

TABLE 1

Baseline Characteristics of Participants in Pain Training and Visual Supports Training

Variable	Total	Visual Support (n = 36)	Pain Training (n = 41)	p
Female, n (%)	67 (87)	31 (40)	36 (47)	.55
Age, (mean, ± SD)		19.11 ± 3.14	18.73 ± 1.14	.47
Race/ethnicity, n (%)				
White/European	69 (90)	32 (42)	37 (48)	.85
Other [^]	16 (21)	6 (8)	10 (13)	.47
Education, n (%)				
Some college/university	77 (100)	36 (47)	41 (53)	1.00
Completed college/university	2 (2)	2 (2)	0 (0)	.22
Working w/ children, (mean ± SD)	7.55 ± 2.13	7.64 ± 2.33	7.46 ± 1.95	.72
Scale range*	0-10			
Familiarity w/ supports, (mean ± SD)	5.14 ± 2.39	5.53 ± 2.47	4.80 ± 2.29	.19
Scale range*	0-10			
Direct care involvement, (mean ± SD)	4.74 ± 2.62	5.25 ± 2.81	4.29 ± 2.39	.11
Scale range*	0-10			
Frequency of interaction, (mean ± SD)	1.94 ± 1.07	2.14 ± .99	1.79 ± 1.11	.14
Scale range ^o	0-4			

Notes:

[^]Other ethnicities: Aboriginal/First Nations/Metis (3), Arab (1), Black/African/Caribbean (4), Persian (1), Serbian (1) South Asian (3), Southeast Asian (2), West Asian (1). One participant identified as 3 ethnicities; seven participants identified as 2 ethnicities.

*Participants had to select one number on an 11-point scale.

^oParticipants had to select one answer on a 5-point scale.

Lower numbers indicated less experience, familiarity, and involvement, and fewer interactions.

TABLE 2

F-values, p-values, and Effect Sizes for Feasibility, Confidence, and Effectiveness Ratings

Rating Type	Covariate (i.e., Pre-score of Rating Measure)			Training Type*		
	<i>F</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>Partial</i> η^2	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Partial</i> η^2
Assessment Feasibility	14.66	<.001	.17	26.75	<.001	.27
Assessment Confidence	33.37	<.001	.32	23.14	<.001	.25
Assessment Skill	29.61	<.001	.29	15.43	<.001	.18
Treatment Feasibility	1.79	.184	.03	6.91	.011	.09
Treatment Confidence	22.88	<.001	.24	30.75	<.001	.30
Treatment Skill	15.33	<.001	.18	13.32	<.001	.16

These statistics show the effect that the covariate and training type had in predicting the raw change scores for all six ratings. Partial η^2 is an effect size statistic.

*Training type effects were computed after controlling for the covariate.

TABLE 3

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses Predicting Participants' Pre-Assessment Confidence Ratings

Step	Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Change R^2
1					.12	
	Assessment Feasibility Rating (pre)	.31**	.11	.34		
2					.56	.44***
	Assessment Feasibility Rating (pre)	.14	.08	.15		
	Assessment Skill Rating (pre)	.70***	.09	.69		
3					.56	.00
	Assessment Feasibility Rating (pre)	.14	.08	.16		
	Assessment Skill Rating (pre)	.71***	.09	.70		
	QUPID-C Knowledge Score (pre)	-.02	.04	-.05		
	Adapted PPKAQ-R Knowledge Score (pre)	.01	.03	.04		

Note: * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

TABLE 4

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses Predicting Participants' Pre-Treatment Confidence Ratings

Step	Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Change R^2
1					.07	
	Assessment Feasibility Rating (pre)	.27*	.13	.26		
2					.64	.57***
	Assessment Feasibility Rating (pre)	.13	.08	.12		
	Assessment Skill Rating (pre)	.74***	.08	.77		
3					.65	.01
	Assessment Feasibility Rating (pre)	.13	.09	.13		
	Assessment Skill Rating (pre)	.77***	.08	.80		
	QUPID-C Knowledge Score (pre)	-.03	.04	-.08		
	Adapted PPKAQ-R Knowledge Score (pre)	.03	.02	.10		

Note: * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

TABLE 5

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses Predicting Participants' Post-Assessment Confidence Ratings

Step	Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Change R^2
1					.30	
	Assessment Confidence Rating (pre)	.51***	.10	.55		
2					.60	.30***
	Assessment Confidence Rating (pre)	.37***	.08	.40		
	Assessment Feasibility Rating (post)	.49***	.07	.57		
3					.70	.10***
	Assessment Confidence Rating (pre)	.16	.08	.17		
	Assessment Feasibility Rating (post)	.28**	.08	.33		
	Assessment Skill Rating (post)	.50***	.11	.49		
4					.73	.03*
	Assessment Confidence Rating (pre)	.21*	.08	.23		
	Assessment Feasibility Rating (post)	.25**	.08	.29		
	Assessment Skill Rating (post)	.45***	.11	.44		
	QUPID-C Knowledge Score (post)	.08*	.04	.18		
	Adapted PPKAQ-R Knowledge Score (post)	.00	.02	.02		

Note: * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

TABLE 6

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses Predicting Participants' Post-Treatment Confidence Ratings

Step	Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Change R^2
1					.40	
	Treatment Confidence Rating (pre)	.64***	.10	.63		
2					.69	.29***
	Treatment Confidence Rating (pre)	.51***	.07	.50		
	Treatment Feasibility Rating (post)	.50***	.07	.55		
3					.86	.17***
	Treatment Confidence Rating (pre)	.15*	.06	.15		
	Treatment Feasibility Rating (post)	.19**	.06	.21		
	Treatment Skill Rating (post)	.66***	.08	.68		
4					.87	.02*
	Treatment Confidence Rating (pre)	.17**	.06	.17		
	Treatment Feasibility Rating (post)	.16**	.06	.18		
	Treatment Skill Rating (post)	.64***	.07	.66		
	QUPID-C Knowledge Score (post)	.07*	.03	.15		
	Adapted PPKAQ-R Knowledge Score (post)	-.01	.02	-.03		

Note: * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$