Professional Development:
The International Journal of
Continuing Social Work Education

Collaboration in Human Services: Skills Assessment for Effective Interpersonal Communication

Journal:	Professional Development: The International Journal of Continuing Social Work Education
Article Title:	*Collaboration in Human Services: Skills Assessment for Effective Interpersonal Communication*
Author(s):	*Alan B. Henkin, and Jay R. Dee*
Volume and Issue Number:	*Vol. 1 No. 1*
Manuscript ID:	*11022*
Page Number:	*22*
Year:	*1998*

Professional Development: The International Journal of Continuing Social Work Education is published three times a year (Spring, Summer, and Winter) by the Center for Social Work Research at 1 University Station, D3500 Austin, TX 78712. Journal subscriptions are $110. Our website at www.profdevjournal.org contains additional information regarding submission of publications and subscriptions.

ISSN: 1097-4911

URL: www.profdevjournal.org **Email: www.profdevjournal.org/contact**

Collaboration in Human Services: Skills Assessment for Effective Interpersonal Communication

Alan B. Henkin, PhD and Jay R. Dee, MA

Deficiencies in current social service delivery systems have been documented (Bruner, 1991; Hare, 1995; Kirst, 1991; Morrill, 1992). Services may be fragmented, duplicative, uncoordinated, and inflexible (O'Looney, 1994). Practitioners may be isolated from each other, and clients may encounter a bureaucratic maze of forms and eligibility processes in diffracted systems.

Collaborative delivery systems, which integrate programs and coordinate professional practices, may offer "client-friendly" services more efficiently than single-discipline models of practice (Briggs, 1997; Corrigan & Bishop, 1997; Franklin & Allen-Meares, 1997; Morris, 1992). Service goals in collaborative delivery systems are achieved, frequently, through the use of groups or teams — collectivities that include practitioners who represent multiple disciplines and synchronize their work in an effort to develop integrated plans and services for clients.

To maintain cohesion and coordination in service delivery, collaborative systems depend on extensive and effective communication among practicing professionals (Fatout & Rose, 1995). Such communication is complex and challenging. Practitioners may be underprepared in terms of communication skills needed for successful collaboration (Briggs, 1997). The human resources development and quality practices literatures related to human services suggest numerous strategies and schema for improving interpersonal and group communication (Ellis & Whittington, 1981; Gaucher & Coffey, 1993; Lippitt, 1982; Long, 1996; Radelet, 1986). Marginal attention is given, however, to assessing the communication attitudes and abilities of interactants. Careful assessment, we posit, is a requisite for systems maintenance and improvement, and essential in the design and development of in-service and continuing education learning opportunities.

The purpose of this study is to examine a range of skills needed for effective collaboration, as well as related assessment constructs associated with effective interpersonal communication. Alternative assessment measures are reviewed, and implications for training are suggested.

Communication in Social Service Practice

Communication may be defined as a social process through which individuals create and share interpretations of reality. In organizational settings, common understandings about professional practice, values, and ethics emerge through communication (Deetz, 1992; Mumby, 1988; Senge, 1990). Where work is accomplished through collective action, in this case by collaborative social service teams, communication constitutes a basic process out of which all other functions derive (Bavelas & Barrett, 1951). Effective practice and service delivery may depend on the quality of interaction among social service professionals.

Interpersonal communication skills have been acknowledged as valuable assets in human services practice (Ivey & Authier, 1978; Keefe & Maypole, 1983; Zastrow, 1992). Formal training in collaborative skills has become an integral part of many professional preparation programs (Bailey, 1996; Forest, 1995). Utilization of related assessment strategies, however, has been less extensive. Such strategies, as components of in-service training programs, can enable identification of skill deficits and suggest areas of need in terms of professional development.

The human services literature suggests specific skills associated with effective collaboration in teams (Briggs, 1997; Fatout & Rose, 1995; Pence & Wilson, 1994).

Collaborative skill constructs and their associations with social service collaboration are elaborated below. Then, related interpersonal skills assess-

Alan B. Henkin is Professor, and Jay R. Dee is Research Associate and a doctoral candidate, Planning, Policy and Leadership Studies, University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA 52241.

ment alternatives are discussed.

Empathy

Empathy refers to efforts to conceptualize oneself in the role of another (Authier, 1986). Empathic communicators attempt to identify and understand the perspectives of others, even when they disagree with them (Long, 1996). Abilities to empathize may enable more accurate perceptions of others' behaviors and intentions (Dymond, 1949; Gudykunst, 1993).

Collaborative efforts may be more successful where team members demonstrate empathy. Research suggests that empathy is a major determinant of altruistic and cooperative behaviors (Batson & Coke, 1981; Eisenberg & Miller, 1987; Mehrabian & Epstein, 1972). Empathy may facilitate higher levels of interaction among colleagues, as team members feel that others are open to their ideas and insights. Here, empathy may enhance the quality of decisions reached by social service teams, as problems are viewed from multiple perspectives and members are able to assess critically and clarify their thinking (Hirokawa, Erbert, & Hurst, 1996).

Empathy may also be associated with higher levels of interpersonal trust (Jourard, 1971; Lewis, 1980). Trust enables team members to develop cohesive work relationships. Where members strongly identify with their colleagues, the team becomes a force for improvement of performance (Coch & French, 1958; Homans, 1951). Trust may be particularly important in multidisciplinary teams, where interdisciplinary and interagency rivalries may interfere with team productivity (Briggs, 1997).

Adaptability

Adaptive communication involves capacities accurately to read interaction contexts and develop situationally-appropriate verbal and nonverbal messages (Hart, Carlson, & Eadie, 1980). Each interaction is deemed unique, and communicators enact flexible responses. Adaptive interactions are perceived as tactful, timely, and somewhat tentative, in that communicators do not offer definitive explanations, but instead consider the communication goals of others (Hart & Burks, 1972).

Adaptability may be a critical component in effective interactions. Studies have found that the timing and placement of verbal and nonverbal behaviors differentiates skillful from less skillful communicators (Fischetti, Curran, & Wessberg, 1977; Peterson, Fischetti, Curran, & Arland, 1981). Skilled communicators, in general, appear to be more responsive to situational and environmental variations.

The multiplicity and variety of situations encountered by social service professionals suggest that communication adaptability skills may be high-level utilities in collaborative practice. Social service teams may include members from several professional disciplines, each with its own knowledge base, practice norms, and terminology. Where practitioners appropriately adapt communication to enhance consistencies with the attitudes, perspectives, and predispositions of their colleagues, higher levels of cohesion may be obtained (Briggs, 1997).

Adaptive communication, moreover, may facilitate conflict management in teams. Adaptive communicators understand that an idea may be expressed in many ways; they tend to avoid communicative rigidity and seek to integrate individual and team goals (Eadie & Paulson, 1984; Hart & Burks, 1972). The adaptive communicator is likely to be considerate of multiple perspectives and may be active in efforts to bridge the hiatus between conflicting parties.

Social Anxiety

Social anxiety refers to a range of cognitive, affective, and behavioral responses to potential interactions. Socially anxious individuals tend to avoid interpersonal communication, or feel apprehensive in situations where avoidance is not possible (Watson & Friend, 1969). Their communication may be constrained by limited cognitive construct systems (Sanz, Avia, & Sanchez-Bernardos, 1996),

low self-esteem (Ingram, 1989), and greater than chance incidence of depression (Sanz & Avia, 1994).

Collaboration becomes difficult where team members are socially anxious. Leary (1983) found a negative correlation between social anxiety and sociability — the preference for being with others rather than alone. Team performance can be constrained by members who would rather work by themselves (McKinney, 1982). Such members avoid taking risks and sharing insights with colleagues, particularly if they believe that it will lead to negative evaluations of their capabilities.

Socially anxious individuals may indicate tendencies toward conformity, where compliance serves to reduce anxiety and remove the need for future interaction (Watson & Friend, 1969). Preferences for conformity, however, may be incompatible with successful team performance. Team members may fail to examine goals and basic assumptions; problem-solving alternatives are not analyzed critically, as members seek a premature consensus. Janis (1972) labeled this phenomenon "groupthink," and documented its negative effects in decision-making groups.

Assertiveness

Assertiveness involves "the propensity for or tendency to pursue one's goals through interaction appropriate to the interpersonal context" (Spitzberg & Cupach, 1989, p. 83). This conceptualization differs from aggressiveness which may be characterized as "win-at-all-cost" behavior. Assertive individuals tend to initiate and maintain conversations effectively and are at ease when meeting new people (Lorr, Youniss, & Stefic, 1991).

Assertive behaviors, such as explaining and taking a stand, tend to be viewed cautiously by social service professionals who associate such actions with authority-centered approaches (Brown, 1986). Although concerns for client-centered models of practice mitigate against the general utility of assertiveness in all situations, the construct remains useful in collaborative team environments where interaction maintenance and goal-directed behaviors are critical factors in performance (Fisher & Ellis, 1990; Henkin & Paramasivam, 1995; Mintzberg, Dougherty, Jorgensen, & Westley, 1996). The accomplishment of social and interpersonal tasks may require, in fact, assertive behavior (Rathus, 1973). Assertive members may help teams by "breaking the ice" during team formation, or by monitoring progress toward task completion (Harrington-Mackin, 1994).

Social Skill

Social skill refers to the constellation of abilities individuals utilize to "act wisely in human relations" (Thorndike, 1920, p. 228). The construct is frequently equated with effective interpersonal collaboration (McGuire & Priestly, 1981; Spitzberg & Cupach, 1989). Socially skilled individuals are deemed competent and credible by their peers (Riggio, 1986); their behaviors reflect complex and diverse interpersonal repertoires (O'Keefe & Delia, 1982).

Riggio (1989) suggested that social skill is manifest in six interpersonal dimensions. Emotional expressivity refers to skill in nonverbal encoding. Emotionally expressive individuals are perceived as animated, energetic, and inspirational. Emotional sensitivity involves nonverbal decoding. Emotionally sensitive individuals are particularly aware of others' emotions.

Emotional control concerns abilities to regulate nonverbal behavior. Snyder (1974) referred to this skill as moderation of emotion. Social expressivity refers to verbal encoding skill. Socially expressive individuals are articulate and able to engage others in interaction. Social sensitivity involves verbal decoding abilities. Socially sensitive individuals tend to be good listeners and demonstrate knowledge of social norms. Social control concerns abilities to regulate verbal behavior. Social control reflects self-confidence, and is regularly demonstrated through tactfulness.

Applications to social service teams appear axiomatic, given the high levels of interpersonal interaction necessary for interdisciplinary collaboration. Social skill appears to encompass a number

of behaviors — nonverbal communication, opening and closing interactions, reinforcement, self-disclosure, listening — associated with effective collaboration (Hargie, 1986).

Group Process Skills

Group process skills may constitute a particularly important professional utility for practitioners engaged in collaborative practice. Collaborative decision-making effectiveness, for example, can often be attributed to the quality of group communication processes (Hackman & Morris, 1975; Simon, 1976; Steiner, 1972). More specifically, effective collaboration appears to be associated with the extent to which group communication fulfills certain functional requisites of decision-making (Cragan & Wright, 1993; Gouran & Hirokawa, 1996).

Group interaction research has identified a number of decisional functions which independently account for variance in collaborative performance. Prominent among these functions is problem analysis — the process through which the group identifies and defines the decision-making situation. Hirokawa (1988) suggested that thorough problem analysis involves an understanding of "(a) the nature of the problem, (b) the extent and seriousness of the problem, (c) the possible cause(s) of the problem, and (d) the possible consequences of not dealing effectively with the problem" (p. 489). Related studies reveal associations between vigilant problem analysis and high quality collaborative decisions (Hirokawa, 1985; Hirokawa & Pace, 1983).

Collaborative decision-making may be more effective when members are skilled in the development and analysis of criteria for acceptable decision choices (Hirokawa, 1988; Hirokawa & Pace, 1983). By setting decision criteria, members define the boundaries of realistic problem-solving alternatives. Goals, objectives, and standards for performance become more clearly defined, as desired futures are elaborated through discussion. Effective teams assess the feasibility and desirability of potential solutions in light of the criteria they establish.

Effective collaborative decision-making may also depend on the extent to which group members evaluate potential alternative solutions. Groups which assess the positive and negative qualities of alternatives tend to produce higher quality decisions than groups which fail to analyze critically proposed solutions (Hirokawa, 1985; 1987; 1988). Here, groups may more readily recognize flaws in logic or identify unexamined benefits of proposals, as the "pros and cons" of each alternative are identified and discussed.

Assessing Interpersonal Communication

Empathy, adaptability, social anxiety, assertiveness, and social skill can be assessed through self-report instruments. Table 1 identifies some widely utilized measures of these constructs. Acceptable reliability and validity were reported for each.

The primary advantage of using self-report instruments is that individuals know more about their own behaviors than others. Self-reports may reflect a comprehensive, consistent evaluation of one's abilities (Spitzberg & Cupach, 1989). Such measures, however, do possess certain limitations. Overly positive or excessively negative perceptions of self, for example, may confound scores on such instruments (McCroskey & McCroskey, 1986; Spitzberg & Cupach, 1989). Here, self-reports of skill differ from those rendered by others.

Information derived from self-reports may be augmented by findings from third party observations of interpersonal behavior. Group process skills, for example, have been assessed using verbal interaction analysis, a technique whereby trained observers categorize communication behaviors according to the functions they perform in group interaction (Bales, 1950; Bales & Strodtbeck, 1951; Fisher, 1970; Gouran, Hirokawa, Julian, & Leatham, 1993). Applications of verbal interaction analysis to educational settings have been extensive since the 1960s (Amidon & Hunter, 1966; Flanders, 1960; Marshall, Green, & Lawrence, 1976; Ober, Bentley, & Miller, 1971; Shachar & Sharan, 1994). Table 2 identifies some widely utilized verbal interaction coding schemes.

TABLE 1
Self-Report Measures of Interpersonal Communication Skill

Empathy	Sample Items
Mehrabian & Epstein, 1972 Emotional Empathy Scale 33 items	"It makes me sad to see a lonely stranger in a group." "I get very angry when I see someone being ill-treated."
Davis, 1983 Interpersonal Reactivity Index 28 items	"I sometimes try to understand my friends better by imagining how things look from their perspective." "I really get involved with the feelings of the characters in a novel."
Adaptability	
Duran, 1983 Communicative Adaptability Scale 30 items	"I enjoy socializing with various groups of people." "I disclose at the same level that others disclose to me."
Hart, Carlson, & Eadie, 1980 Rhetorical Sensitivity Scale 40 items	"One should not be afraid to voice his or her opinion." * "One should keep quiet rather than say something which will alienate others." *
Social Anxiety	
Watson & Friend, 1969 Social Avoidance and Distress Scale 28 items	"I try to avoid talking to people unless I know them well." "I usually feel uncomfortable when I am in a group of people I don't know."
Leary, 1983 Interaction and Audience Anxiousness Scales 24 items	"I get nervous when I speak to someone in a position of authority." "When I speak in front of others, I worry about making a fool out of myself."
Assertiveness	
Rathus, 1973 Assertiveness Scale 30 items	"I enjoy starting conversations with new acquaintances and strangers." "When I am asked to do something, I insist upon knowing why."
Gay, Hollandsworth, & Galassi, 1975 Adult Self-Expression Scale 48 items	"Do you express anger or annoyance to your boss or supervisor when it is justified?" "Do you have difficulty asking a close friend to do an important favor even though it will cause them some inconvenience?" **
Herzberger, Chan, & Katz, 1984 Assertiveness Self-Report Inventory 25 items	"If someone makes loud noises when I am studying at the library I will express my discontent." "If I were stood up on a date I would tell the person who stood me up that I felt angry."
Social Skill	
Riggio, 1989 Social Skills Inventory 90 items	"I usually take the initiative and introduce myself to strangers." "People often tell me that I am a sensitive and understanding person."
Buhrmester, Furman, Wittenberg, & Reis, 1988 Interpersonal Competence Questionnaire 40 items	"Being an interesting and enjoyable person to be with when first getting to know people." "Being a good and sensitive listener for a companion who is upset."

** High scores reflect the middle response option, "sometimes true."*
*** Reverse-scored item.*

Third party observational assessments tend to mitigate potential subjective biases associated with self-reports (Spitzberg & Cupach, 1989). Such procedures are limited, however, in that communicative behaviors are often assigned to a single category (Gouran & Hirokawa, 1996). Since communication may perform multiple functions in an interaction, competencies across multiple dimensions may be underestimated. Findings may be supplemented by self-report instruments which examine individual skill dimensions in more depth.

The limitations of third party observations may be addressed, in part, by the complementary use of self-report instruments; limitations of self-reports, involving self-bias, may be mitigated by supplemental findings of third party observation. Selection of measurement constructs and assessment techniques should reflect a balance of the skills needed to function appropriately in social service teams. Single-construct assessments may provide incomplete profiles of respondent skills. The measurement of multiple constructs using a variety of assessment techniques may provide more comprehensive information regarding respondents' collaborative skills, and may facilitate the design and development of individualized skill development and continuing educational opportunities for human services professionals engaged in collaborative service enterprises.

Skillful communicators frequently demonstrate greater facility in managing change and may readily recognize functional benefits of task interdependence (Briggs, 1997). Effective implementation and maintenance of collaborative delivery systems may depend, in part, on carefully designed efforts to identify deficiencies and improve the communication skills of social service professionals. Continuing education programs may target significant needs where useful and usable diagnostic and assessment approaches are understood and appropriately employed.

TABLE 2
Third-Party Skill Observation, Selected Coding Schemes

Coding Scheme	Focus of Study
Bales, 1950 Interaction Process Analysis 12 categories	group decision-making, group discussion
Fisher & Ellis, 1990 Interaction Analysis: Decision Making 6 categories 4 sub-categories	group decision-making
Hirokawa, 1982 Function-Oriented Interaction Analysis System 4 categories 12 sub-categories	group decision-making
Ralph & Johnstone, 1992 Verbal Interaction Analysis System 8 categories	conversational competence
Shachar & Sharan, 1994 Classroom Interaction 20 categories	collaborative learning

References

Amidon, E., & Hunter, E. (1966). *Improving teaching. New* York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Authier, J. (1986). Showing warmth and empathy. In O. Hargie (Ed.), *A handbook of communication skills*. London: Croom Helm.

Bailey, D. (1996). An overview of interdisciplinary training. In D. Bricker & A. Widerstrom (Eds.), *Preparing personnel to work with infants and young children and their families: A team approach*. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes.

Bales, R. (1950). *Interaction process analysis: A method for the study of small groups*. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Bales, R., & Strodtbeck, F. (1951). Phases in group problem-solving. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 46, 485-495.

Batson, C., & Coke, J. (1981). Empathy: A source of altruistic motivation for helping? In J. Rushton & R. Sorrentino (Eds.), *Altruism and helping behavior: Social, personality, and developmental perspectives*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Bavelas, A., & Barrett, D. (1951). An experimental approach to organizational communication. *Personnel*, 27 (5), 366-371.

Briggs, M. (1997). *Building early intervention teams: Working together for children and families*. Gaithersburg, MD: Aspen.

Brown, G. (1986). Explaining. In O. Hargie (Ed.), *A handbook of communication skills*. London: Croom Helm.

Bruner, C. (1991). *Thinking collaboratively: Ten questions and answers to help policy makers improve children's services*. Washington, DC: Educational and Human Services Consortium.

Buhrmester, D., Furman, W., Wittenberg, M., & Reis, H. (1988). Five domains of interpersonal competence in peer relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 55, 991- 1008.

Coch, L., & French, J. (1958). Overcoming resistance to change. *Human Relations*, 11, 512-523.

Corrigan, D., & Bishop, K. (1997). Creating family-centered integrated service systems and interprofessional educational programs to implement them. *Social Work in Education*, 19 (3), 149-163.

Cragan, J., & Wright, D. (1993). The functional theory of small group decision-making: A replication. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 8, 165-174.

Davis, M. (1983). Measuring individual differences in empathy: Evidence for a multidimensional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44, 113-126.

Deetz, S. (1992). *Democracy in an age of corporate colonization: Developments in communication and the politics of everyday life*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Duran, R. (1983). Communicative adaptability: A measure of social communicative competence. *Communication Quarterly*, 31, 320-326.

Dymond, R. (1949). A scale for measurement of empathic ability. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 14, 127-133.

Eadie, W., & Paulson, J. (1984). Communicator attitudes, communicator style, and communication competence. *Western Journal of Speech Communication*, 48, 390-407.

Eisenberg, N., & Miller, P. (1987). The relation of empathy to prosocial and related behaviors. *Psychological Bulletin*, 101 (1), 91-119.

Ellis, R., & Whittington, D. (1981). *A guide to social skills training*. London: Croom Helm.

Fatout, M., & Rose, S. (1995). *Task groups in the social services*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Fischetti, M., Curran, J., & Wessberg, H. (1977). Sense of timing: A skill deficit in heterosexual-socially anxious males. *Behavior Modification*, 1, 179-194.

Fisher, B. (1970). Decision emergence: Phases in group decision-making. *Communication Monographs*, 7, 53-66.

Fisher, B., & Ellis, D. (1990). *Small group decision making: Communication and the group process* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.

Flanders, N. (1960). *Teacher influence, pupil attitudes, and achievement*. US Office of Education Cooperative Research Project No. 397. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Forest, S. (1995). Rural early intervention training. *Zero to Three*, 15, 22-28.

Franklin, C., & Allen-Meares, P. (1997). School social workers are a critical part of the link. *Social Work in Education*, 19 (3), 131-135.

Gaucher, E., & Coffey, R. (1993). *Total quality in health care*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gay, M., Hollandsworth, J., & Galassi, J. (1975). An assertiveness inventory for adults. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 22, 340-344.

Gouran, D., & Hirokawa, R. (1996). Functional theory and communication in decision-making and problem-solving groups: An expanded view. In R. Hirokawa & M. Poole (Eds.), *Communication and group decision making* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Gouran, D., Hirokawa, R., Julian, K., & Leatham, G. (1993). The evolution and current status of the functional perspective on communication in decision-making and problem-solving groups: A critical analysis. In S. Deetz (Ed.), *Communication Yearbook* 16. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Gudykunst, W. (1993). Toward a theory of effective interpersonal and intergroup communication:An anxiety/uncertainty management (AUM) perspective. In R. Wiseman & J. Koester (Eds.), *Intercultural communication competence* (pp. 33-71). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Hackman, J., & Morris, C. (1975). Group tasks, group interaction process, and group performance effectiveness: A review and proposed integration. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental psychology* (Vol. 8). New York: Academic Press.

Hare, I. (1995). School-linked services. In R. Edwards (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of social work* (19th ed., Vol. 3, pp. 2100-2109). Washington DC: NASW Press.

Hargie, O. (1986). *A handbook of communication skills.* London: Croom Helm.

Harrington-Mackin, D. (1994). *The team building tool kit: Tips, tactics, and rules for effective workplace teams.* New York: American Management Association.

Hart, R., & Burks, D. (1972). Rhetorical sensitivity and social interaction. *Speech Monographs*, 39, 75-91.

Hart, R., Carlson, R., & Eadie, W. (1980). Attitudes toward communication and the assessment of rhetorical sensitivity. *Communication Monographs*, 47, 1-22.

Henkin, A., & Paramasivam, M. (1995). Teams, teamwork, and effective organizational problem solving. *Virginia Social Science Journal*, 30 (2), 91-106.

Herzberger, S., Chan, E., & Katz, J. (1984). The development of an assertiveness self-report inventory. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 48, 317-323.

Hirokawa, R. (1982). Group communication and problem-solving effectiveness I: A critical review of inconsistent findings. *Communication Quarterly*, 30, 134-141.

Hirokawa, R. (1985). Discussion procedures and decision-making performance: A test of a functional perspective. *Human Communication Research*, 12, 203-224.

Hirokawa, R. (1987). Why informed groups make faulty decisions: An investigation of possible interaction-based explanations. *Small Group Behavior*, 18, 3-29.

Hirokawa, R. (1988). Group communication and decision-making performance: A continued test of the functional perspective. *Human Communication Research*, 14, 487-515.

Hirokawa, R., Erbert, L., & Hurst, A. (1993). Communication and group decision-making effectiveness. In R. Hirokawa & M. Poole (Eds.), *Communication and group decision making* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hirokawa, R., & Pace, R. (1983). A descriptive investigation of the possible communication-based reasons for effective and ineffective group decision making. *Communication Monographs*, 50, 363-379.

Homans, G. (1951). The western electric researches. In S. Hoslett (Ed.), *Human factors in management.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Ingram, R. (1989). Affective confounds in social-cognitive research. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57, 715-722.

Ivey, A., & Authier, J. (1978). *Microcounseling* (2nd ed.). Springfield, IL: Charles Thomas.

Janis, I. (1972). *Victims of groupthink: Psychological studies of foreign policy decisions and fiascoes.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Jourard, S. (1971). *The transparent self.* New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Co.

Keefe, T., & Maypole, D. (1983). *Relationships in social service practice: Context and skills.* Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing.

Kirst, M. (1991). Improving children's services: Overcoming barriers, creating new opportunities. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 72, 615-618.

Leary, M. (1983). Social anxiousness: The construct and its measurement. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 47, 66-75.

Lewis, P. (1980). *Organizational communication: The essence of effective management* (2nd ed.). Columbus, OH: Grid.

Lippitt, G. (1982). *Organizational renewal.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Long, V. (1996). *Communication skills in helping relationships: A framework for facilitating personal growth.* Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Lorr, M., Youniss, R., & Stefic, E. (1991). An inventory of social skills. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 57 (3), 506-520.

Marshall, H., Green, J., & Lawrence, M. (1976). *Stability of teacher behaviors as measured by a broad range, low-inference observational system.* Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

McCroskey, J., & McCroskey, L. (1986). *Self-report as an approach to measuring communication competence.* Paper presented at the Central States Speech Communication Association Conference, Cincinnati.

McGuire, J., & Priestly, P. (1981). *Life after school: A social skills curriculum.* Oxford: Pergamon.

McKinney, B. (1982). The effects of reticence on group interaction. *Communication Quarterly*, 30, 124-128.

Mehrabian, A., & Epstein, N. (1972). A measure of emotional empathy. *Journal of Personality*, 40, 525-543.

Mintzberg, H., Dougherty, D., Jorgensen, J., & Westley, F. (1996). Some surprising things about collaboration: Knowing how people connect makes it work better. *Organizational Dynamics*, 25, 60-71.

Morrill, W. (1992). Overview of service delivery to children. *Future of Children*, 2, 32-43.

Morris, J. (1992). Encouraging collaboration to keep kids in school. *Public Management*, 74, 3-7.

Mumby, D. (1988). *Communication and power in organizations: Discourse, ideology and domination.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Ober, R., Bentley, E., & Miller, E. (1971). *Systematic observation of teaching.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

O'Keefe, B., & Delia, J. (1982). Impression formation and message production. In M. Roloff & C. Berger (Eds.), *Social cognition and communication*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

O'Looney, J. (1994). Modeling collaboration and social services integration: A single state's experience with developmental and non-developmental models. *Administration in Social Work*, 18, 61-86.

Pence, D., & Wilson, C. (1994). *Team investigation of child sexual abuse: The uneasy alliance*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Peterson, J., Fischetti, M., Curran, J., & Arland, S. (1981). Sense of timing: A skill deficit in heterosocially anxious women. *Behavior Therapy*, 12, 195-201.

Radelet, L. (1986). *The police and the community*. New York: Macmillan.

Ralph, A., & Johnstone, S. (1992). Assessment and training of functional conversation behaviour. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 13, 443-462.

Rathus, S. (1973). A 30-item schedule for assessing assertive behavior. *Behavior Therapy*, 4, 398-406.

Riggio, R. (1986). Assessment of basic social skills. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 649-660.

Riggio, R. (1989). *Social skills inventory manual*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Sans, J., & Avia, M. (1994). Cognitive specificity in social anxiety and depression: Self-statements, self-focused attention, and dysfunctional attitudes. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 13, 105-137.

Sanz, J., Avia, M., & Sanchez-Bernardos, M. (1996). The structure of the construct system in social anxiety: Qualifications due to affective confounding. *Journal of Constructivist Psychology*, 9, 201-212.

Senge, P. (1990). *The fifth discipline*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Shachar, H., & Sharan, S. (1994). Talking, relating, and achieving: Effects of cooperative learning and whole-class instruction. *Cognition and Instruction*, 12 (4), 313-353.

Simon, H. (1976). *Administrative behavior: A study of decision-making process in administrative organization* (3rd ed.). New York: Free Press.

Snyder, M. (1974). Self-monitoring of expressive behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 30, 526-537.

Spitzberg, B., & Cupach, W. (1989). *Handbook of interpersonal competence research*. New York: Springer.

Steiner, I. (1972). *Group process and productivity*. New York: Academic Press.

Thorndike, E. (1920). Intelligence and its use. *Harpers Magazine*, 140, 227-235.

Watson, D., & Friend, R. (1969). Measurement of social-evaluative anxiety. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 33, 448-457.

Zastrow, C. (1992). *The practice of social work* (4th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.