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This study was designed to measure improvement in communication skills of 11 peer counselors after training. The instrument utilized was the Interpersonal Communication Inventory which was given in a pretest-treatment-posttest format. The treatment consisted of a three month intensive training program which emphasized improving communication skills in the areas of listening, empathy and understanding. The results indicated that the peer counselors improved their communication skills dramatically. The mean on the pretest was 83.82, while the mean after the treatment was 100.09.

Introduction

In the United States, psychologists, counselors and social workers as well as professionals in other related fields have been overwhelmed by clients needing services. Many clients have been put on waiting lists. Peer counseling is not a new trend, but has recently become a more popular and common solution to this problem (Morrill, Leach, Radebaugh & Shreeve, 1987). Indeed, it has become so popular that it has not been limited to high school and college settings. Middle schools are experimenting with various forms of peer counseling programs (Garner, Martin, & Martin, 1989). Peer counselors in a university setting often take on paraprofessional status and remain under the direct supervision of professional counselors, psychologists and social workers. As the number of
clients continues to increase, the role of peer counselors becomes increasingly more important.

Recent literature focusing on the various aspects of peer counseling has demonstrated two concepts. First, students in need of help have demonstrated a willingness to seek help from peer counselors when the peer counselors are thought to be capable of providing such help (Carter & Janzen, 1994). Additionally, one studies that has focused on the needs of the client, indicated that while empathy and listening play a major role in most peer counseling situations, students want more than a supportive person with whom to share their feelings (Morey, Miller, Rosen, & Fulton, 1993). Increasing attention has been placed on giving students the necessary skills in solving problems and reacting in crisis situations that will enable them to not only listen to and support their peers, but to help them in other areas of life as well.

The second concept noted in recent research is that the peer counselors themselves seem to benefit significantly from their experiences as peer counselors (Sprinthall, Hall & Gerler, 1992). In being selected and trained to be a peer counselor, the peer counselors’ communication skills improve, as does their confidence and self concept (Simon, 1993; Sprinthall, et. al., 1992; Kim, McLeod,
In his study entitled "A review of evaluations of peer education programs," Reginald Fennell (1993) calls for research to determine the effect and the success of peer education programs. He argues that current research gives little or no indication of the success of peer education programs. It is to this end that the present study has been conducted. This study attempts to measure the effect of a three-month training program on the communication skills of a group of eleven peer counselors by measuring their communication skills before and after their training.

**Method**

**Participants**

The participants in this study included eleven college juniors and seniors at Utah State University. Of the eleven, six were females and five were males.

**Instrument**

The instrument used in this study is the Interpersonal Communication Inventory (ICI), designed by Millard J. Bienvenu. This test consists of 40
questions which have been factor analyzed to yield a total communication score as well as eleven scores relating to the following factors: awareness, self-disclosure, clarity, attending, avoidance, acceptance of feedback, coping with feelings, self-expression, perceived acceptance, handling differences and dominance. The author reports split half reliability indicated by the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient of .87 and construct validity indicating factor significance.

**Procedure**

The peer counselors were administered the Interpersonal Communication Inventory prior to receiving any training. Students next participated in a three-month training program which was designed to improve their communication skills. The training was broad and designed to cover major areas related to peer counseling. Thus, it included areas such as reacting in crisis situations, listening, reflecting and goal setting, teaching techniques which included role playing and problem solving, as well as education about the various resources offered to students by the university. The training sessions were videotaped to prepare students for videotaped mock-sessions in which they would participate as part of weekly supervision once they began peer counseling. After training was completed, the ICI was administered again as a post-test.
Results

In order to identify areas of significant change, a t test was conducted. Results indicated a dramatic improvement in the interpersonal communications scores of the peer counselors significant at the .01 level (t = 4.13). All factors were analyzed, but no significant improvements were made in any one area of interpersonal communication. The mean score on the ICI pretest was 83.82. The mean score on the test after training was 96.09. Females improved their communication skills more dramatically than did the males. The mean on the pretest for the males was 84.4; on the post-test, 94.4. The mean on the pretest for the females was 83.33; on the post-test, 97.5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PRETEST</th>
<th>POST-TEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>83.33</td>
<td>97.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>94.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>83.86</td>
<td>95.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The author of the ICI obtained a mean score of 85.93 when the test was standardized and administered to adults ages 17 and up.

The results of this research indicate that the males who participated in this study scored higher on the pretest and thus, began their peer counseling training with higher communication scores. At the end of the training, however, females had improved their scores more dramatically and scored higher on the post-test.

**Discussion**

The results of this study indicate several areas of interest regarding the peer counselors’ communication skills both before and after training. Although peer counselors entered the program scoring below (but not significantly below) the standard reported by the author of the test, all were able to improve their scores significantly after training. The mean post-test scores were significantly higher than the scores of the standardized sample.

This may indicate that peer counselors would benefit from training programs which focus on similar skills, techniques and resources as the training program in this study. Perhaps the training made such a difference in the scores on
the pre and post tests because there are relatively few undergraduate opportunities
to learn and apply such skills.

One limitation of this study is the fact that it was given only as a pretest
and a post-test. Administering the test as a screening device before the peer
counselors were selected would have allowed each peer counselor to serve as
his/her own base line.

A second limitation of this study is the small sample size. As this was a
pilot study, more research is needed. It is unknown why there was such a dramatic
discrepancy between pretest and post-test scores. No effort was made to
determine the amount of other types of training the peer counselors may have had
before they were exposed to this training program.

Carter, S. P. & Janzen, H. L. Peer counseling or peer support: There is a difference. Canadian Journal of School Psychology, 10 (1): 36-42.
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