaviour therapy*. Pergamon Press, Oxford.
- Zimbardo, P.G. (1977). *Shyness. What it is and what to do about it*. London: Pan Books Ltd.

**APPENDIX A**

- A1 Social Situations Questionnaire
- A2 Social Avoidance and Distress scale
- A3 Fear of Negative Evaluation
- A4 Self-Esteem Inventory - Adult form
- A5 Texas Social Behavior Inventory - A  
Texas Social Behavior Inventory - B

## APPENDIX A1

SOCIAL SITUATIONS QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire is concerned with how people get on in social situations, that is, situations involving being with other people, talking to them, etc.

On the following pages are listed 30 situations that you might find yourself in which some people have said they find difficult. Having difficulty means that the situations make you feel anxious or uncomfortable either because you don't know what to do, or because you feel embarrassed or self-conscious.

You are asked to think back to the last twelve months before you came to prison. For each of the situations listed, please rate on the 0-9 scale how much of a problem you had with each situation.

If there is a situation that you did not find difficult at all, then you would circle the zero on the scale. You will have found some situations harder than others. Nine on the scale is to be circled for those situations you have found extremely hard.

You can circle any number between 0 and 9, with the higher numbers chosen for the situations you have found quite hard, and the lower numbers chosen for situations that you have found less of a problem.

If some of the situations are ones that you have never found yourself in, please imagine how you would feel if you were in that situation.

Please rate ALL of the situations listed.

Here are some examples:

Accepting a compliment e.g. being told that you look attractive

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Not at all									Extremely
hard for me									hard

Going to a wedding

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Not at all									Extremely
hard for me									hard

Introducing people who have not met before

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Not at all									Extremely
hard for me									hard

The person in this example found it very hard to accept.....

2

Please rate how hard you found each of these situations in the twelve months before you came to prison. Remember to make a rating for every situation. If some of the situations are ones you have never found yourself in, imagine how you would feel if you were in that situation.

1. Walking down the street

[illegible]

2. Going into shops

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
										Extremely hard	
Not at all hard for me											

3. Going on public transport

[illegible]

4. Going into pubs

[illegible]

5. Going to parties

[illegible]

6. Mixing with people at work

[illegible]

7. Going out with someone you are sexually attracted to

[illegible]

8. Being with a group of the same sex and roughly the same age as you

[illegible]

9. Making friends of your own age

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Not at all									Extremely
hard for me									hard

10. Being with a group containing both men and women of roughly the same age as you

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
										Extremely hard	

11. Being with a group of the opposite sex of roughly the same age as you

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Not at all hard for me									Extremely hard

12. Entertaining people in your own home or flat

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
										Extremely
Not at all										hard
hard for me										hard

13. Going into restaurants or coffee bars

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Not at all									Extremely
hard for me									hard

14. Going to dances or disco's

[illegible]

15. Being with older people

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
											Extremely
Not at all											hard
hard for me											

16. Being with younger people

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
											Extremely
Not at all											hard
hard for me											



4

17. Going into a room full of people

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Not at all									Extremely
hard for me									hard

18. Meeting strangers

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Not at all									Extremely
hard for me									hard

19. Being with people you don't know very well

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Not at all									Extremely
hard for me									hard

20. Being with friends

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Not at all									Extremely
hard for me									hard

21. Approaching others - making the first move in starting up a friendship

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Not at all									Extremely
hard for me									hard

22. Making ordinary decisions affecting others  
(e.g. what to do together in the evenings)

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Not at all									Extremely
hard for me									hard

23. Being with only one other person rather than a group

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Not at all									Extremely
hard for me									hard

24. Getting to know people in depth

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Not at all									Extremely
hard for me									hard

5

25. Taking the initiative in keeping a conversation going

[illegible]

26. Looking at people in the eyes

[illegible]

27. Disagreeing with what other people are saying and putting forward your own views

0        1        2        3        4        5        6        7        8        9

Not at all  
hard for me

Extremely  
hard

28. People standing or sitting very close to you

[illegible]

29. Talking about yourself and your feelings

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
										Extremely
Not at all										hard
hard for me										

30. People looking at you

[illegible]

## APPENDIX A2

S.A.D.S.

Please read the following statements, and circle TRUE if the statement describes how you feel. Circle FALSE if the statement does not describe how you feel.

- |     |   |            |
|-----|---|------------|
| 1.  | I feel relaxed even in unfamiliar social situations                                   | TRUE/FALSE |
| 2.  | I try to avoid situations which force me to be very sociable                          | TRUE/FALSE |
| 3.  | It is easy for me to relax when I am with strangers                                   | TRUE/FALSE |
| 4.  | I have no particular desire to avoid people   | TRUE/FALSE |
| 5.  | I often find social occasions upsetting   | TRUE/FALSE |
| 6.  | I usually feel calm and comfortable at social occasions                               | TRUE/FALSE |
| 7.  | I am usually at ease when talking to someone of the opposite sex                      | TRUE/FALSE |
| 8.  | I try to avoid talking to people unless I know them well                              | TRUE/FALSE |
| 9.  | If the chance comes to meet new people, I often take it                               | TRUE/FALSE |
| 10. | I often feel nervous or tense in casual get-togethers in which both sexes are present | TRUE/FALSE |
| 11. | I am usually nervous with people unless I know them well                              | TRUE/FALSE |
| 12. | I usually feel relaxed when I am with a group of people                               | TRUE/FALSE |
| 13. | I often want to get away from people  | TRUE/FALSE |
| 14. | I usually feel uncomfortable when I am in a group of people I don't know              | TRUE/FALSE |
| 15. | I usually feel relaxed when I meet someone for the first time                         | TRUE/FALSE |
| 16. | Being introduced to people makes me tense and nervous                                 | TRUE/FALSE |
| 17. | Even though a room is full of strangers, I may enter it anyway                        | TRUE/FALSE |
| 18. | I would avoid walking up and joining a large group of people                          | TRUE/FALSE |



-2-

- |     |   |            |
|-----|---|------------|
| 19. | When my superiors want to talk with me,<br>I talk willingly                 | TRUE/FALSE |
| 20. | I often feel on edge when I am with a<br>group of people                    | TRUE/FALSE |
| 21. | I tend to withdraw from people  | TRUE/FALSE |
| 22. | I don't mind talking to people at parties<br>or social gatherings           | TRUE/FALSE |
| 23. | I am seldom at ease in a large group<br>of people                           | TRUE/FALSE |
| 24. | I often think up excuses in order to avoid<br>social engagements            | TRUE/FALSE |
| 25. | I sometimes take the responsibility for<br>introducing people to each other | TRUE/FALSE |
| 26. | I try to avoid formal social occasions                                      | TRUE/FALSE |
| 27. | I usually go to whatever social<br>engagements I have                       | TRUE/FALSE |
| 28. | I find it easy to relax with other people                                   | TRUE/FALSE |



## APPENDIX A3

F.N.E.

Please read the following statements and circle TRUE if the statement describes how you feel and Circle FALSE if the statement does not describe how you feel.

- |     |  |            |
|-----|--|------------|
| 1.  | I rarely worry about seeming foolish to others   | TRUE/FALSE |
| 2.  | I worry about what people will think of me even when I know it doesn't make any difference | TRUE/FALSE |
| 3.  | I become tense and jittery if I know someone is sizing me up                               | TRUE/FALSE |
| 4.  | I am unconcerned even if I know people are forming an unfavourable impression of me        | TRUE/FALSE |
| 5.  | I feel very upset when I commit some social error  | TRUE/FALSE |
| 6.  | The opinions that important people have of me cause me little concern                      | TRUE/FALSE |
| 7.  | I am often afraid that I may look ridiculous or make a fool of myself                      | TRUE/FALSE |
| 8.  | I react very little when other people disapprove of me                                     | TRUE/FALSE |
| 9.  | I am frequently afraid of other people noticing my shortcomings                            | TRUE/FALSE |
| 10. | The disapproval of other would have little effect on me                                    | TRUE/FALSE |
| 11. | If someone is evaluating me I tend to expect the worst                                     | TRUE/FALSE |
| 12. | I rarely worry about what kind of impression I am making on someone                        | TRUE/FALSE |
| 13. | I am afraid that others will not approve of me   | TRUE/FALSE |
| 14. | I am afraid that people will find fault with me  | TRUE/FALSE |
| 15. | Other people's opinions of me do not bother me   | TRUE/FALSE |
| 16. | I am not necessarily upset if I do not please someone                                      | TRUE/FALSE |
| 17. | When I am talking to someone, I worry about what they may be thinking about me             | TRUE/FALSE |
| 18. | I feel that you can't help making social errors sometimes, so why worry about it           | TRUE/FALSE |



-2-

- |     |   |            |
|-----|---|------------|
| 19. | I am usually worried about what kind of impression I make                     | TRUE/FALSE |
| 20. | I worry a lot about what my superiors think of me                             | TRUE/FALSE |
| 21. | If I know someone is judging me, it has little effect on me                   | TRUE/FALSE |
| 22. | I worry that others will think I am not worthwhile                            | TRUE/FALSE |
| 23. | I worry very little about what others may think of me                         | TRUE/FALSE |
| 24. | Sometimes I think I am too concerned with what other people think of me       | TRUE/FALSE |
| 25. | I often worry that I will say or do the wrong things                          | TRUE/FALSE |
| 26. | I am often indifferent to the opinions others have of me                      | TRUE/FALSE |
| 27. | I am usually confident that others will have a favourable impression of me    | TRUE/FALSE |
| 28. | I often worry that people who are important to me won't think very much of me | TRUE/FALSE |
| 29. | I brood about the opinions my friends have about me                           | TRUE/FALSE |
| 30. | I become tense and jittery if I know I am being judged by my superiors        | TRUE/FALSE |

ADULT FORM

SEI

# Coopersmith Inventory

Stanley Coopersmith, Ph.D.  
University of California at Davis

Please Print

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Age \_\_\_\_\_

Institution \_\_\_\_\_ Sex: M \_\_\_\_ F \_\_\_\_

Occupation \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

## Directions

On the other side of this form, you will find a list of statements about feelings. If a statement describes how you usually feel, put an X in the column "Like Me." If a statement does not describe how you usually feel, put an X in the column "Unlike Me." There are no right or wrong answers. Begin at the top of the page and mark all 25 statements.

	x4 =	
--	------	--



Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.  
577 College Ave., Palo Alto, CA 94306

Like Me	Unlike Me	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1. Things usually don't bother me.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2. I find it very hard to talk in front of a group.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3. There are lots of things about myself I'd change if I could.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	4. I can make up my mind without too much trouble.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	5. I'm a lot of fun to be with.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	6. I get upset easily at home.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	7. It takes me a long time to get used to anything new.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	8. I'm popular with persons my own age.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	9. My family usually considers my feelings.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	10. I give in very easily.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	11. My family expects too much of me.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	12. It's pretty tough to be me.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	13. Things are all mixed up in my life.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	14. People usually follow my ideas.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	15. I have a low opinion of myself.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	16. There are many times when I would like to leave home.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	17. I often feel upset with my work.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	18. I'm not as nice looking as most people.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	19. If I have something to say, I usually say it.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	20. My family understands me.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	21. Most people are better liked than I am.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	22. I usually feel as if my family is pushing me.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	23. I often get discouraged with what I am doing.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	24. I often wish I were someone else.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	25. I can't be depended on.



**APPENDIX A5**  
T. S. B. I. (A)

Please circle the number on the scale which best describes how well each statement describes you.

For example:

I would feel uncomfortable giving a speech in front of a crowd

[illegible]

I find it easy to get to know people

Not at all like me      0      (1)      2      3      4      5      6      7      8      9      Very much like me











APPENDIX A5  
T. S. B. I. (B)

Please circle the number on the scale which best describes how well each statement describes you.

For example:

I would feel uncomfortable giving a speech in front of a crowd

[illegible]

I find it easy to get to know people

[illegible]







**APPENDIX B**

- B1 Description of Job Seeking Skills Programme
- B2 Subjects' global rating scale
- B3 Interviewer's global rating scale
- B4 Independent raters' global rating scale
- B5 Definitions of behavioural measures

**APPENDIX B1****DESCRIPTION OF JOB SEEKING SKILLS PROGRAMME (JSS)**

The JSS programme ran for ten week days from 9 am to 4 pm daily. On the first and final days of JSS each participant was interviewed for a hypothetical job of his choice by the Executive Officer of Manawatu Prison. These interviews were videotaped.

JSS programmes included the following components:

- \* Writing replies to job advertisements
- \* Filling out job application forms
- \* Telephone enquiries for jobs
- \* Job values and roles: Rainbow of Life exercise
- \* Visit to New Zealand Employment Service, including interviews with an employment officer
- \* Body language
- \* Verbal communication skills
- \* Viewing hired videotape of the Job Interview
- \* Construction of tips for interviews after viewing hired videotape
- \* Modelling of interview by instructor
- \* Job interview roleplays
- \* Peer feedback, instructor feedback
- \* Appearance
- \* Enthusiasm
- \* Answering problem questions in interviews
- \* Purpose of interviewer's questions

## 1. ANXIETY

[illegible]

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Not at all anxious										Extremely anxious

How well do you think you performed in the job interview you have just viewed?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Very poor performance									Excellent Performance	

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Very poor performance									Excellent performance	

**APPENDIX B3**  
**JOB INTERVIEW VIDEOTAPES**

TAPE NO:

SUBJECT:

RATER:

PRE / POST:

**1. ANXIETY**

On the scale below please indicate how anxious/nervous/tense the job applicant in this interview appears to be.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Not at all anxious										Extremely anxious

**2. SOCIAL SKILL/PERFORMANCE**

On the scale below please indicate how well you think the job applicant performed during the interview.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Very Poor Performance/ Unskilled										Excellent Performance/ Skilled

**3. EMPLOYABILITY**

On the scale below please indicate how likely you would be to employ this job applicant if you were in a position to do so.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Highly Unlikely										Highly Likely

## TAPE NO:

SUBJECT:

RATER:

PRE / POST:

On the scale below please indicate how anxious/nervous/tense the job applicant in this interview appears to be.

## 2. SOCIAL SKILL/PERFORMANCE

On the scale below please indicate how well you think the job applicant performed during the interview.

### 3. EMPLOYABILITY

On the scale below please indicate how likely you would be to employ this job applicant if you were in a position to do so.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<b>Highly Unlikely</b>										<b>Highly Likely</b>



## APPENDIX B4

## JOB INTERVIEW VIDEOTAPES

TAPE NO:

RATER:

SUBJECT:

DATE:

PRE / POST

## 4. APPEARANCE

On the scale below please rate the standard of the applicant's overall appearance, considering such things as level of grooming, neatness, and haircare.

N.B. In your rating, please take into account that the applicant has had little choice in the style of clothing worn.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very low standard						Very high standard

## 5. QUESTION ANSWERING

On the scale below please rate the standard of the applicant's question answering, considering such things as the extent to which his answers have been appropriate, and relevant, concise, and direct.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very low standard						Very high standard

## APPENDIX B5

## DEFINITIONS OF BEHAVIOURAL MEASURES

<u>Appropriate</u>	Up and down or side to side movements of the head when
<u>Head Movements:</u>	listening and which indicate listener's attentiveness and/or agreement or disagreement with some aspect of the conversation.
<u>Facial Regard:</u>	Defined as occurring when applicant appears to be looking at the interviewer, i.e. his head is turned toward the eye of the interviewer.
<u>Fiddling:</u>	Small movements of hands which are unrelated to content of speech, e.g. facial picking, scratching, hairstroking, tapping. Does not include movements made while hands are joined together.
<u>Response Latency:</u>	Time elapsed between interviewer's question and applicant's first verbal response or appropriate head movement.
<u>Talk Time:</u>	Any occurrence of verbal behaviour by interviewee.

**APPENDIX C**

Table C-1 Individual and mean scores on SAD

Table C-2 Individual and mean scores on FNE

Table C-3 Individual and mean scores on SEI

Table C-4 Individual and mean scores on TSBI

Table C-5 Subjects' self-ratings for anxiety and social skill in simulated job  
interviews

Table C-6 Interviewer's ratings of anxiety and social skill in simulated job  
interview

Table C-7 Independent rater's judgments of anxiety and social skill in simulated  
job interview

Table C-8 Independent rater's judgments of employability, appearance and question  
answering in simulated job interview

Table C-1

Individual and mean scores on the Social Avoidance and Distress Scale (SAD) (N = 11)

Subject	Pretest	Posttest	Follow-up
A 1	13	19	14
A 2	7	1	1
A 3	8	6	9
A 4	19	16	23
B 1	14	10	12
B 2	24	26	25
B 3	6	2	1
B 4	12	10	12
C 1	18	16	12
C 2	7	9	11
C 4	17	26	18
Mean	13.18	12.82	12.54

Table C-2

Individual and mean scores on the Fear of Negative Evaluation (FNE) (N = 11)

Subject	Pretest	Posttest	Follow-up
A 1	18	21	17
A 2	18	9	16
A 3	18	11	12
A 4	12	9	15
B 1	9	10	8
B 2	25	27	25
B 3	20	21	10
B 4	13	9	7
C 1	15	22	20
C 2	14	7	24
C 4	9	13	25
Mean	15.54	14.45	16.27

Table C-3

Individual and mean scores on the Self-Esteem Inventory (SEI) (N = 11)

Subject	Pretest	Posttest	Follow-up
A 1	60	56	52
A 2	60	76	84
A 3	28	40	40
A 4	80	80	92
B 1	56	64	44
B 2	16	28	24
B 3	64	76	88
B 4	60	64	88
C 1	52	48	84
C 2	68	76	64
C 4	76	56	88
Mean	56.36	60.36	68

Table C-4

Individual and mean scores on the Texas Social Behaviour Inventory (TSBI) (N = 11)

Subject	Pretest	Posttest	Follow-up
A 1	81	64	101
A 2	76	99	90
A 3	85	102	91
A 4	62	56	64
B 1	67	74	79
B 2	31	52	60
B 3	100	100	110
B 4	69	69	71
C 1	72	72	78
C 2	78	95	68
C 4	77	65	67
Mean	72.54	77.09	79.90

Table C-5

Subjects' self-ratings for anxiety and social skill in simulated job interviews (N=9)

Subject	ANXIETY		SOCIAL SKILL	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
A 1	9	3	1	8
A 2	5	4	5	5
A 3	5	5	0	8
A 4	8	4	5	7
B 1	3	3	3	6
B 2	7	6	4	8
B 3	7	4	3	7
B 4	3	2	5	8
C 1	3	2	5	8
Mean	5.5	3.66	3.4	7.2



Table C-6

Interviewer's ratings of anxiety and social skill in simulated job interviews (N=9)

Subject	ANXIETY		SOCIAL SKILL	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
A 1	4	4	5	5
A 2	8	5	3	4
A 3	4	4	3	6
A 4	7	7	2	3
B 1	5	5	3	4
B 2	2	2	6	7
B 3	6	3	7	7
B 4	7	6	2	3
C 1	6	5	5	4
Mean	5.44	4.55	4	4.77

Table C-7

Independent rater's judgments of anxiety and social skill in simulated job interviews (N=9)

Subject	ANXIETY		SOCIAL SKILL	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
A 1	4	2	7	9
A 2	5	5	6	7
A 3	3	4	5	8
A 4	8	7	5	5
B 1	3	4	6	7
B 2	2	0	10	9
B 3	1	1	10	9
B 4	4	4	6	7
C 1	4	4	5	7
Mean	3.77	3.44	6.66	7.55

Table C-8

Independent rater's judgments of employability, appearance and question answering in simulated job interview (N=9)

Subject	EMPLOYABILITY		APPEARANCE		QUESTION ANSWERING	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
A 1	7	9	5	5	6	6
A 2	6	7	5	5	4	5
A 3	4	7	6	7	5	6
A 4	5	5	5	5	3	4
B 1	6	8	5	5	4	6
B 2	10	10	5	6	7	7
B 3	10	10	5	7	7	7
B 4	7	7	4	5	5	5
C 1	5	6	5	6	3	5
Mean	6.66	7.66	5	5.66	4.88	5.66