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Abstract

Individuals diagnosed with developmental disabilities often lack the skills needed to gain meaningful employment in the community. One crucial skill is interviewing as this is the first and often the only pre-job interaction an individual has with his or her employer. In a short interaction, the person must convey information about specific work history, employability, and a general impression of character. This study evaluated the effectiveness of video feedback in improving job interview behaviors for three young adults with developmental disabilities. The interview related-behaviors were appropriate greeting, responses to interview questions, and appropriate closing statement. The performance across the participants was assessed in simulated interviews under a multiple-baseline design across behaviors and participants, with all participants reaching 100% correct performance of all three behaviors after video feedback was implemented. The social validity supports the feasibility of this video feedback intervention. Issues related to future research and implications for the field are discussed.
Chapter One:

Introduction

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) is a law in the United States that ensures that all children with disabilities are entitled to a free and appropriate education (U. S. Department of Education, 2010). This law was enacted to help meet the needs of people with disabilities and prepare them for further education, employment, and independent living (U. S. Department of Education, 2010). This law enables children with developmental disabilities to receive transition services including the advancement of employment objectives (U. S. Department of Education, 2011). However, there is a large gap between legislation and fulfillment.

Despite the requirement of individuals with disabilities to receive these services, for many youth and young adults with developmental disabilities, including autism spectrum disorders, their educational and vocational aspirations often go unfulfilled (Burgess & Cimera, 2014; Lee & Carter, 2012; Newman et al., 2011; Simonsen & Neubert, 2013). The Bureau of Labor Statistics found in 2012 that only 17.8% of individuals with a disability were employed compared to 63.9% of individuals employed without a disability (U.S. Department of Labor, 2013). Surprisingly, despite increased awareness and inclusion for individuals with disabilities, the percent of individuals transitioning to paid employment decreased from 58% to 49% since 2002 (Butterworth et al., 2011). Even more alarming, according to Erickson, Lee, and Von
Schrader (2014), 10.8% or over 1 million individuals with disabilities are actively seeking but not able to obtain employment.

Even though there are supports in place for adolescents and young adults, once an individual ages out of the educational system at 22, supports are no longer mandated by law and individuals with developmental disabilities and/or their caretakers are required to navigate the vocational rehabilitation system and attempt to meet the eligibility requirements to receive services through the vocational rehabilitation system (Lawer, Brusilovsky, Salzer, & Mandell, 2009; McDonough & Revell, 2010). Most individuals with developmental disabilities work in sheltered workshops due to a lack of transportation and employability skills including general social skills to obtain competitive employment with non-disabled persons (Cimera, 2011). Employment is extremely beneficial to adults with developmental disabilities because it promotes financial well-being, independence, new relationships and engagement in the community (Lee & Carter, 2012).

Research has evaluated various techniques of teaching job skills to individuals with disabilities including behavioral skills training (Burke, Andersen, Bowen, Howard, & Allen, 2010); multiple exemplar training (Hughes & Rusch, 1989); and picture prompts (Steed & Lutzker, 1997). In an alternative approach, referred to as video modeling, a participant watches a video displaying an expert in a given area exhibiting the correct behavior(s) or the participant can video-tape his or herself (Miltenberger, 2012). The participant then watches the video which prompts the correct behavior the next time the behavior is to occur.

Laarhoven, Winiarski, Blood, and Chan (2012) and Goh and Bambara (2013) found video modeling to be effective in increasing vocational skills of already employed individuals with developmental disabilities. Laarhoven et al. indicated that students were able to increase
two tasks at the same time while watching video models while on break at work. Similarly, Goh and Bambara demonstrated video self-modeling to be successful in increased task acquisition in various chained tasks. However, both studies also indicated that the effectiveness varied across participants and job tasks, indicating additional training may have been necessary for skills to position these individuals for successful interviewing for jobs.

Video-feedback may occur in conjunction with video modeling to increase effectiveness as some studies have indicated that video modeling alone is ineffective (Allen, Burke, Howard, Wallace, & Bowen, 2012; Goh & Bambara, 2013). Video feedback occurs during or after the participant watches the video and includes praise for behaviors demonstrated correctly and corrective feedback about how to improve performance the next time the behavior is to occur (Kern-Dunlap et al., 1992). Video feedback was used by Morgan and Salzberg (1992) to assist with the generalization of skills to real life scenarios that video modeling alone did not accomplish.

Although job skills are important, individuals with disabilities may not be able to obtain a job in the first place unless they have strong interview skills (Bullis & Cheney, 1999; Bullis & Davis, 1996; Kelly & Christoff, 1983). It is essential these persons convince their potential employer that they are capable of handling the job to increase their chances of being employed outside sheltered work environments. In the short duration an interview occurs, an individual must convey information about specific work history and employability as well as leave the general impression of reliability, good judgment, personal responsibility, and interest in hard work (Bullis & Cheney, 1999; Kelly & Christoff, 1983).

There have been several methods for teaching individuals with disabilities interview skills including behavior rehearsal (Furman, Geller, Simon, & Kelly, 1979; Mozingo, Ackley, &
Bailey, 1994) and behavioral skills training (Grinell & Lieberman, 1977; Hall, Sheldon-Wildgen, & Sherman, 1980; Hollandsworth, Dressel, & Stevens, 1977; Hollandsworth, Glazeski, & Dressel, 1978; Kelly, Wildman, & Berler, 1980; Strickland, Coles, & Southern, 2013). More recent studies have begun to evaluate technology as a means of teaching skills because it may be more cost effective. Despite an abundance of literature on teaching interview skills, studies evaluating using video feedback are relatively unexplored. Only one study has evaluated video feedback to teach interview skills to individuals with developmental disabilities (Bobroff & Sax, 2010).

Bobroff and Sax (2010) used peer tutors and video feedback to teach appropriate interview skills to individuals with disabilities. The participants completed mock interviews that were video-taped with the peer tutor and then watched the video with their peer tutor. The tutor filled out an interview rating form and then the tutor and tutee reviewed the video together and feedback was provided. Participants improved their interview skills; however, the article was unclear about what behaviors were targeted for change or how feedback was provided (Bobroff & Sax, 2010). Another limitation of the study was that feedback on a video was provided after an unknown amount of time after the interview took place as well as an unknown amount of time before the next interview was conducted. This means that the feedback may not have been as effective as if it had been completed immediately before another interview took place. Without information on these variables, it is difficult to assess the parameters of the intervention that may need to be present for it to be effective.

Since video feedback has been shown to be successful in teaching a variety of job-related behaviors, the purpose of the current study was to evaluate the effects of video modeling across three specific interviewing behaviors with young adults with developmental disabilities.
Chapter Two:

Method

Participants

Three young adults ages 19-27 diagnosed with developmental disabilities were participants in this study. For inclusion in this study, the young adult’s mode of communication was required to be verbal, the individual had to be diagnosed with a developmental disability, and each was capable of serving as his own guardian.

Bobby, age 27, resided in a group home and attended an adult day program which taught him basic self-care and other living skills. He reported that he had never had a job but had been looking for one for several years. Bobby was interested in working as a server or chef at Red Robin or at Gamestop.

Hank, age 21, resided in a group home and attended high school. He reported that he never had a job before but stated he was very interested in obtaining a job and had been working with a behavior analyst on trying to find a job for the past several months. In working with the behavior analyst, Hank was only learning to explore what types of jobs he would like to apply for and had never attempted to improve any work-related skills. Hank was interested in working as a salesperson at Best Buy, a computer repairman, or a music teacher.

Joseph, age 19, resided in a group home attended an exceptional center for individuals with disabilities. He reported that he had had small jobs before but they were working for family friends. He stated that he was never able to obtain employment elsewhere due to his lack of
Joseph was interested in working as a salesperson at Gamestop, a car mechanic, or a lawn service technician.

For this study, participants were recruited via fliers passed out around the community by certified behavior analysts. Interested participants then contacted the primary investigator to set up an interview to determine eligibility and talk to the participant about the study. Participants were compensated $2 for every interview he completed.

Materials

An employment interest assessment developed by the investigator was used in assessing job interest (Appendix A). An iPhone 6 Plus was used to record interviews and feedback sessions and a Macbook Pro was used to view the taped interviews in baseline and intervention phases. An Interview Rating Form was provided to the interviewer and participant for each interview and was used to evaluate the participant’s behaviors during baseline and intervention (Appendix B). This form was adapted from the Interview Questions Data Form and Interview Rating Form in Bobroff and Sax (2010). Social Validity Survey forms were provided to each participant and potential employer after the study was completed to assess the acceptability and effectiveness of the intervention (Appendices C and D).

Target Behaviors and Data Collection

Behaviors displayed during mock job interviews were measured. Target behaviors were divided into three categories: appropriate greeting, answering interview questions appropriately, and appropriate closing as one is preparing to leave after an interview.

Appropriate greeting was defined as greeting the interviewer with a salutation such as “Hello” or “Good morning,” and first and last name, with eye contact, and a handshake.
Appropriate greetings were scored on a rating scale of 0 to 4. A score of 0 was given if none of
the three components were present in the first 10s of the interview. A score of 1 was given if 1
of the 4 components were present in the first 10s of the interview. A score of 2 was given if 2 of
the 4 components were present in the first 10s of the interview. A score of 3 was given if 3
components were present in the first 10s of the interview and a score of 4 was given if all
components were present. This score was marked on the Interview Rating Form (Appendix B).

Answering interview questions appropriately was scored on the Interview Questions Data
Form (Appendix B). Each interview consisted of four questions asked by the interviewer and
one question that was developed by the participants to ask the interviewer. Each of these
questions was further broken down into three components. Each component was marked as
“acceptable” or “unacceptable.” The definition of what constitutes an appropriate answer was
located on the Interview Rating Form for each component of each question. For example, if the
question was “Tell me about yourself,” a response that would be scored as “acceptable” would
be “I graduated from J. W. Mitchell High School in 2009.” A response that would be scored as
“unacceptable” would be “I like reading Alice in Wonderland.” If a component was marked as
acceptable it was given a score of 100%. If a component was marked as “unacceptable” it was
given a score of 0%. The number of components marked acceptable out of 15 total components
was computed and marked as the score for answering interview questions appropriately. For
example, if a student has 12 components marked as acceptable and 3 marked as unacceptable,
the overall score for the interview would be 80%. The number of acceptable and unacceptable
answers was marked on the Interview Rating Form.
Appropriate closing was defined as smiling, shaking the interviewer’s hand, and thanking the interviewer in the last 15s of the interview. Appropriate closing was scored in the same manner as appropriate greeting. This score was marked on the Interview Rating Form.

**Interobserver Agreement (IOA)**

IOA was calculated for 100% of interviews in both baseline and intervention conditions for all target behaviors. The interviews were scored by the lead researcher and a research assistant. There were 22 components for each interview. If both observers scored the component the same (either both yes/no or both acceptable/unacceptable), an agreement was scored for that component. IOA was calculated by dividing the number of agreements by 22. The percentage agreement for each baseline interview was summed and divided by the number of interviews in baseline for that participant. The percentage agreement for each behavior after video feedback was introduced was summed and divided by the number of interviews in video feedback for that participant. IOA was calculated for all baseline and all treatment sessions for each participant separately. Hence, there was a baseline and an intervention IOA score for each participant.

IOA was 99.22% in baseline interviews and 99.68% in video feedback interviews for Joseph. IOA was 99.22% in baseline interviews and in video feedback interviews was 99.31% for Bobby. IOA was 99.74% in baseline interviews and 100% in video feedback interviews for Hank.

**Experimental Design**

A multiple baseline across behaviors and participants was used to evaluate the effects of video feedback on interview behaviors.
Procedure

Mock interviews were conducted as if the participant was applying to a specific job. All baseline and intervention interviews involving the lead researcher serving as the interviewer and the participant serving as the interviewee were recorded to be viewed later for scoring and feedback. During all mock interviews, the participant sat facing the interviewer, with their heads 2-3 feet apart.

Job interest assessment. Before beginning baseline, the participant was given a paper questionnaire (Appendix A) to determine what types of employment the participant was interested in. The questionnaire listed several different types of employment and asked the participant to circle five items of greatest interest. If none interested the participant, there was an option to write-in a preferred employment type. These responses were used to create mock interview scenarios tailored to the interests of each participant. For example, if an individual was interested in working with animals, then interviews were created for a position at a pet store or local zoo.

Baseline. Each participant was interviewed by the researcher in both baseline and intervention conditions and all sessions were video-taped. Participants were provided with the scenario of the job they were interviewing for 5-min before the interview began in a separate room from where the interview occurred. When the participant entered the room, the interviewer was looking at papers and any engagement the participant had with the interviewer was noted. If the participant did not engage with the interviewer within 10s, the interviewer said “Thank you for coming to interview today. I am going to ask you a few questions.”

During the interview, the interviewer looked at the papers to read the question and then made eye contact with the participant at all other times. If a participant did not begin to answer a
question within 10s, the interviewer said “Let’s continue to the next question,” and asked the next question. After the fourth question was read and answered, the interviewer stated “Those are all of the questions I have for you.” The interviewer then sat and waited for 10s to see if any further interactions occurred and then walked out of the room. If the participant asked “How did I do?” the interviewer said “We will talk when we review your video next time.”

Training of participants on completing the interview rating form. After a participant completed all of the baseline sessions, he was trained to observe simulated interviews that had been developed between the researcher and the research assistant where they model how to respond to the same questions that were used for this participant’s mock interview sessions. In order for the participant to observe particular behaviors (i.e., appropriate greeting), he was first taught how to fill out the Interview Rating Form for one target behavior at a time. To maintain experimental control, the initial Interview Rating Form only included the target behavior that was to be taught next, starting with greetings first, responding to questions second, and closing third. This was done to prevent the participant from viewing the other two behaviors that currently were not receiving feedback. In addition, each video showed different component behaviors being scored correctly. For example, in greeting, there are four component behaviors; however, each mock interview only demonstrated one of the components being completed correctly. This was to minimize the opportunities for modeling the correct behavior to the participants.

In the first session the participant received video feedback for the appropriate responses, the participant was trained to complete the Interview Rating Form for both greeting and appropriate responses. In the first session the participant received video feedback for closing, he was trained to complete the Interview Rating Form for all three behaviors.
The participant and researcher observed and scored the same simulated interview and then reviewed any differences in their scoring. There were a total of nine simulated interviews developed for this process. There were three videos only depicting greeting, three videos depicting greeting and appropriate responses, and three videos depicting all three target behaviors. One of the three videos for each behavior were selected at random for a participant to observe. The researcher provided feedback to the participant on his scoring. This process was repeated until the participant reached 100% agreement with the researcher in scoring the specific behavior across the simulated interviews.

**Video feedback intervention.** During the first video feedback session, a participant reviewed his last baseline interview with the interviewer. The interviewer and participant each had an Interview Rating Form and, while watching the video, marked the data sheet according to whether or not the participant performed the behaviors appropriately. The participant’s checklist was then compared to the interviewer’s checklist and differences were discussed. The interviewer praised appropriate behaviors and provided constructive feedback on how the participant could improve his interview behaviors. Immediately after the feedback session, the participant was interviewed again. This interview was also taped and used for the next video feedback session. Each participant received video feedback on all behaviors currently in the intervention condition. For example, if a participant was in intervention for appropriate responses, the participant received video feedback for greeting and appropriate responses and scored the Interview Rating Form for those two behaviors.

**Treatment Integrity**

Treatment integrity of the interview was evaluated by the research assistant. The research assistant used the Interview Rating Form as a checklist to assess that each component of
all of the mock interviews were presented appropriately by the interviewer. The number of completed components was divided by the total number of components. Treatment integrity was 100% across 100% of the mock and simulated interviews.

**Social Validity**

Social validity data was collected at the conclusion of the study. An individual who interviews individuals with disabilities was recruited from a large chain store and asked to view one baseline and one treatment video for each participant, for a total of six videos. Each baseline video was the last baseline video for that participant and each intervention video was the last intervention video for that participant. Videos were viewed in a random order and the employer did not know if they were viewing a baseline or intervention video. The employer then completed a survey after each video for a total of six surveys (Appendix C).

Participants also filled out a social validity form upon completion of the study to assess if they felt the intervention was beneficial (Appendices D and E). Participants were asked to rate from strongly disagree to strongly agree, whether watching the interviews and receiving feedback improved the skills across the three target behaviors. Participants were also asked if they liked receiving video feedback of their skills and if they would like to receive video feedback to help improve skills in the future.
Chapter Three:

Results

Overall, participants demonstrated a substantial increase in appropriate interview behaviors after the video feedback intervention was implemented. Figures 1-3 represent individual data for each participant across behaviors. Figure 4 represents data across behavior and participants. Baseline averages were 4.16%, 20.81%, and 0% for greeting, appropriate responses, and closing behaviors, respectively for all participants. All participants after video feedback interventions were able to reach 100% correct performance of all three behaviors. In baseline, two participants, Bobby and Hank scored 0% of the components for appropriate greeting. One participant, Joseph scored 25% on appropriate greeting. After one video feedback session occurred for greeting, two participants, Justin and Hank, scored 100% and after two sessions, Bobby scored 100%. Appropriate responses and closing behaviors maintained at baseline levels after intervention was implemented for greeting. For appropriate responses, the average percentage of components completed in baseline was 42% for Joseph, 22% for Bobby, and 12% for Hank. After video feedback occurred, Joseph reached 100% of components completed after three video feedback sessions, Bobby after six sessions, and Hank after two sessions. Greeting behaviors maintained at intervention levels and closing behaviors maintained at baseline levels after intervention was implemented for appropriate responses. In baseline, all three participants completed 0% of the components correctly for closing the interview. All participants only required one session of video feedback to reach 100% of components for
closing. Greeting and appropriate responses maintained at intervention levels or increased further for one participant (Bobby) after intervention was implemented for closing. Each behavior only increased for each participant when and only when intervention was introduced for that participant.

**Social Validity**

A group home manager blind to the study assisted the participants in completing the social validity questionnaire because two of the participants did not know how to read. She read the questions aloud to all participants and then had the participants verbally answer the questions on a scale from 1 to 5, 1 being strongly disagree and 5 strongly agree. All participants strongly agreed with all eight questions.

In addition, an individual who works for a large retail store, which occasionally hires individuals with disabilities, watched the last baseline interview and last video feedback interview for each participant. The employer then completed a questionnaire that asked if the participant greeted the interviewer appropriately, answered questions appropriately, closed the interview appropriately, and if the employer would hire that individual. Results varied across individuals. According to the survey, the employer “disagreed” that he would hire Bobby in baseline, but after intervention was completed, the employer rated he “agreed” that he would hire Bobby. In baseline, the employer was “neutral” that he would hire Joseph; however, after intervention, the employer rated that he “strongly agreed” he would hire Joseph. Hank also increased his chances of being hired by the employer; however, his score only went from “strongly disagree” to “disagree.” This may be because Hank’s physical disabilities at times made it difficult for him to speak clearly, especially on a video recording.
Figure 1: Video feedback across behaviors for Bobby.
Figure 2: Video feedback across behaviors for Hank.
Figure 3: Video feedback across behaviors for Joseph.
Figure 4: Video feedback across participants and behaviors.
Figure 5: Employer social validity questionnaire for Bobby. Hashed columns represent baseline scores while dotted columns represent post-intervention scores.

Figure 6: Employer social validity questionnaire for Hank. Hashed columns represent baseline scores while dotted columns represent post-intervention scores.
Figure 7: Employer social validity questionnaire for Joseph. Hashed columns represent baseline scores while dotted columns represent post-intervention scores.
Chapter Four: Discussion

The purpose of this study was to examine the effects of video feedback on three interview behaviors for individuals with disabilities. All participants reached 100% in correct performance for all three behaviors after video feedback was sequentially introduced for each participant.

All participants rated social validity very high for all statements, indicating they found the intervention helpful for all behaviors, liked the intervention, and would receive video feedback in the future to improve other skills. All participants were individuals who had not obtained meaningful employment even though the participants reported they had been searching for a job. Two of the participants verbally stated, while in the feedback session, that they thought this was fun and they wished they would teach them this way in school.

The results of this study align with those found by Bobroff and Sax (2010) who found that all interview skills increased using video feedback. However, being that only one other study has used video feedback to increase interview skills for individuals with disabilities, this study contributed to the literature in several ways.

First, this study evaluated using video feedback to teach interview skills to individuals who had already been searching for jobs for several months, or longer, and had been unable to obtain meaningful employment. Previous research has focused on individuals who were still in school and were being trained in preparation of finding employment after graduation (Bobroff & Sax, 2010).
Second, studies like Bobroff and Sax (2010) focused on using video feedback to increase appropriate answers to interview questions only. Data were taken on greeting and closing behaviors only during the first and last interviews but the video feedback intervention was never implemented for these behaviors. Also, data were reported in a bar graph as a before/after comparison. This means data change over time was lost for each participant and less experimental control was demonstrated than a multiple baseline across participants and behaviors as this study implemented. Furthermore, this study added an appropriate time length and number of sentences component for each question in the appropriate responses to ensure more objective data collection for each question.

Finally, this study was the first study to use video feedback to increase three separate interview behaviors throughout the duration of the study. Several studies have targeted only one behavior, such as appropriate responses or appropriate dress, but no study has increased multiple behaviors of an interview from start to finish.

Even though all attempts were made to simulate an actual interview, a limitation of the study was a real interview was never conducted. Therefore, no generalization data were collected on how a participant would perform in an actual interview with a real employer in the workplace setting. In addition, the interviews completed with the participants only lasted around 1 min 30 s on average, whereas a real interview would last much longer.

Another limitation with regards to generalization was that all participants asked to interview for only one job out of the three they had originally indicated they were interested in after video feedback began. By not interviewing for multiple job types, participants’ behavior may not generalize if they have to interview for a different job than the one they received video
feedback on. Future studies could provide video feedback for interview behaviors for several different jobs in real interview settings.

A further limitation was that while participants were being trained to score the Interview Rating Forms, they were provided with an opportunity to see the behavior modeled correctly. Although each video displayed different component behaviors being completed correctly by the research assistant, it is possible the correct behavior served as a model during video feedback.

In addition, no follow up data were collected to determine if the behaviors would maintain without the video feedback over time. A third limitation was the same four questions were asked each interview, which may not be representative of real interviews. A future direction would be to modify the questions based on what a participant stated in an interview or increase the number of questions asked. Future research could also evaluate modifying questions or asking follow-up questions based on participant’s responses to certain questions.
Chapter Five:
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Appendix A: Employment Interest Assessment

Young Adult’s Name: __________________________    Date: _________________

Please take a moment to review the listed job activities below. Circle at least 5 of the items that interest you the most. If there are activities you like that are not listed, please feel free to write them below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sports</th>
<th>Driving</th>
<th>Serving food</th>
<th>Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Be outdoors</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Working with animals</td>
<td>Working on cars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with technology</td>
<td>Working with numbers</td>
<td>Working in medical field</td>
<td>Managing others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>Building things</td>
<td>Electrical work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handling money</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Volunteering</td>
<td>Selling products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping people</td>
<td>Animals</td>
<td>Plumbing</td>
<td>Working in an office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Interview Rating Form

Date: ____________ Primary Investigator: ____________ Young Adult: _______________

Greeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greeted interviewer with salutation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stated full name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided eye-contact for at least 3 seconds within first 10 seconds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shook hands with interviewer within first 30-seconds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appropriate Answers to Interview Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tell me about yourself.</th>
<th>Talks about education.</th>
<th>Talks about strengths and interests?</th>
<th>Answer is at least 3 sentences long and less than two minutes.</th>
<th>Duration of Eye Contact?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why do you want this job?</th>
<th>Talks about experience/skills that he/she can bring to the job.</th>
<th>Talks about what he/she hopes to learn at the job.</th>
<th>Answer is at least 2 sentences long and less than two minutes.</th>
<th>Duration of Eye Contact?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How would you</th>
<th>Talks about he/she</th>
<th>Brings up getting help</th>
<th>Answer is at least 1</th>
<th>Duration of Eye</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>handle a customer who made rude comments to you?</td>
<td>would still interact with the customer in a positive way.</td>
<td>if needed (ask supervisor?)</td>
<td>sentence long and less than two minutes.</td>
<td>Contact?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable Comments</td>
<td>Unacceptable Comments</td>
<td>Unacceptable Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Give an example of a time you worked well with others.</th>
<th>Gives one example (e.g. experience from school, work, home).</th>
<th>Example relates to skills he/she can use on the job?</th>
<th>Answer is at least 1 sentence long and less than two minutes.</th>
<th>Duration of Eye Contact?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable Comments</td>
<td>Unacceptable Comments</td>
<td>Unacceptable Comments</td>
<td>Unacceptable Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you have any questions for me?</th>
<th>Asks at least 1 question.</th>
<th>Avoids asking about salary, vacations, holidays, or sick days?</th>
<th>Question is at least 1 sentence long and less than one minute.</th>
<th>Duration of Eye Contact?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable Comments</td>
<td>Unacceptable Comments</td>
<td>Unacceptable Comments</td>
<td>Unacceptable Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Closing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smile at Interviewer within last 1-min</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaking hands with interviewer within last 1-min</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thanking interviewer within last 1-min</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Employer Social Validity Questionnaire

Date: ______________  Video # ________________  Observer ________________

1. The participant greeted the interviewer appropriately.

  1  2  3  4  5
Strongly Disagree  Neutral  Strongly Agree

2. The participant answered all of the questions appropriately.

  1  2  3  4  5
Strongly Disagree  Neutral  Strongly Agree

3. The participant answered all of the questions with complete sentences.

  1  2  3  4  5
Strongly Disagree  Neutral  Strongly Agree

4. The interview contained appropriate questions.

  1  2  3  4  5
Strongly Disagree  Neutral  Strongly Agree

5. The participant closed the interview appropriately.

  1  2  3  4  5
Strongly Disagree  Neutral  Strongly Agree

6. I would hire the participant to work for me at my place of employment.

  1  2  3  4  5
Strongly Disagree  Neutral  Strongly Agree
Appendix D: Participant Social Validity Questionnaire

Name: __________________

1. I think the comments given to me by Jessica were helpful in answering the interview questions better.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. I think watching my interviews was helpful in answering the interview questions better.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3. I think the comments given to me by Jessica helped me start the interview better.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. I think watching my greeting on video helped me start the interview better.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5. I think the comments given to me by Jessica helped me end the interview better.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6. I think watching my closing on video helped me end the interview better.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7. I liked getting comments and watching videos on my interview skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8. I would like to get comments and watch videos to help me in the future.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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