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THE EFFECTS OF CONFLICT RESOLUTION TRAINING ON STUDENTS WITH PREVIOUS DISCIPLINE REFERRALS

by

Reamous Gunn, Jr.

Educational Leadership and Policy Studies

(ABSTRACT)

The purpose of this study was to determine the effects of conflict resolution training on the number and severity of discipline referral offenses committed by high school students in one urban-suburban school. Effectiveness was measured by the number and severity of student discipline referrals to the school administration. Additionally, data were gathered and analyzed regarding student perceptions following application of conflict resolution training.

The population (N=155) consisted of black and white students in grades nine through 12 who had previously received conflict-related discipline referrals. The samples (n=32) were selected using simple random sampling. Identified students were randomly assigned to one of two groups (treatment v. control). The treatment group received twelve hours of conflict resolution training. In addition, a four hour follow-up training session was conducted 60 days later. The control group did not receive training.

Both quantitative and qualitative methodologies were used to determine the effects of conflict resolution training in this study. The independent variables were conflict resolution training, gender, and eligibility. The dependent variables were number of referrals and level of referrals. Data were collected from student discipline records and by conducting focus groups and individual interviews. The quantitative data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS-X). Two three-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) were used to test all hypotheses. When an alpha level of .05 was used, only
the interaction between gender and eligibility was significant with respect to both the number and level of
discipline referrals. Further analyses were conducted to “tease apart” the interactions.

In order to ascertain participants’ perceptions of the effects of conflict resolution training, the
qualitative data were content analyzed to record emerging themes. When the data were content analyzed,
10 themes emerged with respect to the participants’ perceptions. These themes revealed that participants’
perceptions were mostly positive. Participants reported that the training influenced positive changes in
their own behavior and the behavior of others.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Over the past half-century, school administrators, teachers, parents, and others have invested large amounts of time and energy managing student-to-student conflicts, yet these behaviors seem to continue to escalate in frequency and severity. According to Johnson and Johnson (1996), fighting, violence, and gangs have been found to be linked with lack of discipline as the biggest problem confronting public schools.

Violence and threats of violence have become a major focus of many school systems (Johnson and Johnson 1995; Curwin & Medler, 1997; Dykeman, Daehlin, Doyle, & Flamer, 1996; Carruthers, 1996). According to Johnson and Johnson (1995), “Adolescent homicide rates have reached the highest in U.S. history” (p.2). Young men and women in their teens are killed by gun-fire daily, and these violent incidents are permeating all segments of American society.

The school shooting that occurred on April 20, 1999, in Colorado is probably the most devastating event in the history of American schools. Two students allegedly committed suicide in their high school library after they started shooting classmates in the school parking lot, then moved into the cafeteria, firing as they walked. Their path of death and destruction began around 11:30 a.m. in the parking lot, took them into the cafeteria and up the stairs into the library, where they continued firing what were thought to be semi-automatic weapons and sawed-off shotguns. According to statements from surviving students, “Bullets ricocheted off lockers as students sprinted for the exits” (“2 Gunman Found”, 1999, p. A1). Black trench coats were worn by the gunmen as they swept through their suburban high school with guns and explosives. Several students stated that the killers
were gunning for minorities and athletes. In addition, individuals at the scene indicated that the
gunmen apparently belonged to a clique of outsiders called the “Trench Coat Mafia,” who boasted of
owning guns and disliking African Americans, Hispanic-Americans, and football players. Others said
that the motive for the attack was unknown and that school officials had no reports of trouble from
the students.

Another report covering the same incident stated that the two student gunmen hurled insults
at Jews, Blacks, and Hispanics at a suburban high school near Denver, Colorado. According to this
source, the two professed to hate athletes because they had power and popularity-everything the
gunmen felt they lacked (“Massacre’s Toll”, 1999, p. A1). During this incident, 12 students, one
teacher, and the two gunmen lost their lives. Most of the victims were found in the school library.
Reports indicated that the gunmen, who apparently shot and killed themselves after the shooting
spree, laughed as they opened fire on their classmates.

Another violent incident occurred in a high school in Southwestern Virginia. The newspaper
report indicated that a 15-year old female was eating breakfast in the cafeteria when she was
approached by five other girls. When one girl hit her, they began to fight. The other girls joined in. At
that point, the 15-year old youngster pulled a knife and cut the girl who hit her (“Six Schoolgirls”,
1999, p. B9). All of these students were subsequently charged by the police. The student with the
knife was charged with malicious wounding and possessing a weapon on school property, while the
student who was cut was charged with assault and disruption of school. The four other students were
charged with disruption of school.

There have been other occurrences of serious crimes in the school environment throughout
the past few years. One such event occurred when two boys in camouflage hid behind their school and opened fire with rifles on classmates and teachers who had left the school during a false fire alarm. Four girls and a teacher were killed, and 11 people were wounded ("Five Die," 1998, pp. A1 & A13). The individuals found responsible for these acts of violence, including murder, were an 11-year-old student and a 13-year-old student. "Authorities said as many as 27 shots were fired. Youngsters ran screaming back inside the school as their classmates fell bleeding, then cried as they waited for emergency workers" ("Five Dead," 1998, p.1A).

Dozens of students around the country have been suspended and arrested since the school massacre in a small town in Colorado. These suspensions and arrests were the result of students making threats to carry out attacks against other people in their schools. The Associated Press reported that schools have been evacuated, locked down, and closed as a result of the incidents, which have taken place in big cities and small towns alike since the attack ("Massacre’s Toll," 1999, p. A1).

One such incident occurred in Wisconsin, where two 16-year old boys were arrested for allegedly threatening a study hall supervisor. One of the boys made a reference to the most serious school shooting incident in American history while the other student held his hand in the shape of a gun and yelled, “Pow”! Another incident occurred in South Carolina where an 18 year old student was put under house arrest and forbidden to go near his school after allegedly threatening a teacher by saying that he would “pull a Colorado on all of you”("Student Threats," 1999, p. A1). Three teenagers in New Jersey were suspended after witnesses stated that the teenagers wore black trench coats and pantomimed shooting guns and throwing bombs in a school hallway.
Virginia has had similar incidents. Two high school students in central Virginia were charged with conspiracy offenses in an alleged scheme to manufacture explosive devices and detonate them inside a large high school. “The students, ages 14 and 15, each were charged with conspiracy to commit capital murder” (“Manchester Teens,” 1999, p. A1). The students were charged after an all-night police investigation, which started with rumors that a student had stolen a key to the school. On the same day, police charged the 15-year-old with grand larceny in the theft of three portable two-way radios and one count of petit larceny involving the theft of a master key to the school. The 14-year-old student was charged with grand larceny in the theft of the radios. The conspiracy counts were added later after further investigation by the authorities.

A 14-year-old high school student in Virginia was arrested on a bomb-making charge after another person alerted police. Someone in the area directed authorities to a web page allegedly set up by the teenager. After the police investigated the website, they found a home-made bomb and a floor plan of his school, during a search of his home (“Staunton Teen,” 1999, p. A1).

The frequent occurrence of these threatening and brutal acts has created national concern from the school-house to the White House, as evidenced by the recent activity of the President’s Commission on Youth Violence. These behaviors are not foreign to local areas as evidenced by several firearm-related incidents in central Virginia during the past two years. Curwin and Medler (1997) further highlighted the concerns of responsible individuals throughout the country by asking the following question: “Can it really be true that 14 U.S. children and teenagers are killed by gunshot wound everyday?” (p.4) According to Dykeman, Daehlin, Doyle, and Flamer (1996), the severity and amount of youth violence have increased dramatically during the last ten to fifteen years. Juvenile
homicides have increased faster in the past five years than homicides committed by adults.

In 1988, almost 1.6 million youth were arrested, 69,000 of them for violent crimes, which included murder, rape, robbery, and aggravated assault (Dykeman, Daehlin, Doyle, & Flamer, 1996). It was reported that 18,000 of these youth were between the ages of 10 and 14. The report further showed that between 1985 and 1992, the homicide rate among teenage males (15-19) more than doubled, and juvenile arrests increased by 228% over approximately the same time period.

Carruthers (1996) stated the following:

Violence in the form of students committing assaults on other students or staff, and students bringing weapons to school campuses, had been increasing since the late 1980s; this increase was especially noticeable in the number of firearms that were found on students on school campuses (p. 325).

The effects of youth involvement in violence have been seen in children of ages much younger than those mentioned above. Results from a 1993 survey of first and second grade students in Washington, D.C., conducted by the American Psychological Association Commission on Violence and Youth, indicated that 45% reported having witnessed muggings, 31% reported having witnessed shootings, and 39% reported having seen dead bodies (Dykeman, Daehlin, Doyle & Flamer, 1996). Although the number of gun-related deaths in the nation’s schools has remained relatively small, these cases have doubled in the past four years (Sharp, 1997). According to Sharp, about 10% of students over age twelve say they have taken a gun to school. This figure has risen from the reported 3% in 1993. “In the only national study of violent deaths in the USA’s schools, researchers found 40% of such incidents occurred in non-urban settings” (Sharp, 1997, p. 2A). Sharp further reported that the
U.S. Department of Education’s Safe and Drug Free Schools Agency participated in the nationwide study which tracked 81 firearm deaths in school in 1992-94.

Incidents involving the deaths of students have created a fear among many people about the safety of children in schools. National, state, and local agencies have invested material and financial resources to develop surveys, organize commissions, investigate problems, and generate possible solutions to violence in schools. In a survey conducted by *The Executive Educator* in 1992, 1216 school administrators’ responses were analyzed to determine if schools were as dangerous as some sources reported. The survey was designed to gather information about school executives’ perception of violence in their own schools and school districts. Information about their neighboring communities and the nation was sought as well. Results indicated that low-achieving students were the most likely perpetrators of violent acts in school (Boothe, Bradley, Flick, Keough & Kirk, 1993). The study reported that a lack of parental involvement strongly contributed to school violence. The study also reported that the increase in school violence was widespread, although it was highest in the Southeast. Most school executives reported that they were dealing with more acts of violence today than they were five years ago and that school violence had increased to a greater degree in the nation as a whole than it had in their own districts (Boothe et al. 1993).

In addition, 46% of the school executives reported that the number of violent acts committed by students had grown. According to Boothe et al. (1993), two-thirds of the respondents predict an additional increase in school violence during the next few years.

This trend in violence among the nation’s adolescent population and its permeation into the school setting has prompted school administrators to initiate aggressive discipline actions in hopes of
curtailing threats to safe and orderly schools. “Schools are spending significant amounts of money to address safety concerns” (Johnson & Johnson, 1995, p.v). Many secondary schools have invested in school resource officers (police officers), parking lot attendants, surveillance equipment, and metal detectors to manage inappropriate behavior and conflict. Yet these conflict-related behaviors continue to increase. Johnson and Johnson (1995) posed the following question: “Can school divisions invest in strategies other than a police force, surveillance equipment, and metal detectors to manage violence and conflict” (p.v)? Many authors have reported that training students in conflict resolution techniques may be one way to help school environments become more orderly and peaceful (Johnson & Johnson, 1995; Horowitz & Boardman, 1994; Cutrona & Guerin, 1994). Additionally, peer mediation and conflict resolution training have been identified by the Center for Disease Control and the U. S. Department of Justice as potential processes for reducing violence in schools and communities.

Several studies have examined student management of conflicts before and after peer mediation training. Johnson and Johnson (1994a) report the following: “Before training, most students were found to be involved in conflicts daily” (p.131). The conflicts that occurred most frequently were put-downs and teasing, playground conflicts, physical aggression and fights, academic work conflicts, and taking turns, according to these authors. Before training, students viewed conflict as fights that always resulted in a winner and a loser. Instead of using negotiation and communication to resolve conflicts, they usually placed the responsibility for solution finding on others, such as teachers, administrators or parents. In cases where disputants did not bring the conflict to others for resolution, they usually employed destructive tactics (such as repeating their
request and trying to force the other person to give in) that escalated the conflict and increased the
likelihood that a responsible adult would have to intervene (Johnson & Johnson, 1994a).

Negotiating an agreement that both students liked was never an option. Students had no idea
of how to do so. These findings indicated that students were not being taught negotiation
procedures and skills in the home or community at large and, therefore, that all students
needed to be trained in how to manage conflict constructively. (Johnson and Johnson, 1994a,
p.131)

Some strategies employed by well-intended school personnel have served to escalate conflict
rather than resolve it. Among these are some of the traditional punitive measures, such as suspensions
( in and out of school) and detentions. Frequently, these behavioral consequences have not dealt with
the root causes of negative conflict-related behaviors. Other strategies , such as negotiation, have
enormous potential to decrease and resolve unwanted conflict. “Negotiation is a basic means of
getting what you want from others” (Fisher & Ury, 1991, p. xvii). These authors have further defined
negotiation as the back-and-forth communications designed to reach an agreement when both sides
have some interests that are shared and others that are opposed (Fisher & Ury,1991).

Conflict resolution training offers an opportunity to teach negotiation skills to students. While
there is variation in the structure of conflict resolution programs, most contain the same elements and
carry the same functions. Jacobson and Lombard (1992) reported, “In most school programs a small
number of students are selected by peers and/or teachers to become student mediators” (p.3). Many
schools who have used mediation have simplified the process for children by condensing the process
to several steps. Students are taught that step one is to say what happened and how you feel about
blaming. Step two is to listen to other person. Step three is to say what you want from the other person. Step four is to work together on possible solutions. Step five is to mutually agree to a solution.

A large number of conflict resolution programs implemented in schools have similar characteristics. School programs usually involve a small number of students selected by peers and/or teachers to become student mediators. Racial and ethnic background, gender, and socioeconomic status have been considered in some cases, and often students “at-risk” of dropping out of school are encouraged to become mediators. Selected students have been trained for 12 to 20 hours. “After training, mediators work in pairs or individually during class time or before and after school, to help fellow students resolve disputes non-violently” (Jacobson & Lombard, 1992, p.3). Playground and classroom disputes often involve pushing, name-calling, and unfair playing as types of conflicts mediated on the elementary level. Middle and high school mediators have worked with these and other issues, such as arguments about ownership of property or rumors. “In some high school programs, student-teacher teams mediate disputes between other students and faculty. In many schools, student mediators wear special pins, hats or t-shirts” (Jacobson & Lombard, 1992, p.3).

Statement of the Problem

More than half of all serious crimes in the United States are committed by youth between the ages of ten and seventeen. Schools have not been immune to these acts of violence. The problem addressed in this study was the increase in violence in schools.

School officials throughout the country and abroad have been searching for interventions and strategies that could positively affect student behaviors. Teaching conflict resolution techniques to
students may be one effective alternative to the only two choices many face today – fight or flee. This study was designed to determine whether students receiving conflict resolution training have fewer and less serious referrals for disciplinary infractions in school than students who have not received such training.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effects of conflict resolution training on the behavior of students who had previously had discipline problems. Effectiveness was measured by the number of times students received referrals to the school administration for inappropriate student behavior offenses. Specifically, this study determined whether conflict resolution training reduced the incidence of students engaging in behaviors that resulted in referrals to the school administration. In addition, it investigated whether conflict resolution training affected the severity of discipline referrals.

**Significance of the Study**

Results of the analysis in this study will contribute to the evolving literature on conflict resolution programs by reporting their effectiveness at increasing the number of students previously involved in discipline infractions who peacefully resolve potentially violent conflicts. Focusing the investigation on pupils who have previously received conflict-related discipline referrals and who have been trained in conflict resolution techniques will enhance practitioners’ knowledge of how students make decisions as they face critical choices. Historically, high school students who have found themselves in the principal’s office for discipline-related offenses often received punitive actions that have not fully addressed their problems or provided lasting solutions. As a result, students often have
cycled repeatedly through the more traditional school discipline systems. This study investigated whether conflict resolution training provided an effective option, for students with previous disciplinary infractions, in helping to reduce or curtail the repetition of disciplinary offenses.

**Theoretical Framework**

The theoretical framework contains the variables and their relationships in this study. It provided a systematic process for testing the relationships among the variables. According to Kerlinger (1986), “An independent variable is the presumed cause of the dependent variable, the presumed effect” (p. 32). The independent variables in this study are groups (treatment v. control), gender, and socioeconomic status (eligible v. not eligible). The dependent variables are the number of referrals and the level of referrals.

A portion of this investigation focuses on the relationship between conflict resolution training and the number and level of discipline referral offenses committed by high school students. Training students to use conflict resolution techniques has decreased both the level and severity of discipline offenses, according to the results of several research studies (Freiberg, Stein and Parker, 1995; Kirleis, 1995, & Johnson and Johnson, 1994a).

Existing research has documented a relationship between the number and the level of discipline referral offenses and gender. Results tend to suggest that gender influence both the frequency of referrals and their severity (Lupton-Smith, 1995; Booth, Bradley, Flick, Keough, & Kirk, 1993). This study further investigates these relationships.

The effects of socioeconomic status on the number and level of discipline referral offenses committed by high school students was another relationship investigated in this study. The results of a
study conducted by Burdett and Jensen (1993) indicate that a relationship exists; however, the relationship is not in the expected direction.

Finally, this study investigated other relationships between conflict resolution training and discipline referral offenses as perceived by the participants in the study. These components comprise the theoretical framework for this study. They are a set of interrelated constructs that present a systematic view of the problem by specifying relations among variables (Kerlinger, 1986).

Some researchers have reported that conflict resolution training, gender, and socioeconomic status (SES) account for portions of the variance in both the number of discipline referral offenses committed by high school students and the severity of those offenses. Figure 1 graphically depicts these relationships, highlighting the factors used in data analysis for this study.

Definition of Variables in the Study

These definitions explain the terms used in this study.

Level of offense- This term is defined as the severity of offense. Four levels were used:

Level I -- minor violations; Level II -- intermediate offenses; Level III -- major offenses; and Level IV - severe offenses (Appendix A)

Sum of levels - The aggregate total of all disciplinary referral levels per participant generates this number.

Socioeconomic Status (SES) - The economic condition of the family of participating students as measured by whether they qualify for free or reduced price lunch. Participants who received free or reduced lunch were categorized as eligible and participants who did not receive free or reduced price
Figure 1. Theoretical framework of the relationships among the independent variables (conflict resolution, gender, and eligibility) and qualitative and quantitative variables.
lunch were categorized as not eligible.

**Race** - The ethnicity of the participants (Black or White).

**Group** - The participants receiving conflict resolution training or the participants not receiving conflict resolution training.

**Research Issue** - Questions that emerged from the qualitative data that are subordinate to the main qualitative research question. These are used for reporting purposes only in this study.

**Research Questions**

The major questions addressed in this study are listed below.

1. Does conflict resolution training make a significant difference in the number of discipline referral offenses committed by high school students?

   1a. What is the difference between students receiving conflict resolution training and students not receiving training with respect to the number of discipline referral offenses?

   1b. What is the difference between males and females with respect to the number of discipline referral offenses?

   1c. What is the difference between participants eligible for free and reduced lunch and those not eligible with respect to the number of discipline referral offenses?

   1d. What is the interaction between training and gender with respect to the number of discipline referral offenses?

   1e. What is the interaction between training and eligibility with respect to the number of discipline referral offenses?
1f. What is the interaction between gender and eligibility with respect to the number of discipline referral offenses?

1g. What is the interaction among training, gender, and eligibility with respect to the number of discipline referral offenses?

2. Does conflict resolution training make a significant difference in the level of discipline offenses committed by high school students?

2a. What is the difference between students receiving conflict resolution training and students not receiving conflict resolution training with respect to the level of discipline offenses?

2b. What is the difference between males and females with respect to the level of discipline offenses?

2c. What is the difference between participants eligible for free and reduced-priced lunch and those not eligible with respect to the level of discipline referral offenses?

2d. What is the interaction between training and gender with respect to the level of discipline offenses?

2e. What is the interaction between training and eligibility with respect to the level of discipline referral offenses?

2f. What is the interaction between gender and eligibility with respect to the level of discipline referral offenses?

2g. What is the interaction among training, gender, and eligibility with respect to the level of discipline referral offenses?

3. What are other effects of conflict resolution training as identified by the participating students?
Limitations of the Study

There were several limitations inherent in this study. First, there was the possibility that
teachers were less likely to refer trained student mediators for disciplinary reasons as frequently as
students who were not trained as mediators. Teachers may have been biased when referring students to
the principal's office since they were aware of the students who had received training and those who
had not. Second, this study was limited to the high school that was the site of this investigation;
therefore, findings could only be generalized to the population from which the sample was drawn.
Third, the results were limited to a population that had already experienced discipline referrals, a subset
of the entire student body of that school. Fourth, the researcher was the chief administrative officer--
the principal of the school under study. Fifth, the small sample size in some cells greatly impacted
statistical significance. Finally, the operational definition of SES is non-traditional and only two levels
(eligible and not eligible) are utilized. Thus, high SES is reported in SPSS tables as not eligible for free
and reduced-price lunch. Low SES is reported as eligible for free and reduced-price lunch. Middle
SES is not used by the researcher in this study.

Organization of the Study

Included in Chapter I is the introduction, a statement of the problem, the purpose of the study,
definition of variables in the study, research questions or hypotheses, and limitations of the study. The
remainder of the study is organized into four chapters. Included in Chapter 2 is a comprehensive
review of previous research and literature directly related to the problem presented. Explained in
Chapter 3 is the methodology of the study. Included are the development of instruments, population
and sample, data collection techniques, statistical hypotheses, method of analysis, and design of the
study. Contained in Chapter 4 is a description of the data collected and analyzed during the study. Finally, contained in Chapter 5 is the summary, findings, conclusions, implications for practice, and recommendations for future study.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter holds a review of the literature concerning factors that have impacted discipline referrals in high schools. These factors have included peer conflict resolution, gender, socio-economic status, and race. A section on issues and problems of violence in schools has been included. Peer mediation and conflict resolution were factors described by various writers using different terms. These terms have been used in this review of the literature according to the author’s use.

Issues and Problems of Violence in Schools

There are many issues and problems that contributed to violence in schools. Among these are gangs, outsiders (non-students), low self-esteem, socioeconomic status, peer pressure, bias, and negative attitudes. Each of these factors contributed to hostile environments for students in at least some cases. Although each has contributed to negative conflict, each has positive potential as well. Perhaps it took a stretch of the imagination to see positive uses for gangs; however, in some large urban areas, gang members have been recruited by local agencies to mediate potentially dangerous situations to resolutions that all parties have honored.

Who would most likely be involved in school violence? When school administrators were asked this question by *The Executive Educator’s* survey, an overwhelming majority (76%) cited low-achieving students as the most likely perpetrators. "Outsiders" were the second most likely instigators of school violence, according to 34% of all respondents, with 46% of high school principals and 45% of all urban school administrators reporting problems with individuals not enrolled as students at the school where violence occurred (Boothe, Bradley, Flick, Keough, & Kirk, 1993).
Fifty-six percent of all deaths among youth and young adults 10-24 years of age resulted from only four causes. Homicides accounted for 20% of all deaths. Suicide accounted for 13% of that total. Motor vehicle crashes were responsible for 13%, and other unintended injuries accounted for the remaining 10% (Boothe et al., 1993). These figures highlighted the enormous need to monitor the early symptoms of these at-risk behaviors while children were young. These data provided at least part of the rationale for early interventions that enhanced children’s ability to make healthy and positive choices when confronted with situations that put them at-risk. One environment available for reaching youth with early intervention has been the school setting.

Violence in schools does not happen in urban settings only. "Significant percentages of both suburban (54%) and urban (64%) school executives report a rising number of violent acts. Surprisingly, school executives in small towns (43%) also report an increase compared to five years ago" (Boothe et al., 1993, p.17). There have been several incidents of violence at schools located in non-urban areas which resulted in students and teachers losing their lives (Sharp, 1997;"Five Die",1998;"Five Dead",1998). One recent incident occurred in March of 1998, when four teenage girls and one teacher were killed after two fellow students fired high-powered weapons into a crowd. This particular incident is recorded as follows:

The individuals responsible for this act of violence, which included murder, were an 11-year old student and a 13-year-old student. Authorities said as many as 27 shots were fired. Youngsters ran screaming back inside the school as their classmates fell bleeding, then cried as they waited for emergency workers. (Five Dead, 1998, p. 1A)

Although 12% of those surveyed said serious injury caused by school violence has increased,
only 4 percent of the respondents cited an increase in deaths as a result of school violence. Also, respondents reported that disputes in urban environments may become physical more frequently; disputes in suburban environments, though, may encompass a greater variety of issues (Johnson & Johnson, 1994b).

**Gun-related incidents**

Schools have increasingly served as hosts to the violence in schools. Rising gun violence, particularly in urban areas, prompted a flurry of problems and legislative action in the early 1990s. As a result, the National Safe Schools Act of 1994 required the states to pass laws which stated that any youngster caught with a gun would be expelled. Access to guns was greater in rural areas, where about 40% of residents owned firearms. According to Sharp (1997), "Urban schools have benefited most from concerted efforts, such as metal detectors, school police officers, and classes in non-violent ways to resolve conflicts (p. 1A).

Among urban schools executives, 38% reported more gun-related incidents than five years ago, but an almost equal percentage (39 %) reported the problem did not apply to their schools or districts. In districts enrolling 25,000 or more students, 52% of the administrators have reported a rise in gun-related incidents, and 45% in schools with predominantly black students have stated the same (Boothe et al., 1993).

In 1993, the U.S. Department of Education reported that at least 71 persons were killed with guns at school from 1986 through 1990. "According to the Center to Prevent Handgun Violence,70 students were shot to death in 1990. Even one death is too many, but when compared to other settings, schools are still relatively safe"(Hyman, Dahbany, Blum, Weiler, Brooks-Kline, & Pokalo, 1997, p.311).
However, Hyman et al. (1997) reported, "In response to public rhetoric about school crime, we conducted a systematic examination of the data on the relative dangers in schools and found that schools are one of the safest institutions for children and youth" (p. 310). Serious crimes, such as rape, robbery, and assault, were reported as more likely to occur in the home than in the school (Hyman et al., 1997).

No group or individual is immune to random acts of violence today. Three incidents occurred in the researcher’s geographic area within the past year and a half. Each incident involved gunfire resulting in personal injury to individuals. Each incident occurred either in the school building or on the school property. The first incident was in a high school parking lot during an athletic contest with a neighboring school. Two groups of non-students were engaged in a conflict that resulted in an exchange of automatic weapon fire. In this incident, one person was wounded several times by gunfire. Authorities reported that more than 18 shots were fired as indicated by the number of empty shell casings recovered (“Gunshots end game”, 1997, p. A1). The second incident occurred inside a high school. Two employees were injured as a result of a 14-year-old student who discharged a handgun in a hallway. Officials indicated that the student was disgruntled because several students from another neighborhood had allegedly issued threats of violence against him. The third incident occurred in a rural high school. A 16-year old was taken into custody and accused of firing a weapon inside the school. One shot was fired and the only injury was a superficial wound to the index finger of the youth accused of firing the weapon (“Teen Accused”, 1999, p. B4).

Gang-related activity

The increase in violence in schools has not excluded gang-related activities. Individuals responsible for student and staff safety quickly realized that more attention must be focused on
redirecting gang activity toward productive and helpful enterprises instead of destructive ones. Rodriguez (1990) reported that gangs begin as unstructured groups where children seek a sense of belonging. They flourish when there is a lack of social recreation, decent education, and employment for young people. “As gang-related violence continues to increase within the public schools, educators and counselors are continually seeking ways to deal with these potentially explosive situations” (Tabish & Orell, 1996, p. 65). At one Albuquerque, New Mexico, middle school, the staff takes a pro-active approach to dealing with the issue of gang membership and gang violence at the school. Gang membership is viewed as a student’s choice; however, gang behaviors are not tolerated on campus and are dealt with in a consistent and fair manner. School authorities used a formal mediation structure with rival gangs. The conflict resolution process used was referred to as “Respect Encourages Student Participating in Empowering Communication Techniques (RESPECT)”. This process has markedly curbed gang violence, has created a neutral turf atmosphere for gang members, and has made the campus a safer place for the entire student and adult population (Tabish & Orell, 1996).

As with gun-related incidents, when respondents of The Executive Educator’s survey were asked to describe whether gang-related activity contributed to the growth in school violence, the answer was mixed. The majority of respondents (57%) stated that gang-related incidents were not applicable to their school districts (Boothe et. al, 1993). More than half of the respondents reported that gang violence was most likely to exist in larger urban districts with students populations equally divided between black and white students or districts with nonwhite student populations. Principals in urban schools (43%) and administrators in school districts with enrollments of 25,000 or more (54%) stated that gang-related incidents have increased in the last five years in their schools or districts. Disturbingly,
22% of elementary school principals in this survey reported that the number of gang-related incidents has risen. Administrators, law enforcement officers, mental health professionals, and others throughout the country have expressed a growing concern about the increase in gang and other anti-social group activities that have led to students and teachers being injured or killed as a result of violence in schools.

**Peer Mediation and Conflict Resolution Programs**

Educators have recognized that controversy and conflict are a normal part of school children's maturation and socialization. Therefore, most educators have also realized the value of employing strategies that increase constructive conflict instead of destructive conflict. Deutsch (1973) stated:

At the extremes, these terms are easy to define. Thus conflict clearly has destructive consequences if its participants are dissatisfied with the outcomes and feel they have lost as a result of the conflict. Similarly, a conflict has productive consequences if the participants all are satisfied with their outcomes and feel that they have gained as a result of the conflict. Also, in most instances, a conflict in which the outcomes are satisfying to all the participants will be more constructive than one that is satisfying to some and dissatisfying to others. (p.17).

As a result, there has been an increasing trend to turn conflicts into constructive learning experiences. Throughout the country, teachers and school administrators have opted to train students to solve their own disputes in hopes of gaining sustained positive results.

Conflict resolution training has demonstrated promise in education for a number of reasons. First, conflict has been recognized as a natural human state. Second, more appropriate and effective systems are needed to deal with conflict in the school setting than the punitive discipline measures
currently employed. Third, “since conflicts are inevitable when people interact with one another, peer mediation can considerably reduce counterproductive and destructive behavior among students and help eradicate violence and conflict in our schools” (Morse & Andrea, 1994).

The Process

“This process, sometimes referred to as dispute resolution or conflict management, has been adopted in a growing number of elementary, middle, and high schools in various parts of the country since 1981—with almost unanimous success” (Koch & Miller, 1987, p.59). Aspects included in the conflict resolution process include the selection, training, effect on behaviors at school, and attitudes. The most important outcome of this process has been that student conflicts were not resolved by teachers or principals; rather, disputes were resolved by the disputants themselves.

In the Locke and Zimmerman study (1987), training consisted of an orientation, a two day workshop, a 2.5 hour semester course with role-playing, and additional workshops over one semester. Each peer mentor was assigned to work with 3 to 5 freshmen, and teams were formed of 3 to 5 mentors along with their mentees for support. The experimental group was pre-tested in the spring of 1985 and post-tested in the spring of 1986. In the spring of 1986, the comparison group was pre-tested.

Selection of Participants

There have been various factors recognized as contributors to the success of a conflict resolution program, including the selection of mediators. Lupton-Smith, Carruthers, Flythe, Goettee & Modest (1996) further reported, "In our own experience, we have found that mature students in the third and fourth grades can be effective mediators" (p.378).

School administrators have also considered a number of criteria when selecting mediators.
Gender, race, socioeconomic status, placement (e.g., special education), and achievement level were some of the factors in selection (Lupton-Smith et al., 1996; Tolson, McDonald, & Morairty, 1992; Koch & Miller, 1987; Jacobson & Lombard, 1992). DeJong (1994) reported that mediators should be representative of a cross section of the student body. They should be defined by gender, race, class, achievement level, and placement (Lupton-Smith et al., 1996). "Criteria for recommendation as mediators included a grade point average (GPA) above 2.5 and recognized leadership skills. Students were selected to reflect the academic, racial, and gender mix of the student body" (Tolson, McDonald, & Moriarty, 1992, p. 87).

When selecting students to serve as mediators, Koch and Miller (1987) have offered the following advice:

Experience indicates that it is wise to choose a cross section, including some who are behavior problems. Ironically, but understandably, these children often show major improvement in their new roles, as their needs for wholesome recognition are realized.

One school reported that a "high risk street-fighter" became an honor student. (p.62) Those organizing conflict resolution programs should consider racial, ethnic, and gender balance when selecting candidates for training. In addition, students at risk of dropping out of school could be considered (Jacobson and Lombard, 1992).

Kinasewitz (1996) conducted a study in a high school located in South Florida that supports diversity as a key factor when selecting conflict resolution participants. He reported that special emphasis was placed on recruiting mediators who reflected multi-ethnic composition of the student body.
Behavior at School

The effect of conflict resolution programs ultimately is reflected in the behaviors demonstrated by students in the school setting. Tolson, McDonald, and Moriarty (1992) conducted a study designed to assess the effectiveness of mediation on disputants. The purpose of the study was to determine if conflict resolution has been an effective alternative to traditional discipline for students involved in interpersonal conflicts. "An experimental design with random assignments of subjects was used" (Tolson et al., 1992, p.89). Participants in the treatment group (n=28) were assigned to mediation and met with two mediators when offenses occurred. Participants in the control group (n=24) met with an associate dean and received traditional discipline, which included warnings, demerits, and suspensions. In this study, the data collection period was 49 school days. Tolson et al.(1992) reported, "Results indicated that mediation reduced the number of referrals for interpersonal problems (F = 6.696; df = 1,50; p<.05)" (p.90). However, there was not a reduction in overall discipline referrals, according to these authors.

Attitude

Students must develop positive attitudes about conflict if they intend to solve potentially destructive problems constructively. Several studies report evidence that untrained students have more negative attitudes toward conflict than their trained counterparts. Johnson and Johnson (1996) reported that they asked students to write down all words that came to mind when they thought of the word “conflict”. Before training, the mean score for students in grades six through nine was seven negative words and one positive word. After conflict resolution training, students listed five negative and three positive words. These researchers suggest that these and other facts provide clear evidence that conflict
resolution training contributes to positive attitudes and approaches when students deal with conflict. Other researchers have supported the work of Johnson and Johnson with additional studies (Stevahn, Johnson, Johnson, Laginski, & O’Coin, 1996; Stevahn, Johnson, Johnson, & Real, 1995; Crary, 1992; Brown, 1992). Brewer (1998) conducted a study entitled The Effects of Conflict Mediation Training on the Attitude Toward Conflict and Interpersonal Problem Solving Strategies of Middle School Students. One purpose of this study was to determine the possible effects of participation in a conflict mediation training program on the attitude a student has toward conflict. The population in the study was 40 students enrolled in three grade levels at a middle school. Analysis of variance and t-test were conducted to determine if significant effects were present. All test results were analyzed at the .05 level of confidence.

The results indicate that participants in the treatment group chose collaboration and compromise when encountering conflict. Participants receiving no training chose avoidance and accommodation most frequently. Students in the treatment group generated 57.9% more solutions to problems than their untrained peers. Brewer (1998) further reported, "Based on reports submitted by parents, it was concluded that students who participated in conflict mediation training had significantly less social problems and exhibited less aggressive behavior" (p. 58).

Success of Programs

Several research studies in various geographic locations have reported results related to the success of conflict resolution training. In North Carolina, Carruthers, Sweeney, Kmitta, and Harris (1996) reported results from 15 elementary, middle, and high schools. According to these researchers, a total of 858 mediations were conducted in the 1993/94 school year, and 804 (94%) of these were said
to be successful. In the 1994-95 school year, 25 schools reported a total of 1,412 mediations, with 1284 (91%) said to be successful. These authors further stated that the program coordinator at one school found that 60 of 62 disputants surveyed two to four weeks after their mediation session said that their agreements had been honored by the other; at another school where informal follow-ups were conducted with 84 disputants, the program coordinator noted that all but a few disputants said that their agreements had been honored (Carruthers et al.,1996).

A study conducted by Burrell and Vogl (1990) reported that 80% of the cases referred to mediation were successfully resolved at a high school in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Other researchers have reported equally significant results. “At the elementary, middle, and high schools studied in Honolulu, 127 conflicts among students were mediated with a 92% success rate and 100% of 12 student-teacher conflicts were successfully mediated” (Johnson & Johnson, 1996, p.485). Ninety-eight percent of the 245 conflicts referred to mediation in a Midwestern middle school were successfully resolved, also (Schumpf, Crawford, & Usadel, 1991).

Discipline Referrals and Conflict Resolution Training

A number of studies on conflict resolution and discipline referrals have been reported by various authors (Johnson & Johnson, 1994a; Freiberg, Stein, & Parker,1995). The settings of these studies have included elementary, middle, and high schools. The effects of peer mediation programs in various geographic regions have been investigated with the data collection periods ranging from periods of several months to several years. Johnson and Johnson (1994a) stated, “The findings indicate that about 85-95 percent of conflicts mediated by peers resulted in lasting and stable agreements. Students trained in mediation engage in less antisocial and more prosocial behavior in schools.” (p. 130) They further
stated that referrals to the principal were reduced by about 60 per cent.

Freiberg et al. (1995) conducted a study of discipline referral data collected from a middle school in a medium-sized school district (36,000) in the Southwest. The school had 1,285 students in grades 6 through 8. Primarily urban, the school bordered a large metropolis. In this study, data collected from discipline referral cards indicated that seventh grade students were referred more often for major violations than any other group when analyzing this middle school’s referral data. Other results of this study will be discussed later in this report.

Kirleis (1995) reported a 95% success rate in resolving disputes before they escalated or resulted in discipline referrals over a period of three years. Participants were trained in peer mediation techniques and had an opportunity to develop mediation skills through role play before being assigned to work with disputants. Kirleis (1995) examined discipline referrals by level of severity. Results indicated that level one offenses decreased by 74%, level two offenses decreased by 49%, and level three offenses decreased by 34%. Kirleis (1995) further reported that the target group decreased in-school suspension by 82% and out-of-school suspension by 4%. The control group decreased in-school suspension by 10% and increased time spent serving out-of-school suspension by 49%.

Gender and Discipline Referrals

In regards to those receiving discipline referrals for violent acts, educators have observed an increase that is not gender specific. Several authors reported an increase in fighting and other violent behaviors among girls (Lupton-Smith, 1995, Kaufman, 1991, Boothe et al. 1993). According to Lupton-Smith (1995), "Many educators and psychologists are observing more violent behavior in young women today. Females, like males, are turning to aggression as a means of resolving conflict” (p.1).
When *The Executive Educator* surveyed 6,200 school administrators about specific acts of violence troubling their schools, many reported that confrontational behaviors, including fighting among girls, have increased rapidly (Kaufman, 1991; Boothe et al.,1993). In addition, survey results indicated that nearly half of the elementary school principals (45%), middle school principals (49%), and high school principals (48%) stated that girls are fighting more often. Consequently, these behaviors have resulted in discipline referrals to the school administration for appropriate action. Males seem to be involved in fights more quickly but forget about them sooner, whereas females' disputes seem to be more verbal and last for longer periods of time (Kaufman, 1991). Boothe et al.(1993) reported an upsurge in fights among girls as well. Even respondents (49%) from small town school divisions have stated that girls are fighting more. Nationally, 45% of respondents report an increase in girls fighting compared to five years ago.

Freiberg et al. (1995) conducted a study on discipline referrals with respect to gender and other variables. Two hundred and forty seven males were referred one or more times to the office across all grade levels, accounting for 38% of all males in the school during a one month period. One hundred forty-one females were referred to the office, which represented 22% of all females in the school. Other results reported by Freiberg et al. were as follows:

1. Sixth- and seventh-grade females were referred statistically fewer times than were sixth-, seventh-, and eighth-grade males, and eighth-grade females. This grade-by-gender effect accounted for 5% of the variance in this variable.

2. Sixth-grade males were referred statistically more times during lunchtime than were any other group of students. There were no statistically significant differences observed between any
group on any of the other time variables.

3. There were no statistically significant differences detected for location of infraction.

4. Seventh-grade males and females were referred statistically more times for major violations and statistically fewer times for minor violations than were sixth-and eight grade males and females.

5. There were no statistically significant differences detected for disciplinary actions taken.

Freiberg et al. (1995) reported that "males were more likely to be suspended in all settings (urban, surburban, and rural)” (p.423). In addition, they reported that approximately three times as many boys in a group labeled aggressive were more likely to become criminals than their less aggressive peers. Girls were found to follow this same pattern, but they did so in lesser numbers.

McFadden, March, Price and Hwang (1992) found that "A chi-square test comparing student race by gender for disciplinary referral was highly significant (X² = 76, df = 4, p,.00001); 73.8% of all black pupils, 84.9% of Hispanic pupils, and 79.2% of all white pupils referred for disciplinary action were male” (p.143). A comparison of the types of offenses by gender (X² = 151, df = 26, p,.00001) was of interest to these authors as well (McFadden et al., 1992). In this study, offenses by males were more prevalent than those by females. These authors further reported that 77% of the recorded defiant behaviors were offenses committed by males. More than 70% of the truancies, 86.8% of bothering others, and 66.7% of the fighting were offenses committed by males, (McFadden et al., 1992). Finally, a chi-square test comparing the types of punishment by gender was also significant (X² = 126, df =13, p<.00001); 81.5% of all pupils who received corporal punishment, 74.7% of all internally suspended pupils, and 75.4% of suspended pupils were male. Only in the case of corporal punishment,
however, was the figure higher than expected, given the higher percentage of males referred for disciplinary action.

In a study conducted by Tolson et al. (1992), mediation training was found to be more effective than traditional discipline in reducing interpersonal conflict. They further reported, "Because of the unequal distribution by gender between the experimental and control groups, the interaction of groups and gender was examined. Results indicated that males receiving mediation training did better than females ($F = 5.672; df = 1.47; p < .02$)" (pp.89-91). However, these authors indicated that the sample included relatively few females, and, because they were unevenly distributed, this finding must be interpreted with care.

Socio-economic Status and Discipline Referral

Children are referred to school personnel for disciplinary action as a result of aggressive behavior daily. Traditionally, it has been assumed that most of these children have been from low socioeconomic backgrounds. Burdett and Jensen (1983) conducted a study designed to answer the following question: "How does the relationship between the self-concept and aggression vary according to the influence of sex, grade level, and socioeconomic area variables?" (p.370) The sample was comprised of eight classrooms which were selected from four public elementary schools. Included in the sample were one third-grade class and one sixth-grade class from the two lowest-ranked schools according to socioeconomic indicators, and one third-grade class and one sixth-grade class from the two highest-ranked schools according to socioeconomic indicators (Burdett & Jensen, 1983).

The sample (n = 229) contained 116 males and 113 females. In reference to socioeconomic status, these authors reported that high and low socioeconomic area discriminating criteria were taken
from data compiled on a residential and low income worksheet, provided by a mid-western school
district administrator. The total number of families living within the respective school boundaries
receiving Aid to Dependent Children or free lunches, but not both, was divided into the total school
residency count, resulting in a percentage of low income families living within that school's boundaries.
“The low socioeconomic area had percentages of 52% and 44%, and the two highest socioeconomic
area schools showed low income percentages of 3% and 6%, respectively” (Burdett & Jensen, 1983,
p.371). An analysis of variance (socioeconomic area x grade x sex x self-concept level) was computed.
The results indicated that no main effects or interactions were found for the socioeconomic area
(Burdett & Jensen, 1983).

Race and Discipline Referrals

According to *The Executive Educator's* national survey, 69% of the school executives in
predominately Black schools indicated an increase in fighting among their students. Fifty-eight percent
of school executives in schools with equal numbers of Black and White students have also indicated a
rise in fighting.

It is interesting that the differences in types of conflicts by race have not been noted, according to
Carruthers et al. (1996). Carruthers and Sweeney (1996) surveyed more than 1000 high school students
(grades 9-12) after they had completed four class periods of instruction on conflict resolution.
Differences in perceptions were noted based on grade and sex, but not on race.

A study on race and gender bias as they relate to the punishment of children was conducted in
1992 by McFadden et al. The purpose of the study was to assess race and gender differences in the
occurrence and treatment of school children's (a) rates of referral for discipline action, (b) types of rule
violations, and (c) types of punishments administered for these violations, according to these authors. The McFadden study sampled 4,391 discipline files from nine schools (K-12) in a south Florida school district which enforced corporal punishment laws and maintained discipline files (McFadden et al., 1992). Twenty-five categories of rule violations were identified by the school district and grouped into one of five levels, depending on severity. The levels ranged from serious (offenses including criminal behavior such as assaults, drug use, and possession of weapons) to minor offenses (bothering others). The school district authorized 14 types of disciplinary procedures for use in dealing with the identified rule violations, including counseling, detention, corporal punishment, internal and external suspension, and expulsion. Data were gathered over a nine-month period of time and analyzed using the chi-square statistic to compute the significance of the relationship. According to McFadden et al.(1992), the results indicated that Hispanic and white students had lower percentages of discipline referrals than Black students. They reported the following:

White pupils comprise 57.9% of the population but only 46.1% of the disciplinary referrals, Hispanic pupils comprise 18.0% of the population but only 15.8% of the disciplinary referrals. Black pupils, however, had higher rates of disciplinary referrals than would be expected; they comprise 22.0% of the population and 36.7% of the disciplinary referrals. (p.142)

According to these records, Black students received higher percentages of corporal punishment (54.1%) and suspensions (43.9%) and a lower percentage of internal suspensions (23.0%). White students received a higher percentage of internal suspensions (59.1%) and lower percentages of corporal punishment (33.1%) and school suspension (35.0%). The figures for Hispanic pupils were more in line
with their overall percentage of discipline referrals. "A chi-square test comparing white, black, and Hispanic pupils by type of punishment administered was highly significant ($X^2 = 137, \ df = 16, p < 0.0001$)" (McFadden et al., 1992, p. 143).

Locke and Zimmerman (1987) conducted a study that examined the effects of a peer counseling training on the psychological maturity of undergraduate Black students. Participants included Black students selected to be mentors (counselors) in the peer mentor program. The experimental group consisted of 75 undergraduate students selected to be peer mentors in April, 1985. Mentors were students who expressed a desire to help others and who were academically successful, with a minimum 2.5 GPA. Of the seventy-five, 52 constituted the final experimental group. This group consisted of 15 men and 37 women, freshmen through seniors. The comparison group consisted of 84 students (49 women and 35 men) who were selected to be peer mentors in April, 1986, including freshmen through juniors. The 1986 students were selected by the same criteria as the 1985 sample.

The authors used a t-test for independent samples comparing the experimental group's post-test scores with the comparison groups pre-test scores. The region of rejection was at the .05 level of significance. The results indicated that although the mean score on the pre-test and post-test differed in the experimental group and in the expected direction, the difference was not statistically significant. Pre-test scores for the experimental group and the comparison group did not differ significantly. In the study, the average score for Black students in both groups on pre-tests was lower than those reported in earlier research studies (Lupton-Smith, 1995).

Locke and Zimmerman (1987) reported no statistically significant difference occurred between mean scores of the experimental and comparison groups on the pre-test. Significant changes were found
with respect to pre-test and post-test scores for the experimental group. The data in this study indicated that only 7% of the experimental group showed no change. The authors concluded significant growth in ego development occurred as a result of training. Movement in the expected direction did occur for moral reasoning.

**Outcomes**

When reviewing the effects conflict resolution programs have on the entire school, one of the most frequently cited findings is that the school administration, especially the principal, is critically important to the success of the program (Davis & Porter, 1985).

Carruthers and Sweeney (1996) surveyed program coordinators in 40 schools operating peer mediation programs and found that virtually every coordinator attributed much of the success (or failure) of their efforts to support (or lack thereof) from the school administration. Although the school administration was important, the coordinator's role was equally important. The role of the coordinator required as much as 30% to 50% of the coordinator's professional time in the first year of developing a successful program. However, this time commitment often decreased significantly in subsequent years. Kmitta (1995) found that experienced coordinators were spending five to ten hours a week coordinating peer mediation programs.

The effectiveness of a conflict resolution and peer mediation program in an urban secondary school was examined in Canada (Stevahn et al. 1996). The subjects were 42 ninth grade English students. According to these authors, students were randomly assigned to either an experimental or control group. The experimental group spent ten hours studying a literature unit where conflict resolution training had been integrated. The control group spent the same amount of time studying the
identical literature, without the integration of conflict resolution training. The results indicated that students in the experimental group learned the negotiation procedure more completely than did students in the control group. The following evidence was offered in the study, $t(38) = 8.03, p < .0001$. "The experimental students also retained more of the procedure over time, $t(36) = 15.34, p < .0001$" (Stevahn et al., 1996, p.29). In addition, this study reports the following:

76 percent of the students in the experimental condition accurately recalled all of the negotiation steps and an additional 5 percent recalled nearly all of the steps, while in the control condition, 89 percent listed zero steps. On the retention test given thirteen weeks after, 62 percent of the students in the experimental condition recalled all of the negotiation steps and an additional 19 percent recalled nearly all of the steps, while in the control condition, 88 percent of the students listed zero steps (p.29).

Data were reported on whether students could also use this procedure in resolving conflicts. The participants were given a "Conflict Scenario Written Measure" that described an unresolved conflict situation about taking turns at a computer. Students were asked to describe how they would resolve the conflict. This instrument was administered before training and after training to both groups. Before training, students in both the experimental and control groups primarily dealt with the conflict by telling the teacher (52%) or by physical aggression (24%). No one in either group attempted to negotiate a solution to the conflict prior to training. After training, approximately 48% of the students in the experimental group used different degrees of negotiation as they dealt with conflict; however, students in the control group primarily dealt with conflict in the same manner as they did before. No one in the control group used negotiation after training. "A repeated-measures ANOVA was conducted on the
differences between experimental and control scores both before and after training on the Conflict Management Scale" (Stevahn et al., p.31). Results indicate that there were no significant differences noted before training; however, students in the experimental group managed conflicts more constructively than did students in the control group after training.

Many parents of mediators seem to believe that their children benefit from being mediators. When Carruthers and Sweeney (1996) surveyed parents of mediators in elementary, middle, and high schools, they found that 58 of 62 respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, "I believe my child has benefited from being a peer mediator" (p.6). When parents were asked if they had seen improvements in (a) school attendance, (b) behavior at school, (c) class work or grades, and (d) attitude about school since starting in the peer mediation program, the parents most frequently noted improvements in attitudes and grades (Carruthers, Sweeney, Kmitta, and Harris, 1996, p.7).

Summary

The existing literature on conflict resolution is extensive. Many researchers have investigated issues related to discipline referral offenses and school violence, with varying results. Several of these have been extracted from this review of the literature and have been restated below.

- Johnson and Johnson (1994a) reported a 60% reduction in discipline referrals after conflict resolution training.
- Burrell and Vogl (1990) reported a reduction in the number of discipline referrals after conflict resolution training.
- Tolson et al. (1992) reported that conflict resolution curbed gang violence.
- Kirleis (1995) reported a 95% success rate in solving disputes before they escalated. With
respect to the level of discipline referrals, Kirleis reported a 74% decrease in level I offenses, 49% decrease in level II offenses, and a 34% decrease in level III offenses.

- Freiberg et al. (1995) reported that males were more likely than females to be suspended in all school settings.

- McFadden et al. (1992) reported that offenses by males were more prevalent than those committed by females.

- Burdett and Jensen (1983) reported no main or interaction effects for the variable of SES in their conflict resolution study.

- Schumpf et al. (1991) reported that 98% of the 245 conflicts referred to mediation were successfully resolved.

Table 7 contains other studies, elements, and dates. It can be found in Appendix H.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter contains the research methodologies that were used in this study. The purpose of this study was to determine whether training in conflict resolution techniques significantly decreased negative behaviors of students who have already been identified for committing discipline offenses. Descriptions of the population and samples, sample selection, the research design, variables, treatment, data collection, and methods of data analysis have been included.

Population and Samples

This study was conducted in an urban high school located near Richmond, Virginia. The membership of the school as of September 30, 1997, the year of the study, was 1,163 students in grades 9 - 12. Data drawn from 1996-97 documents indicated that there were 357 freshman, 288 sophomores, 230 juniors, 233 seniors and 55 special education students enrolled. Data on group membership by ethnicity revealed that 85.1% of the students were black, 12.3% were white, 1.3% were Hispanic, 1.1% were Asian and .2% were American Indian or Alaskan. The school has a disproportionately high number of less affluent students when compared to other high schools in this school district. During the 1996-97 school year, the percentage of students receiving free or reduced-price lunch was 42%, which was the highest among the high schools in the school system, the county-wide rate being 20%. Thirty-two percent of the students were from one-parent families, contrasted to the county-wide figure of 19%.

The total population in this study consisted of black, Hispanic and white students in grades nine through twelve who received at least one referral to the school administration for conflict-related discipline offenses during the previous school year and the first semester of the 1997-98 school year.
(N=155). However, race was not analyzed because of the small number of Hispanic and White students in the population. Specifically, four White students and one Hispanic student were among those selected for the study.

Sample Selection

Data on conflict-related referrals were taken from student discipline records. Two random samples of 50 students were drawn from the population using a table of random numbers. Permission forms were requested for members of the samples. Some declined participation, others had dropped out of school, and still others had moved or transferred. This left 64 students or 32 students each for the treatment group and the control group. A coin was flipped by the researcher to assign the students to the first of the two groups. The remaining group was the control group. Data on the population and samples are presented in Table 1.

Research Designs

Several researchers have suggested that a combination of methodologies produce a stronger study in some cases (McMillan and Schumacher, 1989; Patton, 1990). M. E. Yakimowski (personal communication, July 12, 1998) stated that using both qualitative and quantitative methodologies strengthens some studies. Two research designs were utilized in this study. Dual methodologies were used to strengthen this study. A combination of methodologies allowed the investigator to collect and analyze different types of data on this problem (Patton, 1990). An experimental design was employed.
Table 1
Population and Samples by Group, Gender, and Socio-economic Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Population</th>
<th></th>
<th>Samples</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>94</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td></td>
<td>102</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>155</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to quantitatively investigate the effects of conflict resolution training on discipline referrals in this high school. An emergent design was used to investigate other effects of conflict resolution training on student behavior as perceived by the participating students.

Quantitative Design

An experimental design investigated the effects of conflict resolution training on the number and severity of discipline referrals in this urban high school. Students in the treatment group (32) received twelve hours of conflict resolution training designed to prepare them to become conflict managers capable of resolving disputes between students. Students in the control group (32) did not receive training.

Qualitative Design

An emergent design was employed as part of this study to investigate other effects of conflict resolution training. Qualitatively oriented evaluation models have assumed that the value of an educational program heavily depends on the perceptions of the participants (Borg & Gall, 1989). They believe that qualitative research produces descriptive data in the form of written or spoken words. A qualitative design was appropriate as part of this study because of the search for written or spoken data through focus groups and individual interviews. Interviews allowed the researcher to follow up leads to obtain more data and greater clarity during data collection.

Qualitative data on students’ perceptions related to the effectiveness of conflict resolution training were collected. Two focus groups of participants from the treatment group were conducted. The purpose of the first focus group was to refine the interview instrument. The second focus group was to gather data. One focus group was conducted on October 22, 1998, lasting approximately thirty
minutes. Several adjustments were made after the initial focus group session. The original protocol of 10 questions was revised as a result of feedback gathered from this session. Questions were rewritten to gather information on conflict resolution domains which included opinions on the value of conflict resolution training on participants, changes in their behavior, perceptions about changes in others’ behavior, and use of conflict resolution training. Questions number 2, 3, 5 and 6 were rewritten and they remained a part of the interview protocol. Questions 1, 4, 7, 8, 9, and 10 were deleted. Other questions were added to address the specific domains of conflict resolution as outlined in this report.

The other focus group was conducted on March 11, 1999. The feedback gathered was used to determine if the questions solicited information related to conflict resolution training. The participants’ responses included information on time, techniques, value, quality of training, and changes in self, others, and their school. In addition, one student from the treatment group was interviewed on March 17, 1999, to pilot the interview instrument. Each focus group lasted approximately 25 minutes, while the single interview lasted approximately 20 minutes. Subsequently, the instrument was refined further, and five participants from the treatment group were interviewed. Each participant was asked a set number of questions in a structured interview format in order to collect the necessary data (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 1996) and each session was tape-recorded. The data collected were transcribed and recorded for the subsequent analysis. These procedures were conducted by a professional guidance counselor, and the complete interview protocol can be found in Appendix C.

Variables

The independent variables in this study were group (treatment and control), gender, and
eligibility (eligible for free and reduced-priced lunch or not). The dependent variables were the number of referrals and the level of offenses. The number of referrals was the quantity accumulated. Level of offenses was the severity of offenses.

Treatment

The treatment in this study was training in conflict resolution techniques. On February 24 and 25, 1998, twelve hours of conflict resolution training were provided for members of the treatment group. A follow-up training session of four hours was conducted in April of 1998 to reinforce skills of participants in the treatment group. The control group did not receive the training.

The purpose of this training was to investigate the effects of conflict resolution training on student behavior. It prepared students for their role as conflict managers capable of solving personal conflicts and disputes involving two or more individuals. The training was provided by a professional conflict resolution training facility located in Charlottesville, Virginia.

Subjects in the treatment group received specific conflict resolution training. They learned four stages and a caucus to assist in solving disputes. Stage one consisted of the introduction and ground rules. Stage two was entitled storytelling; here potential mediators were taught to help disputants paraphrase feelings and fact. They were also taught to ask questions to better understand the problem. In stage three, potential mediators were taught to assist disputants in finding solutions and in using a caucus when difficulty arises. A caucus is an option available to mediators when negotiations break down in stage three. A caucus can be called when everyone has been heard from twice. Each disputant would be taken to another setting, where individual negotiations could take place between the disputant and the mediator. If a compromise could be reached in each caucus session, the mediation resumed.
Stage four was the agreement stage. Here, members of the treatment group were taught to assist disputants in reaching acceptable agreements that work for both parties. Also, they were taught to write up agreements and to appropriately close sessions. Finally, the treatment group was taught to help disputants reach consensus. A description of the entire program is in Appendix B. According to Wampler, Garrity, Kanagy, Hess, and Emmerson (1997), the philosophy of this training program was based on the belief that, “Everyone has dignity. Everyone deserves respect. Mediators show respect by listening. Conflict is a normal part of living. Conflict is an opportunity to do something good. Mediation is a respectful way of resolving conflict” (p.4). In addition, these authors presented several expectations for potential peer mediators:

- to learn to be a good listener.
- to improve communication skills.
- to learn to collaborate.
- to learn leadership skills.
- to make our schools a better place for everyone.
- to help reduce violence.
- to create positive ways to resolve conflict.
- to attend all the training sessions.
- to be on time and to participate.
- to learn and help others.

Collection of Data on the Dependent Variables

The number and level of referrals were collected on all subjects by reviewing school records.
Data were gathered throughout a 12 week period during the spring of 1998. For each participant, the data gathered included group (treatment v. control), gender (male v. female), and socioeconomic status (low v. not low). The number of referrals to the school administration and the level of severity of each referral were gathered. The form used to collect the data is in Appendix F.

Intercoder Reliability

All discipline referrals were coded in one of four levels, depending on the severity of the offense. Each offense was coded either level I, II, III, or IV, with level one being least severe and level IV being most severe. Three assistant principals and the researcher coded the offenses to ensure accuracy. Each coder rated each individual discipline referral either level I, II, III, or IV. After the individual coding sessions, all of the coders met to compare the results and reached consensus on the assigned level for each referral. When all coders agreed on 95% of their categorizations, the coding was assumed to be accurate. The scoring for level of offenses was determined by calculating the aggregate sum of levels for all referrals accumulated by each participant. Scoring for the number of referrals was the total referrals accumulated by each participant.

Collection of Interview Data

Qualitative data were collected using interview questions designed to determine the effectiveness of conflict resolution training as measured by student perceptions. The instrument used to collect this data was the interview protocol, located in Appendix C.

Development of the Interview Protocol

Several questions were developed as a result of the procedures outlined in this section. Other interview questions were developed from the domains of conflict resolution. These domains are located
in Table 2.

Content validity of the interview questions in this study was assessed using three methods. First, the interview protocol was evaluated by a certified conflict resolution trainer to determine if the instrument collected the perceptions of students trained in conflict resolution techniques. Second, two focus groups were conducted to improve questions on the interview protocol, identify kinds of probes needed, and develop a sequence that makes sense (Borg and Gall, 1989). Five high school students from the treatment group were used in the first session. Four participants were used in the second focus group session. Finally, one participant from the treatment group was interviewed.

Quantitative Data Analysis

In this problem, the independent variables were gender (male & female), socio-economic status (low & not low), and groups (treatment & control). All three were nominal measures.
### Table 2

**Domains and Questions for Individual Interviews**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains for Interview Questions</th>
<th>Interview Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Question</strong></td>
<td>Tell me about the conflict resolution training that you participated in last winter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time</strong></td>
<td>Was the training period long enough?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What opinions do you have about the length of the training?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What do you think the results of this training will mean for our school over the long term?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Techniques - use</strong></td>
<td>Describe your use of the conflict resolution practices learned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- usefulness</td>
<td>How useful were the practices?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- application</td>
<td>How have you used this training?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Changes</strong></td>
<td>What do you think happened to you as a result of the training?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What do you think happened to our school as a result of the training?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value</strong></td>
<td>What are your opinions on the value of the training?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table continued)
Domains and Questions for Individual Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains for Interview Questions</th>
<th>Interview Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructors - quality</td>
<td>What is your opinion on the quality of instructors?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction - quality</td>
<td>What is your opinion on the quality of the instruction?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The number and levels of conflict-related discipline referrals were the dependent variables. The number and level of referrals are continuous measures. Descriptive statistics were calculated for all variables. Main effects and interactions were analyzed using two three-way analyses of variance (ANOVA). An alpha level of .05 was used for all tests.

Interview Data Analysis

Qualitative data analysis is an inductive process of organizing the gathered data into categories and identifying themes as they emerge from the data (McMillan & Schumacher, 1993). Themes are general patterns that appear within the responses of different participants. General patterns or themes were identified when interview data were content-analyzed (Patton, 1990). Content analysis is the process of identifying, coding, and categorizing the primary themes in the data (Harris, 1996; Borg and Gall, 1989). Specifically, it means analyzing the content of the interviews and focus groups in this study to ascertain themes or categories for reporting data.

Multiple analyst were utilized in this study to enhance the quality and credibility of the interview data analysis. “That is, having two or more persons independently analyze the same qualitative data set and then compare their findings” (Patton, 1990, p. 468). An assistant superintendent responsible for research and planning, an assistant principal with a guidance background, and the researcher analyzed the data and compared findings to decrease the intrinsic bias that comes from a single analyst.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to determine the effects of conflict resolution training on the number and severity of discipline referrals received by high school students in one urban-suburban high school. Data were collected using two distinct methods. First, student discipline records were reviewed to collect the number of conflict-related discipline referrals for each subject. Included in the first method was the rating of each infraction by more than one rater to determine its level of severity. Second, a sub-set of students from the treatment group was interviewed to determine their perspectives on the conflict resolution training.

The data were reported in several sections. Descriptive statistics for the variables in the study are in this section. Quantitative analyses are presented in the second section. Qualitative analyses are presented in the third section.

Descriptive Statistics for the Variables in the Study

Two groups of 50 students were randomly selected from a population of 155 who had conflict-related referrals. Sixty-four participated in the study. Descriptive statistics for the variables in the study are discussed as part of the results of each hypothesis. In addition, they are located in Tables 3 and 4, respectively.

Research Questions and Null Hypotheses

The major research questions and null hypotheses are listed below:

1. Does conflict resolution training affect the number of referral offenses committed by high school students?
Table 3

Mean Number of Referrals for Treatment and Control Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>SES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>treatment</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>eligible</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eligible</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eligible</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>control</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>eligible</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eligible</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eligible</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>3.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Table 3 continued)

Mean Number of Referrals for Treatment and Control Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>SES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>eligible</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>female</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>eligible</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eligible</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

Mean Level of Referrals for Treatment and Control Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>gender</th>
<th>SES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>treatment</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>eligible</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>6.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td></td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>eligible</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>eligible</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>5.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>control</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>6.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>eligible</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>7.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>6.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td></td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>5.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>eligible</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>4.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>5.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>eligible</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>6.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>5.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table 4 continues)
Mean Level of Referrals for Treatment and Control Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>SES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>eligible</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>6.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>5.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eligible</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eligible</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following null hypotheses were developed from this research question for this study. Each was analyzed using an ANOVA.

**Hypothesis 1a**

Hypothesis 1a stated that there is no statistically significant difference between trained and untrained participants with respect to the number of discipline referral offenses. When tested with analysis of variance, the main effect of training was not significant at an alpha level of .05 for the number of referrals, $F(1, 56) = 2.36, \ p > .05$. That is, participants receiving conflict resolution training did not differ from participants who did not receive training. ANOVA results for the number of referral offenses are reported in Table 5.

**Hypothesis 1b**

Hypothesis 1b stated that there is no statistically significant difference between genders with respect to the number of discipline referral offenses. The main effect of gender was not significant at an alpha level of .05 for the number of referrals, $F(1, 56) = 2.68, \ p > .05$. That is, males did not differ from females on the number of referral offenses committed by participants.

**Hypothesis 1c**

Hypothesis 1c stated that there is no statistically significant difference between participants
Table 5

ANOVA with Main and Interaction Effects for Relationships Between the Number of Discipline Referrals and Conflict Resolution Training, Gender, and Eligibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18.03</td>
<td>18.03</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.45</td>
<td>20.45</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eligible</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.88</td>
<td>9.88</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.73</td>
<td>8.73</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training x gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training x eligibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender x eligibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35.29</td>
<td>35.29</td>
<td>4.62*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training x gender x eligibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within (Error)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>427.54</td>
<td>7.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>491.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p ≤ .05
eligible for free and reduce-priced lunch and participants not eligible for free and reduce-priced lunch committed by high school students in the school under study. lunch with respect to the number of discipline referral offenses. When tested with analysis of variance, the main effect of eligibility was not statistically significant at the predetermined alpha level of .05 for the number of referral offenses, $F(1,56) = .04, p > .05$. That is, participants who were not eligible did not differ from eligible participants on the number of referral offenses.

**Hypothesis 1d**

Hypothesis 1d stated that there is no statistically significant interaction of training and gender with respect to the number of discipline referral offenses. When tested with analysis of variance, the first order effect of training and gender was not significant at an alpha level of .05 for the number of discipline referrals, $F(1,56) = .105, p > .05$. That is, training and gender did not interact to influence the number of discipline referral offenses committed by participants in the study.

**Hypothesis 1e**

Hypothesis 1e stated that there is no statistically significant interaction of training and eligibility with respect to the number of discipline referral offenses. When tested with analysis of variance, the first order effect of training and eligibility was not significant at an alpha level of .05 for the number of discipline referrals, $F(1, 56) = .21, p > .05$. That is, training and eligibility did not interact to influence the number of discipline referral offenses committed by participants in the study (see Table 5).
Hypothesis 1f

Hypothesis 1f stated that there is no statistically significant interaction of gender and eligibility with respect to the number of discipline referral offenses. ANOVA results indicated that there was an interaction present, $F(1, 56) = 4.62, p < .05$. In other words, gender and eligibility worked together to influence the number of discipline referral offenses committed by high school students in the school under study. The interaction mentioned above is graphically depicted in Figure 2. ANOVA results for number of referrals are located in Table 5.

Further analyses were conducted to calculate simple effects and “tease apart” the interaction. Four one-way analyses of variance were conducted to determine if significant differences existed between groups. When tested with analysis of variance, the simple effect of eligible males versus eligible females was not statistically significant at an alpha level of .05 for the number of referral offenses, $F(1, 56) = 1.29, p > .05$. That is, males who received free and reduced-price lunch did not differ from females who received free and reduced-price lunch on the number of discipline referrals.

When tested with analysis of variance, the simple effect of ineligible males verse ineligible females was not statistically significant at an alpha level of .05 for the number of referral offenses, $F(1, 56) = 1.13, p > .05$. That is, males who did not receive free and reduced-price lunch did not differ from females who did not receive free and reduced-price lunch on the number of referrals.

When tested with analysis of variance, the simple effect of eligible males versus ineligible males was not statistically significant at an alpha level of .05 for the number of referral offenses,
Figure 2. Interaction between gender and eligibility for the number of discipline referrals received by participants. The numbers at each data point represent the means (average number of referrals) for each sub-group.
F (1, 56) = 1.24, p > .05. That is, males who received free and reduced-price lunch did not differ from males who did not receive free and reduced-price lunch on the number of referrals.

When tested with analysis of variance, the simple effect of eligible females versus ineligible females was not statistically significant at an alpha level of .05 for the number of referral offenses, F (1, 56) = 1.14, p > .05. That is, females who received free and reduced-price lunch did not differ from females who did not receive free and reduced-price lunch on the number of referrals.

**Hypothesis 1g**

Hypothesis 1g stated that there is no statistically significant interaction among group membership, gender, and eligibility with respect to the number of discipline referral offenses. When tested with analysis of variance, the interaction of group x gender x eligibility was not significant at an alpha level of .05 for the number of discipline referrals, F (1, 56) = .15, p > .05. That is, training, gender, and eligibility did not interact to influence the number of discipline referral offenses committed by the participants in this study.

2. Does conflict resolution training affect the level of discipline referral offenses?

The following null hypotheses were developed from this research question:

**Hypothesis 2a**

Hypothesis 2a stated that there is no statistically significant difference between groups (students receiving training and students not receiving training) with respect to the level of discipline referral offenses. When tested with analysis of variance, the main effect of group (treatment v. control) was not statistically significant at an alpha level of .05 for the level of
referrals, $F(1, 56) = 2.13, p > .05$. That is, participants who received conflict resolution training did not differ from participants who did not receive training on level of referral offenses. ANOVA results for level of referrals are in Table 6.

**Hypothesis 2b**

Hypothesis 2b stated that there is no statistically significant difference between males and females with respect to the level of discipline referral offenses. When tested with analysis of variance, the main effect of gender was not statistically significant at the predetermined alpha level of .05 for the level of referrals, $F(1,56) = 2.48, p > .05$. That is, males did not differ from females on the level of discipline referral offenses.

**Hypothesis 2c**

Hypothesis 2c stated that there is no statistically significant difference between participants eligible for free and reduce-priced lunch and participants not eligible for free and reduce-priced lunch with respect to the level of discipline referral offenses. When tested with analysis of variance, the main effect of eligibility was not statistically significant at an alpha level of .05 for the level of referral offenses, $F(1, 56) = .02, p > .05$. That is, participants who were not eligible did not differ from eligible participants on the level of referrals.

**Hypothesis 2d**

Hypothesis 2d stated that there is no statistically significant interaction of training and gender with respect to the level of discipline referral offenses. When tested with analysis of variance, the interaction of training and gender was not statistically significant at an alpha
Table 6

ANOVA with Main and Interaction Effects for Relationships Between the Level of Discipline Referrals and Conflict Resolution Training, Gender, and Eligibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>49.54</td>
<td>49.54</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>57.61</td>
<td>57.61</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eligible</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42.51</td>
<td>42.51</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.92</td>
<td>13.92</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>males</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.49</td>
<td>14.49</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>females</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27.28</td>
<td>27.28</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training x gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training x eligibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender x eligibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>120.32</td>
<td>120.32</td>
<td>5.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training x gender x eligibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1300.87</td>
<td>23.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1497.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
level of .05 for the level of discipline referrals, $F(1, 56) = .08, p > .05$. That is, training and
gender did not interact to influence the level of discipline referral offenses committed by
participants in this study.

**Hypothesis 2e**

Hypothesis 2e stated that there is no statistically significant interaction of training and
eligibility with respect to the level of discipline referral offenses. When tested with analysis of
variance, the interaction of training and eligibility was not significant at an alpha level of .05 for
the level of discipline referrals, $F(1, 56) = .11, p > .05$. That is, training and eligibility did not
interact to influence the level of discipline referral offenses committed by participants in this study.

**Hypothesis 2f**

Hypothesis 2f stated that there is no statistically significant interaction of gender and
eligibility with respect to the level of discipline referral offenses. ANOVA results indicated that
there was a statistically significant interaction present, $F(1, 56) = 5.18, p < .05$. This interaction
is graphically depicted in Figure 3. ANOVA results for level of referrals are located in Table 6.

Further analyses were conducted to calculate simple effects. Between-group analyses
were conducted to determine where significant differences existed. When tested, the simple effect
of eligible males versus eligible females was not statistically significant at an alpha level of .05 for
the level of referral offenses, $F(1, 56) = 1.83, p > .05$. That is, males who received free and
reduced-price lunch did not differ from females who received free and reduced-price lunch on the
level of referrals.
Figure 3. Interaction effects between gender and eligibility for the level of discipline received by participants. The numbers at each data point represent the means (average of the sum of levels) for each sub-group.
Results of the one-way ANOVA run on the simple effect of ineligible males versus ineligible females was not statistically significant at an alpha level of .05 for the level of referral offenses, $F(1, 56) = .60, p > .05$. That is, males who did not receive free and reduced-price lunch did not differ from females who did not receive free and reduced-price lunch on the level of referrals.

When tested with analysis of variance, the simple effect of eligible males versus ineligible males was not statistically significant at an alpha level of .05 for the level of referral offenses, $F(1, 56) = .62, p > .05$. That is, males who received free and reduced-price lunch did not differ from males who did not receive free and reduced-price lunch on the level of referrals.

When tested with analysis of variance, the simple effect of eligible females versus ineligible females was not statistically significant at an alpha level of .05 for the level of referral offenses, $F(1, 56) = 1.17, p > .05$. That is, females who received free and reduced-price lunch did not differ from females who did not receive free and reduced-price lunch on the level of referrals.

Hypothesis 2g

Hypothesis 2g stated that there is no statistically significant interaction among group membership (treatment v. control), gender, and eligibility (participants eligible for free and reduced-price lunch and participants not eligible) with respect to the level of discipline referral offenses. When tested with analysis of variance, the interaction of training x gender x eligibility was not significant at an alpha level of .05 for the number of discipline referrals, $F(1, 56) = .00, p > .05$. That is, training, gender, and eligibility did not interact to influence the
level of discipline referral offenses committed by participants in this study.

3. What are other effects of conflict resolution training as identified by the participating students?

This section contains some of the major categories that emerged from the data, as well as verbatim examples of responses by nine participants on the effects of conflict resolution training, obtained during interview and focus group sessions. When asked about their perceptions of conflict resolution training, the participants’ responses reflected many similarities as well as some unique insights.

Data were recorded by interview question. Each response served as a coding unit. Next, a set of topics was developed from the recorded data. Each coding unit was recorded under a relevant topic. A miscellaneous category was created for outliers. A list of topics is located in Appendix G and participants’ responses by interview question are located in Appendix I.

Three separate individuals (a guidance counselor, an assistant superintendent in charge of research and planning, and the researcher) studied the content and coded the data. In each case, the data were coded into a classification scheme. The results of the individual coding were compared, and consensus was reached on one classification scheme. Results of the qualitative portion of the study were reported using research issues and themes derived from this process. These themes were interrelated entities which made up the participants’ perceptions of conflict resolution training.

**Research Issue One**

What changes occurred as a result of the conflict resolution training?
Changes that occurred as perceived by the participants were addressed under this issue. Two themes emerged from these data. The first theme involved personal changes and addressed the participants’ perceptions of alterations in their behavior. The second theme addressed behavioral changes in others as perceived by the participants.

**Theme One: Personal Changes.**

Personal changes referred to the effects of conflict resolution training that altered the behavior of individual participants as perceived by the those individuals. Three students reported that their behavior was different because, since the training, they were willing to sit down and negotiate a solution to a potentially destructive conflict. One participant reported using more self-restraint to stop himself from engaging in destructive conflicts, such as fights, to settle disputes. These comments by participants (in their own words) indicated a different orientation toward conflict resolution by the subjects interviewed in this study:

- I have seen students who have changed from this program. Me for one. I took the mediation, and I was very different, and I guess I understood why people argue on the street and on the team. (Participant #6)

- I stopped myself from being in a lot of fights this year. I could have been in a lot but I just kind of let it slide on by and just went to talk to an administrator. Something like that you know, so it really did help me because I got in a couple of fights. It taught us to talk to one another instead of arguing. (Participant # 5)

- Since I have been in training, it’s like I’ve calmed down a lot.
I am willing to talk about stuff now. I still have the program going by myself. Last year when I was in the ninth grade, I won’t thinking about talking out nothing. I was ready to fight, but, now I talk about all my problems. (Participant #7)

I think it bettered my personality about or within myself. (Participant #1)

Sitting down and talking about it is really more effective is the message. That’s what we learned in the class. (Participant #8)

**Theme Two: Changes in Others.**

Changes in others as perceived by the participants interviewed were addressed in theme two. Some respondents reported that, after conflict resolution training, participating students were more likely to “stop and think” before getting into a fight or other destructive behavior than they were prior to training. Although participants did not always report the exact nature of observed changes in others, they frequently reported that the training had an effect on other students. Selected comments are reported below:

If they are getting in a fist fight, they will stop and think. They will think of how many days you will get put out of school. (Participant # 1)

Like, people in the group changed a lot. The people in the program had an effect on the other students in the school. (Participant # 4)

I have seen students who have changed from this program. (Participant # 6)

Sitting down and talking about it is really more effective is the message. That’s what we learned in the class. (Participant # 8)
It taught us to talk to one another instead of arguing (Participant # 5).

It gets you to think about it. Stop and think before you get to fighting. (Participant # 7)

Research Issue Two

What benefits did you or other participants gain from the conflict resolution training?

What were the benefits for the school? Benefits of conflict resolution training as perceived and reported by participants are addressed in this issue. Three themes emerged from the analysis of these data. The themes were benefits for self, benefits for others, and benefits for the school.

Theme Three: Benefits for Self.

Eight of the participants who were interviewed reported that conflict resolution training was beneficial to them in changing their behavior. Each participant reported specific effects. These effects ranged from reports of assistance with problem-solving to helping individuals realize how other people feel. When taken collectively, the responses served to highlight the benefits of training as measured by the perceptions of the participants. One participant reported that the training assisted in keeping him in school. Some of the comments are listed below:

I think it helped me, like, not only helping other people solve their situation, but solving my own situations, so I think it was a good program. For me once I take the training or whatever, I really don’t think about the training anymore but its like my situations come out to be naturally, you know, to try to solve it. I use the method they taught us. Role play and acting was real good. We acted out different situations. It was helpful.

( Participant #8)
I think the training will do us a lot of good because the people in the group stop fights or break up fights. (Participant #1)

I talk out conflicts at home with my mom. (Participant #4)

Kept me in school. Made me a better person. (Participant #5)

I think it made me a better person. (Participant #3)

Personally, I think I’ve come to realize how other people feel. (Participant #6)

**Theme Four: Benefits for Others.**

Benefits for others referred to the participants’ responses related to conflict resolution training and its effects on other participants. Most participants reported that the training was beneficial to others. Only, one interviewee reported observing no difference. Selected comments included:

More kids will think about fighting and have verbal solutions. (Participant #1)

Help people get over their problems without fist fighting, verbal language or other conflict involving matters. It gets you to think. Stop and think before you get to fighting. We went over different procedures and how we would use them. We did a lot of acting. (Participant #7)

It taught you to resolve certain conflicts on what you should and shouldn’t do. (Participant #2)

**Theme Five: Benefits for the School.**

Benefits for the school referred to participants’ responses about the effects of conflict
resolution training on the total population of the school. Some participants reported that the school had benefitted because the conflict resolution training had reduced physical and verbal confrontations that tend to lead to violence in school. This perception was supported by previously reported literature (Morse & Andrea, 1994; Johnson & Johnson, 1995; Curwin & Medler, 1997). Selected comments included:

The people in the program had an effect on the other students in the school. I think it will be a good thing for the school because different people have different opinions about different things at the school, so you have different characters.

There will be less arguments. (Participant #4)

Well, it was about helping other people solve their problems through mediating.

(Participant # 6)

We calmed down a little bit. (Participant # 9)

I think it’s good for the school; not only will the students that were in it help resolve conflicts, but now we know different ways to help solve conflicts. (Participant # 8)

It has been a lot less fights this year. I think it stopped a lot of fights. It stopped a lot of fights, and it helped me stop and talk things out. We were supposed to be the ones to stop fights, to get to the bottom so that there will be no fights. (Participant # 5)

It stops fights. (Participant # 6)

Research Issue Three

What effects did selection of participants have on changes in their behavior?
Theme Six: Effects of Selecting Participants.

The effects of the selection process on behavioral changes as perceived by participants were addressed in this issue. Respondents reported that selection of participants was an important factor, and their comments further illustrate this point. Specifically, some respondents stated that students selected must not be afraid to talk. They reported that they were always in the middle of things and had the ability to smooth out potentially destructive conflicts before they went too far. Further, participants reported that they liked people who could persuade other people to do things. In addition, several comments suggested that the selection of potential mediators included students who would intervene after hearing of a potential conflict.

Collectively, the participants indicated that individuals selected had the ability to influence others. Some of the comments follow:

Another thing is the selection of people picked, cause you just couldn’t pick people that nobody know; cause then people that’s quiet are not gonna say nothing, no way. It seemed like the people that are not scared to talk. See, it’s not more of a point that people come to me or look up to me like I’m big or something. It’s more like I was always thinking of something to do. I be like, “let’s do this, alright”. (Participant #9)

Yeah, I think it was good pretty much. I’m not trying to say that we’re trouble- makers or nothing, but a lot of times, we always be in the middle of things and when something comes across us, now we stop it and smooth it out a little before it goes too far.

( Participant #8)
Yeah, we know we gonna hear it or somebody talking about it anyway, because they gonna come on our end. We should be like, “Well, I should go ahead and mediate this before getting it bigger than it already is.” (Participant #7)

We like the people that can persuade other people not to do something.

(Participant #4)

Research Issue Four

What effects did the length of the conflict resolution training have on changes in behavior of the participants?

Theme Seven: Effects of Time

The length of the conflict resolution training and its related effects were addressed in this issue. Based on the data collected, six of the nine students interviewed in either an individual interview or in a focus group reported that the training was not long enough. They indicated that two days was not long enough to learn the process. Responses from other participants did not directly address the length of the training. Some of the comments include:

Two days will not help you. Some people just don’t have it. It was not long enough for some people because it takes longer to get things through their heads. (Participant #6)

It was not long enough, but long enough to cover the basics. (Participant #1)

Some people wanted it to be longer. It could have been longer. (Participant #5)

I think the training should be at least a week, and it should be a week because when you
first came in there, they have to explain to you why they picked you. What purpose the
training is for. They need to get into everything, and we really didn’t get into it until, like,
the second day. Anyway, so finally the second day we was doing mostly, they was
explaining from the first and acting out, but
we really weren’t into it. It was kind of short. We had two days. (Participant #7)
Yeah, because it was like a can packed, like they compacted it all together real
quick like the first day. (Participant #9)
I was surprised that it was only two days, and they did not continue, and this needs to be
continually done. To really get it down pat, it should have lasted a week and a half.
( Participant #3)

Research Issue Five

How useful were the conflict resolution practices for the participants and others?

Theme Eight: Application of Conflict Resolution Practices

The effects of conflict resolution training as they relate to application of practices by
participants were addressed in this issue. Respondents reported that they used the practices, they
did not use the practices, others used the practices, or their responses did not address application.
Five participants reported that they used conflict resolution techniques to resolve potentially
destructive conflicts. One participant suggested that the police should use conflict resolution with
people who were arrested. One participant reported that he did not use the practices. Another
participant reported that teenagers and children had put conflict mediation practices to good use.
Other respondents did not directly address the application of conflict resolution practices. Some of the responses are listed below:

   Teenagers and children had put the mediation to good use. I used it a week ago myself because this girl and I got into an argument but I thought about what was going on. (Participant # 1)

   It would be good with police, like, at clubs. You will have time to go to mediation. Police should use it with people they arrest. (Participant #4)

   I never used it. It was not really a process. (Participant #2)

   I used it in the way of life. If I was to hear that two girls or any two people were to have a conflict, the reason why I use the method is because if they were to get to fighting in school, they would get into more trouble. Well, like I said, I did two conflicts this year. It’s in my records. I try to put in mediation first, and then, before they got to fighting, they would think about it. (Participant #7)

   They did not use it for what it was meant to be. I do it almost everyday with my sister and brother because they fight about everything. (Participant #6)

   I stopped myself from being in a lot of fights this year. (Participant #5)

   Let me see, I have two sisters and a brother. Sometimes they have conflicts with each other and they think about fighting is the only way to solve it. But I took them in and sat them down to talk to them one at a time and got each one to tell me what the problem was and they told me what the problem was and then I called both of them in there and asked if
there was a better way to solve it. This was what one had said about each other at school, and it got back to them, and they were all mad at each other. I took them in and said, “Well do you know who said what?” I also said, “Do you believe what someone say about you?” I asked them and they said no, and they shook hands. (Participant #3)

Research Issue Six

How valuable was the conflict resolution training?

Theme Nine: Value of Conflict Resolution Training

The value of conflict resolution training as perceived by participants was addressed in this issue. Respondents reported that the training was valuable because it helped them solve conflicts. One participant did report that the training was drawn-out and difficult to understand at first, although, it was good training. Another student reported that the training was confusing on the first day; however, it started going well by the time it was completed. Some of the responses are reported below:

The training was drawn-out; but, all in all, I think it had a good purpose to it and the acting out and going into life situations. The things made it real hard for me to understand what it was trying to do when I first got here. Like, the first day we were there, I had to study what was going on until we got into fluid things like, yeah, stuff do go like that, and it is another way to approach your conflicts in the school, and so I think it was good, real good. It let me just understand, basically, just understand things that I knew already, but it just added on so it made it that much easier for me to do it. (Participant # 9)
The first day it was confusing, and everybody was not organized. Then the second day it started going well, and it just stopped. The value is very good. I see why this training is good. (Participant # 3)

I thought the program was real good. It was real interesting. I thought it was well for me personally. (Participant # 7)

It meant a whole lot to me because it was like how you can stand at a different point or different angle, and it helped me more how to look at different situations. I think it will be a good thing. (Participant # 4)

I think this program should be in every school. The good of the training was we got in groups to see who in the group had problems with their frustrations by verbal conversation in a calm way. (Participant # 1)

I think the program was valuable. I need to keep the training in my heart at all times. (Participant unknown)

It was very good for them and for me. (Participant # 6)

Research Issue Seven

What is your opinion on the quality of the instructors? What is your opinion on the quality of the instruction?

Theme Ten: Quality of Instructors and Instruction

The participants’ perceptions of the conflict resolution instructors and instruction were addressed in this issue. Five participants submitted responses on this issue. One respondent
reported that the instructors respected their comments. Another participant reported that they were not “put down.” Another respondent reported that the instruction was broken down so that they were able to understand the material. Some of the comments are listed below:

She took what we said in a positive way. She was very good but I forgot her name. If you listen to her and follow her instructions, you could be a better person in life.

(Participant #9)

She was a nice lady. She had patience with us and everything. She was a real good teacher. (Participant #3)

She broke it down to us so we could understand. She act like she knew what she was talking about. (Participant #3)

We had a lady and a guy. The presenters were real good. (Participant #3)

They did not keep it boring. The way they did it was real good. The instructors were good. (Participant #6)

The lady never put us down. We really got the drift of what we covered. (Participant #1)

Good teachers (Participant #4)

They got the job done. (Participant #5)

**Miscellaneous**

Several respondents reported comments that were categorized as miscellaneous. One respondent reported that more mediators were needed. Another indirectly suggested that training
seniors be re-evaluated because of their limited time on campus. A third respondent reported that mediators were there to help other students, not to command them. Some of these comments are reported below:

I think they need to have more than one group. Some were seniors, and they have left, and it does not help right now, and we need more people like that. (Part. #6)

It was not about grades. (Participant #1)

It was fun to get out of class. (Participant #5)

The mediator is there to help them out, not to command them. (Participant #6)

We had two people being conflict managers and the other two were acting out the conflict. (Participant #7)

Summary of Interview Data

The qualitative investigation was conducted to complement the quantitative analysis. These data were gathered from high school students who were participants in conflict resolution training. Analysis of the interview data indicated that participants’ perceptions of the effects of conflict resolution training on the behavior of high school students were mostly positive. They reported that the training influenced positive changes in their own behavior and the behavior of others. The results of the content analyses suggested that the conflict resolution training received by participants positively impacted their behavior in school.
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

This chapter contains a summary of the study, including the purpose, findings, and conclusions. In addition, a section on recommendations for further research is included. Both quantitative and qualitative methodologies were used to strengthen the investigation of the effects of conflict resolution training on high school students with previous discipline referrals. The focus of the investigation was only on participants trained in conflict resolution techniques. Each member of the treatment group received twelve hours of conflict resolution training, with a four-hour update two months later.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effects of conflict resolution training on students with previous discipline referrals. There were two dependent variables in this study. They were the number of discipline referrals reported to the school administration and the level of those referrals. The independent variables were training (those receiving conflict resolution training and those who did not receive training), gender, and eligibility (eligible and not eligible for free and reduced-price lunch). Two three-way ANOVAs were conducted to determine if there were significant main and interaction effects of the independent variables on the number and level of discipline referral offenses reported for students in this urban high school.

One focus group and six interviews were conducted to gather qualitative data. Data were
content analyzed to determine the perceptions of the participants about conflict resolution training. Ten themes emerged from the data.

Findings

Students who were trained in conflict resolution practices did not differ on either the number of discipline referrals nor the level of discipline referrals from students who did not receive training. None of the main effects were significant; however, there were interactions between gender and eligibility for both the number and level of discipline referrals. When the interaction for number of referrals was “teased apart,” none of the simple main effects were statistically significant. When the interaction for level of referrals was “teased apart,” none of the simple main effects were statistically significant.

There are several possible reasons why the treatment group and the control group did not differ significantly on any of the variables in the study after the intervention. The characteristics of the sample may be one reason. Both the treatment group and the control group were small (n = 32). It is quite possible that the small sample size contributed to the limited number of discipline referrals, thus reducing the chances of finding significant main or interaction effects. A larger number of participants in both the treatment and control groups could have increased the power of the analyses. Tolson et al. (1992) reported a similar problem with sampling and advised caution when reporting results and reaching conclusions.

Next, the design of the study could be related to the findings. The control group could have been exposed to some of the techniques of conflict resolution through alternative means.
They could have gained information about conflict resolution prior to training, during the training, or after the training period.

A third reason for lack of support for the quantitative research questions could be the data collection procedures. Although each assistant principal collected and coded data for participants on his or her grade level, and the principal verified the data, individual differences could have intervened and influenced the results. Each discipline referral offense was assigned to either level I, II, III, or IV; each level representing a different degree of severity. The same discipline referral offenses could have been assigned to different levels based on the professional judgement of each rater.

Other effects of conflict resolution training were collected with interviews of eleven questions. Ten themes emerged from the data. They are restated here with related findings.

1. Personal changes emerged as one theme. Participants reported two types of personal observations as they related to changes in student behavior. They reported that they had noticed changes in their own behavior and the behavior of others. With respect to their own behavior, participants indicated that fighting had decreased since the conflict resolution training. One student stated that he had stopped himself from being in a lot of fights. Another participant stated that she had calmed down since the training. The same student indicated that she was willing to “talk about stuff” now.

2. Changes in others was another theme that emerged from the data. Respondents reported that they had observed changes in other participants as a result of the conflict resolution
More students thought about conflicts that they were involved in prior to having a physical or verbal confrontation. The conflict resolution training taught them to “stop and think” before getting into a fight. Overall, most respondents reported that conflict resolution training contributed to changes in themselves and other participants.

3. Benefits to self was another theme. One participant reported that the conflict resolution training helped him learn to resolve conflicts for himself and others. Other participants indicated that the training benefitted them by providing strategies for dealing with conflict. For example, one participant indicated that she used the method that was taught to resolve conflicts. One participant indicated that he did not benefit from the conflict resolution training.

4. Benefits for others emerged as a theme. When data about benefits of conflict resolution training for others were analyzed, some respondents reported that the training was good. Others reported that some participants who received conflict resolution training intervened to help others resolve conflicts. One participant reported that the training kept him in school. According to another respondent, the conflict resolution training got participants to think prior to reacting in a negative manner. Another reported that more students will “stop and think” after receiving conflict resolution training. Still another reported that the training taught participants to resolve conflicts, instead of using negative behaviors.

Prior research supports the use of conflict resolution training to peacefully resolve disputes as a benefit for others. Brewer (1996) reported that students trained in conflict resolution techniques chose to utilize collaborating or compromising when faced with situations
of conflict. Students receiving no training chose avoiding or accommodating most frequently. Johnson and Johnson (1994a) reported that students trained in conflict resolution engaged in less antisocial and more prosocial behavior in a variety of school settings. Further, the findings indicated that 85-95% of the conflicts mediated by peers resulted in lasting agreements. Violence and other serious discipline problems decreased, and discipline referrals were reduced by 60%.

5. Benefits for the school was the third theme to emerge for this part of the data. Respondents indicated that conflict resolution training had an effect on other students in the school. It helped students solve problems through the use of conflict resolution practices. One student reported that there were fewer arguments in the school, and several students reported that the conflict resolution training stopped fights. Another student reported that the participants receiving training “calmed down a little bit.” A third participant reported that conflict resolution training was a good thing for the school because participants learned different ways to resolve potentially destructive conflicts.

6. Effects of the selection process emerged as a theme. Most participants reported that those chosen possessed the ability to persuade other students to follow their lead. Using their own language, they described students who not only possessed leadership skills, but also were not afraid to use them to influence others. They reported that those selected were people other students knew. One respondent reported that participants selected were those who would intervene to resolve conflicts if they knew about them. Another reported that potential mediators were individuals who were admired by other students. Finally, one participant reported that he
was always thinking of something to do; therefore, other students followed him. Overall, the participants who were interviewed reported that the selection process was very important because “you just couldn’t pick people that nobody know.”

7. The length of the conflict resolution training was another theme. Respondents reported that the training was not long enough to cover the basics or to help those who needed more time. Others commented that the training was not long enough for some people because it takes them longer to learn the process than others; they suggested that the training should be at least a week, that they were surprised that the training was only two days, and that “to get it down pat, it should have been a week and a half.”

8. Application of conflict resolution practices emerged as a theme. Students alluded to their use of the practices to resolve conflicts between females, use of the practices to resolve conflicts between siblings, and use of the practices to resolve conflicts between students at school.

9. The value of conflict resolution training was another theme. It produced a variety of positive comments from interviewees. Participants noted that the conflict resolution training had a good purpose, although it was drawn-out; the training meant a lot to students because it taught them to look at things from a different angle; the program should be in every school; and the conflict resolution training was valuable for them and other students in this high school.

10. Quality of the instructors and the instruction emerged as a theme. Participants noted that both were good; that they knew what they were doing and presented the material in a positive manner; that the instructors were patient, nice and good teachers; that the instructors
broke the material down so it could be easily understood; and that the presentations were not boring. Overall, the participants’ comments were very positive about the trainers.

Conclusions

The quantitative data analyses revealed that conflict resolution training did not affect the number nor the level of discipline referrals received by participants. This conclusion is supported by at least one study (Burdett & Jensen, 1983) reported earlier in this paper. However, these results were not consistent with some of the other research (Johnson & Johnson, 1994a; Burrell & Vogl, 1990; Kirleis, 1995) reported in this study. Johnson and Johnson (1994a) reported a reduction in the number of discipline referrals after conflict resolution training. Burrell and Vogl (1990) reported a reduction in the number of discipline referrals after conflict resolution training. With respect to the level of referrals, Kirleis’s work supports a decrease in the severity of discipline referrals received by participants after conflict resolution training. Other studies are available in Chapter 2 and a complete reference list is located on pages 93 through 100.

Based on the qualitative findings, the following conclusions were reached by the researcher. These are listed below.

1. The data analyses revealed that most of the participants interviewed used their cognitive abilities to analyze potentially destructive conflicts prior to reacting in a negative manner more frequently after training. According to respondents, this constituted a significant change in their own behavior. In addition, it was reported that the training provided effective strategies for avoiding violence in school, such as aggressive verbal arguments.
and fights. Therefore, conflict resolution training was perceived by the students as having a positive effect on their behavior with respect to the reduction of violence.

2. Conflict resolution training was a positive experience for the respondents, and it was perceived to have a positive effect on the participants’ high school, based on the analysis of interview data.

3. Effective conflict resolution mediators were perceived to be students who were influential in their high school and had the ability to persuade others.

4. Students believed the length of the training was not sufficient.

5. Students reported that they used the practices to resolve their own conflicts and the conflicts of others.

6. The instructors and instruction were perceived to be effective by the students.

Implications for Practice

In this section, the implications of conflict resolution training are presented. Determining how conflict resolution training affects student behaviors, school cultures, and communities at large is a key issue facing school personnel today, because violence is escalating in schools. This study attempted to address this problem to some degree. Although two methodologies were used in this study, both had clear implications for those considering conflict resolution as a strategy for improving student discipline.

Although no differences were found when quantitative data were analyzed, most respondents reported positive perceptions about the effects of conflict resolution training when
qualitative data were closely examined. Although the length of the training in this study was reported to be insufficient, the conflict resolution practices learned were utilized effectively and were reported to be valuable. The fact that only one respondent reported that the practices had not been used is further evidence of the benefits of this training as one strategy to use when attempting to reduce the number and severity of discipline referral offenses in this high school.

Recommendations for Further Study

The findings of this study suggest a number of areas for further study. Since the study rendered some conflicting results, a follow-up study could investigate the perceptions of participants after a longer training period. Other recommendations for further research are:

1. Researchers could investigate the length of conflict resolution training to determine if reinforcement sessions influenced the results with respect to the number of discipline referral offenses committed by trained participants and the level of those referrals.

2. Researchers could expand the current study to include all high schools in the district with conflict resolution programs. This could increase the ability to generalize results beyond the population of this study.

3. Researchers could investigate the effects of conflict resolution training on students in suburban and rural high schools to compare results with those from urban high schools.

4. Researchers could utilize a case study approach to examine, in detail, perceptions about conflict resolution practices. This study could include participants, non-participants, trainers, teachers, and administrators to gather data to use when making program
decisions.

5. Researchers could investigate the perceptions of staff members about the effects of conflict resolution training as it relates to reduction of violence on high school campuses. This study could have major implications for safe and orderly schools.

6. Researchers could conduct a state-wide survey about the effects of conflict resolution training on student behavior. This could increase the ability to generalize results.

7. Researchers could conduct a pre-test and post-test study on the effects of conflict resolution training to determine if significant differences exist between groups, grade levels, and race. This could yield the necessary hard data required to make wise decisions about expenditures for safe and orderly schools.

8. Researchers could conduct a qualitative study utilizing interviews to determine if conflict resolution training significantly affect drop-out rates. This study could provide information on the effects of group membership as it relates to social acceptance by peers, teachers, and administrators. Results could yield effective strategies necessary for retaining at-risk students through graduation.

9. Researchers could replicate the current study in a high school with a more representative ethnic population or conduct this study using a stratified random sample to ensure adequate members in each cell. This could enhance the ability to generalize results beyond the current school’s population.

10. Researchers could conduct a study on conflict resolution training to investigate the
frequency of its use. This study could generate data needed to determine if negative behaviors are reduced if participants use the training.
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Appendix A

Code of Conduct
To: Certain Assistant Principals

From: R. Gunn

Subject: Code of Conduct

Please take the time to code each item in the code of conduct. Decide whether each entry should be coded level I, level II, level III, or level IV. Many decisions will require your professional judgement. Listed below are two examples

fighting-level III Assault-level IV

Thank you for your assistance in this important matter. If you require additional information please let me know.
FACULTY/STAFF RESPONSIBILITIES

The classroom teacher has the major responsibility for classroom management. Each teacher should develop a positive climate for learning. To accomplish this goal, intervention to change student behavior should include methods to prevent or correct misconduct.

The efficient, routine operation of a classroom requires a well-developed, well understood and consistent set of rules and regulations. Students are to be held accountable for certain standards. Expectations must be established ahead of time in a manner that makes them easily learned and understood. Listing to do’s and don’t in a attempt to cover every situation may create a confused classroom climate. If the code is too detailed and prescriptive, it will become impractical and unmanageable. Rules and regulations that attempt to define every type of situation and recourse are not necessary.

Teachers handle the major portion of student discipline through their system of classroom management. However, teachers will refer a student for discipline when the situation warrants. Each public school operating in Henrico County has in place a referral system for student discipline. The school principal and/or designee is responsible for addressing the student’s behavior after the teacher/staff referral. Central office administration support is provided by the Disciplinary Review Hearing Officer, the Superintendent of Schools or designee, and the School Board.

ATTENDANCE - Level I

Students are expected to arrive at school and all classes on time every day.
A. Excessive and Unexcused Tardies or Absences to School or Class

Students are expected to attend all assigned classes every day. A parent, teacher, or staff members’ approved request will be required for excused class absences. Justifiable reasons for nonattendance should be submitted to the school for each absence.

B. Truancy

In the event a student arrives at school but does not attend his first class, this action is considered truancy. Once a student arrives on school property, he may not leave without administrative permission prior to the end of the regularly scheduled school day.

C. Leaving School Property
Recommended Dispositions - one or more may apply

Student Conference

Counseling

Parent Contact

Conference with Parent

Instructional Support Services Intervention

Detention

Alternative School Program

Shortened School Day

School Resource Officer/Law Enforcement Agencies

Court Referral Initiated by Social Worker

Probationary Student Status and Limited Participation in School Program

Recommended Expulsion to the School Board

INTEGRITY - Level I

Students are expected to perform honestly through the production of their own work and the demonstration of respect for the belongings of others.

The following acts are prohibited.

A. Cheating this includes the actual giving or receiving of any unauthorized aid or assistance of the actual giving or receiving of unfair advantage on any form of academic work.

B. Plagiarism includes the copying of the language, structure, idea, and/or thought of another and
representing it as one’s own original work.

C. Falsification includes the verbal or written statement of any untruth, including the production of forgery or use of forged writing.

D. Stealing includes acquiring another’s possessions without right or permission. The possession of stolen property is considered theft.

E. Attempts toward completion of any act described above would constitute a violation and may be punishable to the same extent as if the attempted act had been completed.

F. Unauthorized us of technology and information gained through its use without permission is prohibited, as specified in computer use guidelines.

**Recommended Dispositions - one or more may apply**

- Student Conference
- Parent Contact
- Conference with Parent
- Detention
- Alternative School Program
- Suspension
- School Resource Officer/Law Enforcement Agencies
- Court Referral
- Restitution
- Community Service
Revocation of Computer Access and Use

Recommended Expulsion to the School Board

DISRUPTIVE BEHAVIOR - Level II

Students are entitled to a learning environment free of unnecessary disruption. Any physical or verbal disturbance within the school setting or during related activities which interrupts or interferes with teaching and orderly conduct of school activities is prohibited.

A. Dress, such as see-through shirts, scanty attire, apparel to convey an inappropriate message, etc., which distracts others from the learning process is unacceptable. Each school’s “Standards of Dress” specifies the expectations of appropriate attire determined suitable for the age, grade level, stage of development, and physical facility.

B. Any event, action, or statement which relies on chance for the monetary advantage of one participant at the expense of others is gambling. This violation includes exchanging items of value as well as currency and extends to keeping score for later settlement.

C. The possession of literature or illustrations which are obscene or significantly disrupt the educational process is prohibited. Included are inappropriate student expression, distribution of non-authorized literature, and illegal assembly when any of these activities causes a disruption.

D. The possession or use of any type of unauthorized electronic or mechanical device is prohibited. This shall include but not be limited to pagers (beepers), CB radios, cellular phones, boom boxes, walkman, etc. or the representation thereof. These items will be confiscated by the school administration and maintained for the duration of the disciplinary process.
E. Cursing or using abusive language including remarks intended to demean a person’s race, religion, sex, national origin, disability, or intellectual ability is considered **obscenity**. This violation includes action or displays of an obscene nature and the wearing of clothing or adornments, including inappropriate jewelry, which themselves convey either violation or sexually suggestive messages or **offensive statements** towards school personnel and/or students, i.e., vulgar language.

F. Any serious or persistent use of language to prevent an orderly and peaceful learning experience for any individual constitutes verbal abuse.

G. Failure to appropriately respond to written or verbal directions given by school personnel and the School Resource Officer is considered insubordination. Also included in disobedience or defiance of reasonable requests made by school personnel.

H. Other activities which disrupt the orderly functions of the school include, but are not limited to: habitual offenses, sexually explicit behavior, sexual harassment, unauthorized fraternities or secret societies, unauthorized sales by students, possession of inappropriate toys, and inappropriate use of school lockers and facilities.

**Recommended Dispositions - one or more may apply**

- Student Conference
- Parent Contact
- Conference with Parent
- Instructional Support Services Intervention
Detention
Suspension
Shortened Day Program
Alternative School Program
Suspension Intervention Program
School Resource Officer/Law Enforcement Agencies
Court Referral
Confiscation
Community Service
Mediation/Conflict Resolution
Recommended Expulsion to the School Board

TOBACCO PRODUCTS - Level II & III

The law requires all school buildings to be smoke-free.

All students are PROHIBITED from the use and possession of tobacco products, matches, and lights on school property. This prohibition includes all related activities (i.e., bus stops, school bus, extracurricular activities, etc.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Offense</th>
<th>Student Conference</th>
<th>Parent Conference</th>
<th>Referral to School Resource Officer</th>
<th>Alternative School Program</th>
<th>(3 days)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subsequent Offenses</td>
<td>Student Conference</td>
<td>Parent Conference</td>
<td>Referral to School Resource Officer</td>
<td>Suspension</td>
<td>Possible Recommended Expulsion to the School Board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VANDALISM - Levels III & IV**

Members of the school community are entitled to enjoy property free from the abuse of others.

Vandalism is the willful marring, defacing, or destruction of property held in trust by the School Board of Henrico County, or any other Board’s employees. This section includes, but is not
limited to the buildings, both exteriors and interiors thereof, books computer equipment and
software, school buses, private automobiles, school grounds, and property as designated above.
Causing or attempting to cause damage to school and personal property of others will not be
permitted.

**Recommended Dispositions - one or more may apply**

- Student Conference
- Parent Contact
- Conference with Parent
- Alternative School Program
- Suspension
- School Resource Officer/Law Enforcement Agencies
- Court Referral
- Restitution
- Community Service
- Recommended Expulsion to the School Board

**FIGHTING - Level III/ASSAULT - Level IV**

Students and school personnel are entitled to a school environment free from threat and the
physical aggression of others.

The following acts are prohibited.

A. Actions, comments, or written messages intended to cause others to fight or which may result
in a fight are considered incitement or instigation.

B. Intentionally hitting, shoving, scratching, biting, kicking, blocking the passage of, or throwing objects at a student is considered physical abuse.

C. Conveying by gestures, notes, or verbal comments the intent to cause bodily injury or to deprive a student of his rights is considered a threat.

D. Fighting involves two or more parties in conflict when they are striking each other for the purpose of causing harm or injury. This action may extend to mutual shoving, wrestling, or other aggressive actions which may result in the danger of harm or injury to either party, bystanders, or school property.

E. The willful use of physical violence which is intended to result in bodily injury or the use of a dangerous object in an effort to cause bodily injury is considered an assault on a student.

F. Physical aggression directed toward a School Board employee and the School Resource Officer is considered an assault. VIOLATION OF THIS RULE WILL RESULT IN AN IMMEDIATE RECOMMENDATION FOR EXPULSION.

G. Conveying by gestures, notes, or verbal comments the intent to cause bodily injury or to deprive a School Board employee and the School Resource Officer of his rights is considered a threat.

H. Any inappropriate behavior which is of a sexual nature including, but not limited to, touching of sensitive private areas of one’s body is considered sexual assault.

I. The willful use of physical or verbal threats or physical abuse intended to result in an
involuntary transfer of money or property to another student is considered extortion.

J. Unsafe conduct which endangers either oneself or others is prohibited.

**Recommended Dispositions - one or more may apply**

Student Conference

Parent Contact

Conference with Parent

Instructional Support Services Intervention

Detention

Alternative School Program

Suspension Intervention Program

Suspension - Required Mediation/Conflict Resolution Training

School Resource Officer/Law Enforcement Agencies

Court Referral

Community Services

Recommended Expulsion to the School Board

**CHEMICAL ABUSE - Level IV**

A. Alcohol  
B. Drugs  
C. Drug Paraphernalia
Each student has the right to learn in an environment free of drugs and alcohol.

ALCOHOL AND OTHER DRUGS NOT PRESCRIBED FOR THE STUDENT ARE NOT PERMITTED.

| CHEMICAL ABUSE: possessing, which includes bringing substances onto school property, using, or having evidence of prior use of illegal chemicals, alcohol, look alike drugs and alcohol, anabolic steroids, inhalants, any drug not prescribed for the student by a physician, or any substance represented as a drug; OR possession or use of drug paraphernalia. CHEMICAL ABUSE ALSO ENCOMPASSES DISTRIBUTION, WHICH INCLUDES SALE, GIFT, SHARING, AND TAKING ORDERS FOR OR ARRANGING FOR A SALE BEFORE, DURING, OR AFTER SCHOOL. |

Procedures for handling chemical abuse violations:

**Possession of Alcohol, Drugs or Drug Paraphernalia**

**First Offense**

1. report to School Resource Officer and Disciplinary Review Hearing Officer
2. referral to an administrative school hearing chaired by building principal and/or designee
   
   (a) minimum ten-day suspension from school  (b)30 day exclusion from all
extracurricular activities

(c) if a student has an illegal substance in a motor vehicle, parking permit privileges will be revoked for twenty school days

(d) absences during suspension will be Unexcused, with no right to make up missed work

(e) if the student successfully completes the school division’s Awareness and Intervention Program, and student and parent participate in one meeting with Program staff, any suspension IN EXCESS OF TEN DAYS may be waived; all absences during the suspension will be excused, with the right to make up work; and any exclusion from extracurricular activities IN EXCESS OF TEN DAYS may be waived

(f) the parents may enroll the student in community drug counseling program of their choice, and sign permission to share information between school and program, in which case the provisions of paragraph 2(e) shall apply

Subsequent Offense

The following will be implemented:

(1) report to school Resource Officer

(2) referral to Disciplinary Review Hearing Officer

(3) RECOMMENDED EXPULSION TO THE SCHOOL BOARD

Distribution or Attempted Distribution of Alcohol or Drugs (whether sale, gift, or sharing).
In addition to any of the penalties described under possession, the following will be implemented:

(1) report to School Resource Officer

(2) referral to Disciplinary Review Hearing Officer

(3) RECOMMENDED EXPULSION TO THE SCHOOL BOARD

DANGEROUS OBJECTS, FIREARMS, EXPLOSIVES, ARSON

Each student has the right to learn in a safe environment with others who respect their well-being.

The following categories are considered extremely serious violations which threaten a suitable and secure learning environment:

A. The possession of Dangerous Objects includes the representation of items commonly understood to be inappropriate to school activities as well as, but not limited to machetes, brass knuckles, switchblades, knives, Chinese stars, mace, etc. also included is the misuse of common place objects, including but not limited to keys, locks, etc. Violation of this rule may result in a recommendation for expulsion.

B. The possession of look-alike weapons, such as cap guns, squirt or water guns, toy pistols, comb knives, etc. is prohibited on school property.

C. The objects noted in A and B used to intrude on the security and safety of fellow students and school personnel WILL RESULT IN THE IMMEDIATE RECOMMENDATION FOR EXPULSION.

D. The possession or representation of a firearm, whether loaded or unloaded, operative or inoperative, on any school property or during any school activity is prohibited unless specifically
authorized by school officials. Possession includes bringing a firearm onto school property, storing it in a vehicle, locker, or other receptacle. Firearms include pellet guns, BB guns, CO2, air pistols, stun guns, and any other device which meets the definition of firearm in the Code of Virginia. VIOLATION OF THIS RULE WILL RESULT IN AN IMMEDIATE RECOMMENDATION FOR EXPULSION.

E. THE USE of a firearm, whether loaded or unloaded, operative or inoperative, WILL RESULT IN AN AUTOMATIC RECOMMENDATION FOR EXPULSION. Also included is the use of a look-a-like firearm, cap gun, water gun, etc., in a manner which threatens a person’s safety or health.

F. The possession or representation of any explosive or material considered to have the capacity to create an explosion, including firecrackers, is prohibited unless specifically authorized by school officials.

G. THE USE of an explosive, including, but not limited to, a bomb threat, false fire alarm, fireworks, smoke/stink bomb or any representation of an explosive device is prohibited.

H. The use or the intent to use any material which may result in a fire on school property constitutes arson and is prohibited unless specifically authorized by school officials.

**Recommended Dispositions - one or more may apply**

Student Conference

Parent Contact
Conference with Parent

Instructional Support Services Intervention

Alternative School Program

School Resource Officer

Suspension

Law Enforcement Agencies/Fire Marshall

Court Referral

Confiscation

Community Service Restitution

Recommended Expulsion to the School Board

TRESPASSING - IV

Students, patrons, and school personnel are expected to have the appropriate authorization to be on School Board property.

A. Any student who has been suspended from attendance may be considered a trespasser if he/she appears on any Henrico County Public School property during the suspension period. Violation of this section will be considered an additional infraction and will require a separate disposition.

B. Students who arrive at school before school opens or remain after the close of their school day without specific need or appropriate supervision may be
considered trespassers.

C. Any student who is requested by an administrator to leave school property is expected to do so immediately. Failure to do so may be considered trespassing.

D. No student or other person may attend or visit a Henrico County School as a guest during the regular school day without authorization from the school’s administration.

Recommended Disposition - one or more may apply

Student Conference
Parent Contact
Conference with Parent
Additional Suspension Time
School Resource Officer/Law Enforcement Agencies
Court Referral
Suspension
Recommended Expulsion to the School Board
Appendix B

The Mediation Process
The Mediation Process

Stage 1  Introduction  &  Ground Rules

Greetings and handshakes  .  do not interrupt

Confidential, except for harm  .  no name calling putdowns  Take turns, talk about the
problem  .  work hard to solve

Breaks  .  be honest

People create the solutions

Written agreement

Stage 2  Storytelling

Listen to one..................

Listen to the other.............

Anything else? (ask each person)... 

Summarize the whole story

Common ground

Each one states the other person's point of view

Stage 3  Finding Solutions

Name the issues

Brainstorm solutions

What can you agree to?  fsr
Stage 4  
Agreements

Restate solutions

4WH

Reality.  Is it possible?  What if...?

Balance

Write up agreement

Congratulations.  Tell your friends it's solved.

Option  Caucus: We would like to take a break now...

!  Confidential

!  More listening

!  Solutions

!  Summarize when back together

FSR Association  Tools for Living  Student Manual Secondary  EMS

MEDIATION PROCESS

STAGE ONE: INTRODUCTION AND GROUND RULES creating a safe place to talk

1.  Hello my name is...(shake hands)...Thank you for coming.

2.  Would you like to solve your problem with us...

3.  Everything that you say will be kept confidential.  

fsr
We will not tell other students what you say.

There is one exception-

If we hear that someone is going to be harmed or has been harmed, we are required to report it to our supervisor.

4. Here's how mediation works.

Each of you will have a chance to speak...

Then we will look at the problems to be solved...

We will help you talk and listen to each other about the problem/conflict...

We are not judges...

We will not decide the solution for you...

You will create the solution yourselves...

We may want to take a break to meet with each of you separately or to meet together ourselves.

At the end of this meeting, if you like the solutions, we will write an agreement for you to sign.

5. There are a few ground rules that you need to agree to before we begin.

1. Do not interrupt

2. No name calling or putdowns

3. Work hard to solve the problems
4. Be honest

Mediators are impartial listeners who guide the meeting. Mediators leave their own stories, opinions, and judgements out of the mediation process.

FSR Association  Tools for Living  Student Manual Secondary  EMS

STAGE 2 STORYTELLING: uninterrupted listening time

5. "Please tell us what happened...(ask one person)

6. PARAPHRASE

7. "How do you feel about that?"

8. PARAPHRASE & Ask questions to understand better.

9. "Please tell us what happened...(ask the other person)

10. PARAPHRASE

11. "How do you feel about that?"

12. PARAPHRASE & Ask questions to understand better.

13. Is there anything else you want to talk about? listen, paraphrase, ask questions to understand better

14. SUMMARIZE the whole story. & Note COMMON GROUND.

15. Say to each: Please tell me what you heard_say? (What are they concerned about?)

fsr
STAGE 3 FINDING SOLUTIONS: create options

16. What would you like to solve...

17. Think about what is important to you... Think of some different ways this could be solved

18. Brainstorm solutions

Each person takes turns giving ideas.

All ideas are accepted.

Repeat all of the ideas that were stated.

19. "Which of these solutions are good for you?"

Mediators do not suggest solutions.

Mediators:

If things stop or get too difficult, ask

1. What will happen if you don't solve the problem here?

2. Do you want that to happen?

3. What can you think of to solve the problem.

STAGE 4 MAKING AGREEMENTS: mutual satisfaction

20. Restate the solutions.

21. Will the solutions work? Are they possible? Can you do them?  

fsr
22. What if...this happens...What will you do?

23. FWH (who, what, when, where, how)

24. Do you think the problem has been solved?

25. What could you do to keep the problem from happening again?

26. Write up the agreement.

27. Everyone sign the final agreement.

28. Please tell your friends that you have solved the problem. This will prevent rumors from spreading.

29. Congratulations. You have worked hard to solve this problem.

30. Everyone shake hands.

31. If this agreement doesn't work out, you may want to come back and talk about it.

**Caucus:** an option for the mediators

1. "We would like to take a break now to meet with each of you separately...

2. "This meeting is confidential...

3. "Is there anything you would like to say now that...is not here?

4. "Would you like to bring that up when we get back together?...May we bring it up?

5. "What do you really need to here?  

   fsr
6. "Is there anything you have said that you do not want us to bring up?"

7. "When we all get back together, would you be willing to say some of the things you have told us? May we say them?" (This asks if they will summarize the caucus.)

8. After the caucus, when everyone is back together, summarize what was said. Let the people be the ones to tell. If they did not want to, then mediators summarize.

Consensus

It's a good solution. I can live with it. I will support it. I will not block it. It may not be my first choice

fsr Associates’s “Tools for Living Student Manual” Secondary EMS
Appendix C

The Interview Protocol
Interview Protocol

11. Tell me about the conflict resolution training that you participated in last winter?

12. Was the training period long enough?

13. What opinions do you have about the length of the training?

14. What do you think the results of this training will mean for our school over the long term?

15. Describe your use of the conflict resolution practices learned.

16. How have you used this training?

17. What do you think happened to you as a result of the training?

18. What do you think happened to our school as a result of this training?

19. What are your opinions on the value of the training?

20. What is your opinion on the quality of the instructors?

21. What is your opinion on the quality of the instruction?
Appendix D

Parent Permission Letter
February 20, 1998

9540 Kennedy Station Terrace
Glen Allen, VA 23060

Dear Parent,

I am currently a doctoral candidate at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia. I am interested in studying the effects of peer mediation and conflict resolution training on student behavior. I am interested in studying the perceptions and opinions of your son/daughter regarding peer mediation/conflict resolution and discipline. The results will be shared with you and other parents once the study has been completed. It is my desire to present the information in a manner which will be useful to schools as we assist students in the educational process.

In an effort to gather information needed for the study, I am asking your permission for your son/daughter to complete a two day workshop designed to teach students skills needed to resolve conflict. Also, I am asking your permission for your child to complete a short interview on the program. The initial responses will be held in the strictest of confidence and no names will be used. This workshop is free for students. All fees have been paid. I am requesting that your child participate because his or her opinions are important to the success of this program. If you would like additional information about the study, please call me at (804) 228-2700.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Reamous Gunn, Jr.

_____ I give permission for my son/daughter to participate.

_____ I do not give permission for my son/daughter to participate.

______________________________  ______________________
Parent Signature                              Date
Appendix E

Student Permission Letter
Dear Student,

I am currently a doctoral candidate at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia. I am interested in studying the effects of peer mediation and conflict resolution training on student behavior. You have been asked to participate in this study because your perceptions and opinions regarding conflict resolution and discipline are important. The results will be shared with you and your parents once the study has been completed. In an effort to gather information needed for the study, I am asking you to complete a two day workshop designed to teach the skills needed to resolve conflicts. Also, I am asking your permission for you to complete a short interview about the program. The initial responses will be held in the strictest of confidence and no names will be used. This workshop is free for students. All fees have been paid.

If you would like additional information, please let me know. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Reamous Gunn, Jr.

___ I will participate in the conflict resolution training and interview.

___ I will not participate in the conflict resolution training and interview.

________________________________________  _____________________
Student Signature                              Date
Appendix F

Data Collection Form
Data Collection Form

Student Name: ___________  Date: _____

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>SES</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Consequences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G

Topics for Organizing Interview Data for Content Analysis
Topics for Organizing Interview Data For Content Analysis

Abbreviation: P’s React Training
Meaning: Participants’ reactions to the training

Abbreviation: P’s React P’s
Meaning: Participant’s reaction to other participants

Abbreviation: Train Process
Meaning: Examples of the training process

Abbreviation: Outs
Meaning: Effects of the program on participants or outcomes

Abbreviation: Others
Meaning: Other effects as identified by the perceptions of the participants

Abbreviation: P’s changed beh.
Meaning: Changes in the behavior of the participants

Abbreviation: Perc. Of reduced vio.
Meaning: Participants’ perceptions of reduced violence

Abbreviation: P’ react. to time
Meaning: Participants’ perceptions of the length of the training

Abbreviation: P’s use time
Meaning: Participants’ perception of the use of training
Abbreviation: Misc.

Meaning: Miscellaneous responses

(adapted from M. Q. Patton, 1990, p. 382)
Appendix H

Summary of Research Studies in the Review of the Literature


Table 7

Summary of Research Studies in the Review of the Literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Study and Author(s)</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selection of conflict resolution participants</td>
<td>Conflict resolution as peer mediation: Programs for elementary, middle and high school students <strong>Lupton-Smith et al.</strong></td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School violence, conflict resolution</td>
<td>Teaching Students to be peacemakers: Results of five years of research <strong>Johnson and Johnson</strong></td>
<td>1994b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of participants</td>
<td>Resolving student conflicts with student mediators <strong>Koch &amp; Miller</strong></td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of Participants</td>
<td>Effective school climate: Roles for peers, practitioners, and principals <strong>Jacobson and Lombard</strong></td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of participants</td>
<td>Creating a more peaceful world <strong>DeJong</strong></td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Research Studies in the Review of the Literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Study and Author(s)</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of conflict resolution training, discipline referrals</td>
<td>Peer mediation among high school students: A test of effectiveness&lt;br&gt;Tolson et al.</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes and conflict resolution</td>
<td>Conflict resolution and peer mediation programs in elementary and secondary schools: A review of research&lt;br&gt;Johnson and Johnson</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude and conflict resolution</td>
<td>Effects on high school students of integrating conflict resolution and peer mediation training into an academic unit&lt;br&gt;Stevahn et al.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table 7 continues)
(Table 7 continued)

Summary of Research Studies in the Review of the Literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Study and Author(s)</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of conflict resolution</td>
<td>The effects of conflict mediation training on attitudes toward conflict and interpersonal problem-solving strategies of middle school students Brewer</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success of programs</td>
<td>Conflict resolution: An examination of the research literature and a model for program evaluation Carruthers et al.</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success of programs</td>
<td>Turf-side conflict mediation for students Burrell and Vogl</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction of discipline referrals</td>
<td>Constructive conflict in the schools Johnson and Johnson</td>
<td>1994a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>Study and Author(s)</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of discipline referrals</td>
<td>Discipline referrals in an urban middle school: Implications for discipline and instruction Freiberg et al.</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of discipline referrals</td>
<td>The effects of peer mediation training on conflicts behaviorally and emotionally disordered high school students Kirleis</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender and discipline referrals</td>
<td>The effects of a peer mediation training program on high school and elementary school students Lupton-Smith</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender and discipline referrals</td>
<td>The violence at your door Boothe et al.</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Research Studies in the Review of the Literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Study and Author(s)</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender and discipline referrals</td>
<td>Assessment of the implementation of conflict management programs in 17 Ohio schools: First year reports school demonstration, 1990-93 by Kaufman</td>
<td>1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic status and discipline referrals</td>
<td>The self concept and aggressive behavior among elementary school children from two socioeconomic areas and two grade levels by Burdett and Jensen</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race and discipline referrals</td>
<td>A study of race and gender bias in the punishment of school children by Mcfadden et al.</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of discipline referrals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes of conflict resolution</td>
<td>Dispute resolution: the fourth R by Davis and Porter</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>Study and Author(s)</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>Conflict resolution: The history, philosophy, theory, and educational applications</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carruthers and Sweeney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Effects of Conflict Resolution Training by Participants and Interview Questions
### Effects of Conflict Resolution Training by Participants and Interview Question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Q1= Tell me about the conflict resolution you participated in last winter.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participant 1</strong></td>
<td>“It was a project where a group of us had to come together.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“It was not about the grades.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“We made how much trouble we got in but about how we could help each other get over problems.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The program was to help us become mediators, help respect the certified mediators.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Help people get over their problems without fist fighting, verbal language or other conflicts involving matters.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participant 2</strong></td>
<td>“It was like a regular program that you go to that we stayed in all day.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“It taught you to resolve certain conflicts on what you should and shouldn’t do.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Q1= Tell me about the conflict resolution you participated in last winter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 3</td>
<td>“Well, its like we go in like a group of students and sometimes we do a group exercise.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Like, well somebody would have to try to help them solve it.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Like, that and then we filled out some worksheets.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Basically, it was like trying to help other kids with their problems.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Like, trying to help them with conflicts, like, if they were having problems at home, problems at school, problems with other students.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“We would try to help them solve it other than fighting or violence stuff like that.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Q1= Tell me about the conflict resolution you participated in last winter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 4</td>
<td>“It was about self-control. A new thing going around.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“First, I did not know what was going on.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Second, it was like fun and new that I did not know about myself.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I think it was fun for me cause I learned about different situations and stuff and how you could ‘um’, like they said it was all good, it’s all good.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Q1= Tell me about the conflict resolution you participated in last winter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participant 5</strong></td>
<td>“It was a lot of fun.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“We did a lot of different activities.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“It was fun to get out of class too.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“We did skits and role play that was just about what we were doing.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“It was trying to help keep fights down and showing people how to get along.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“We were suppose to be the ones to stop fights to get to the bottom so there will be no fights.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Q1= Tell me about the conflict resolution you participated in last winter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 6</td>
<td>“Well it was about helping other people solve their problems through mediating.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“It was a very good idea because the mediation got to be like the negotiator, the listener and the other two people in conflict got to talk it out.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The mediator is there to help them out not to command them.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Q1= Tell me about the conflict resolution you participated in last winter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 7</td>
<td>“I thought the program was real good, it was real interesting.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“We would do the program in the training center for two days.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“We acted out different problems.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“We had two people being conflict managers and the other two people were acting out the conflict.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“We went over different procedures and how we would solve them.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“We did a lot of acting.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I think it was good and I enjoyed it a lot.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Q1= Tell me about the conflict resolution you participated in last winter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participant 8</strong></td>
<td>“It lasted two days.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“We acted out different situations.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I think it was very interesting.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I think it helped me, like not only helping others people solve their situation, but solving my own situations so I think it was a good program.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participant 9</strong></td>
<td>“The program was drawn out but all in all I think that it had a good purpose to it and the acting out and going into real life situations.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The things made it real hard for me to understand what it was trying to do when it first got here, like the first day we were there, I had to study what was really going on, until we got into fluid things like, yeah, stuff do go like that and like it is another way to approach your conflicts in the school and so I think it was good, real good.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Role play and acting was real good, it was helpful.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Q2= Was the training long enough?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 1</td>
<td>“It was not long enough but long enough to cover the basics.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I think it was a couple of weeks.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“It was all day. I had so much fun, I really can’t remember how long.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 3</td>
<td>“It was too short. It was like two days.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 4</td>
<td>“I think it lasted for about a week and a half, I think.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I think it was a week or two weeks.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I forgot.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 5</td>
<td>“I think it was a week maybe two. It was long enough I think.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 6</td>
<td>“It was two days, a whole school day.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Q2= Was the training long enough?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 7</td>
<td>“It was kind of short, we had two days.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Q3= What opinions do you have about the length of the training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant 1</td>
<td>“The first week we got the hang of it.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“We really got the drift of what we covered.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“We got to cover a lot of things.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I think, don’t remember the time went by so quick.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Q3= What opinions do you have about the length of the training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 3</td>
<td>“The first day it was confusing and everybody was not organized. Then the day, it started going well and it just stopped.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“To really get it down pat, it should have lasted a week and a half.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 5</td>
<td>“Some people wanted it to be longer.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“They got the job done.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“It could have been longer.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 6</td>
<td>“It was not long enough for some people.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“It was not long enough for some people because it takes some people longer to get things through their heads.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“They are not the type to be mediators because some people have been mediators for 16 years. Two days will not help you. Some people just don’t have it.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Q3= What opinions do you have about the length of the training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Participant 7 | “We had really just gotten into it the second day, cause the first day we were kind of confused and stuff.”
<p>|               | “I think that the training should be at least a week and it should be a week because when you first come in there they have to explain to you why they picked you. What purpose the training is for, they need to get into everything and we really didn’t get into it until like the second day. Anyway, so finally the second day we was doing mostly, they was explaining from the first and acting out, but we really weren’t into it.” |
| Participant 9 | “Yeah, cause it was more like a can packed, like they compacted it all together real quick like the first day.” |
| Participant 6 | “I think they need to have more than the group that we have because some were seniors and they have left and it does not help Henrico right now and we need more people like that.” |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Q4= What do you think the results of this training will mean for our school over the long term?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant 2</td>
<td>“So as far as it concern it is probably the same as if we had not had it.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 5</td>
<td>“I think it will be less fights. The more people take it, the more the more we would learn.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 6</td>
<td>“I have seen student who have changed from this program. Me for one.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 8</td>
<td>“I think it’s good for the school, not only will the students that were in it can help resolve conflicts and now we know different ways to help solve conflicts and I think also like I said earlier.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 4</td>
<td>“Well, I think it decreased the more bad in Henrico cause for the last two years I have been here it was nothing but fights, but since Mr. Gunn left it’s been less fights and stuff and people are more like lets talk it out.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Participant 1 | “I think the training will do us a lot of good because the people in the group stop fights or break up fights.”

---

“If they are getting in a fist fight themselves, then they will stop and think.” They will think of how many days you will get put out of school.”

---

“More kids will think about fighting and have verbal solutions.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Q4= What do you think the results of this training will mean for our school over the long term?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant 4</td>
<td>“I think it will be a good thing for the school because different people have different opinions about different things at the school so you have different characters.” “I think it will be a good thing.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Q5= Describe your use of the conflict resolution practices learned.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant 1</td>
<td>“We were taught not to put people down.” “I used it a week ago myself because this girl and I got into an argument but I thought about what was going on.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 2</td>
<td>“I never used it. It was not really a process.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 5</td>
<td>“I stopped myself from being in a lot of fights this year. I could have been in a lot but I just kind of let it slide on by and just went to talk to an administrator. Something like that you know so it really did help me because last year I got in a couple of fights.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Q5= Describe your use of the conflict resolution practices learned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 3</td>
<td>“Let me see, I have two sisters and a brother. Sometimes they have conflicts with each other and they think fighting is the only way to solve it. But I took them in and sat them down to talk to them one at a time and got each one to tell me what the problem was and they told me what the problem was and then I called both of them in there and asked if there was a better way to solve it.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 7</td>
<td>“Well, like I said, I did two conflicts this year.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I used it in the way of life if I was to hear that two girls or any two people were to have a conflict, the reason why I used the method is because if they were to get to fighting in school they would get into more trouble.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Q5= Describe your use of the conflict resolution practices learned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Participant 9** | “It’s like something that I do. It ain’t no thinking about it.”  
“I was like that anyway, before I would like to calm situations down, sometimes it would get down, sometimes it would get to the point where I can’t get along then I fight.”  
“In the program, it taught you how to look at it from a different angle and then just calm all the situations down, even when you feel like getting involved.”  
“It’s like with me, I just do it all the time.”  
It’s natural to go ahead and do it most of the time I try to do it.” |
| **Participant 8** | “For me once I take the training or whatever, I really don’t think about the training anymore but it’s like my situations come out to be naturally you know, to try to solve it.”  
“I use the method they taught us.” |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Q6= How have you used this training?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants 3</td>
<td>“This was what one had said about each other at school and it got back to them and they were all mad at each other. I took them in and said well do you know who said and I said do you believe what someone say about you. I asked them and they said no and they shook hands.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants 7</td>
<td>“I try to put in mediation first and then before they got to fighting they would think about it.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 2</td>
<td>“I never used it after the class.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 2</td>
<td>“I never used it.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 5</td>
<td>“I stopped myself from being in a lot of fights this year.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 7</td>
<td>“Well like I said, I did two conflicts this year.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 7</td>
<td>“It’s in my records with Mr. Adkins.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 7</td>
<td>“Since I have been in training, its like I’ve calmed down a lot.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 7</td>
<td>“I am willing to talk about stuff now and this year since Mr. Gunn been gone, I still have the program going by myself.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 6</td>
<td>“I do it almost everyday with my sister and brother because they fight about everything.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Q7= How useful were the practices?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 4</td>
<td>“It meant a whole lot to me because it was like how you can stand at a different point or different angle and it helped me more how to look at different situations.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 7</td>
<td>“Going through mediation helps you a lot really about getting into trouble.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 9</td>
<td>“It’s helped me but I don’t think about it.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Q8= What do you think happened to you as a result of the training?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Participant 1 | “I think it bettered my personality about or within myself.”  
“Treat others like you want to be treated. I know a golden rule. A lot of parents tell their children to treat others like you want to be treated.”  
“Always think before you judge people.”  
“You should always think how you judge people.”  
“How I judge people on our everyday basis.” |
| Participant 4 | “I talk out conflicts at home with my mom.” |
| Participant 5 | “Made me a better person.”  
“It stopped me from fighting and getting in so much trouble.”  
“Kept me in school.” |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Q8= What do you think happened to you as a result of the training?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Participant 3 | “My mom and dad are surprised at me because I really changed before the I got into it. I think I do really good.”  
“I think it made me a better person.”  
“I know how to solve problems without fighting.” |
| Participant 6 | “Personally, I think I’ve come to realize how other people feel.”  
“I took the mediating and I was very different and I guess I understood why people argue on the street and on the team.” |
<p>| Participant 8 | “I think that it really showed, helped us see that a whole lot of times during our arguments and fighting doesn’t solve anything anyway.” |
| Participant 4 | “It just increased the more violence in the situation.” |
| Participant 8 | “Sitting down and talking about it is really more effective is the message. That’s what we learned in the class.” |
| Participant 7 | “Last year when I was in the ninth grade, I won’t thinking about talking out nothing. I was ready to fight; but, now I talk about all my problems.” |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Q9= What do you think happened to our as a result of the training?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant 4</td>
<td>“Like people in the group changed a lot.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“It started with one person then it goes around. So you start with one and you add more and more.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The people in the program had an effect on the other students in the school.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“There will be less arguments.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 5</td>
<td>“It has been a lot less fights this year.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I think it stopped a lot of fights.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 9</td>
<td>“We calmed down a little bit.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Q10= What are your opinions on the value of the training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 1</td>
<td>“The good of the training was we got in groups to see who in the family, who had problems with your frustrations by verbal conversation in a calm way but sat and take the time to communicate.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I think this program should be in every school.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Teenagers and children had put the mediation to good use.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 2</td>
<td>“As of now, I don’t see any problems. What happens in the future you never know.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 4</td>
<td>“It would be good with police like at clubs, you will have time to go to mediation.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Police should use it with people they arrest.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 5</td>
<td>“It stopped a lot of fights and it helped stop and talk things out.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“It taught us to talk to one another instead of arguing.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Q10= What are your opinions on the value of the training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participant 7</strong></td>
<td>“It gets you to think about it.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Stop and think before you get to fighting.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“We thought it was well for me personally.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I think we all enjoyed it.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participant 3</strong></td>
<td>“It was valuable.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“If you can get this program to come back and get all the students to take it, this would be a much better place.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“All the kids in the group really enjoyed themselves.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“You see, you have some students who will come to the program just to get out of class. Then they go out and fight.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Q10= What are your opinions on the value of the training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 6</td>
<td>“They did not use it for what it was meant to be.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“It was consistent because it is very good.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“It stops fights.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Q10= What are your opinions on the value of the training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 3</td>
<td>“The value is very good.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I see why this training is good.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“It can help people very much if those people put their mind into it.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The type of people who want to help and not hurt people.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“It was very good program from day one. I mean it and I have no doubt about it.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I was surprised that it was only two days and they did not continue and this needs to be constantly done.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant ___</td>
<td>“I think the program was valuable.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I need to keep the training in my heart at all times.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Q10= What are your opinions on the value of the training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Participant 9** | “Oh, Alright! The value it taught me a whole lot that I didn’t know.”
| | “It let me just understand, basically, just understanding things that I knew already but it justs added on so it made it that much easier for me to do it.”
<p>| | “Understand how to go approach a situation, put it like it’s a whole bunch of ways.” |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Q11= What is your opinion on the quality of the instructor?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant 1</td>
<td>“The lady never put us down.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“She took what we said in a positive way.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“She was very good but I forgot her name.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“If you listen to her and follow her instructions, you could be a better person in life.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 2</td>
<td>“They had to do an alright job because I got something out of the program.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I don’t know if they were teacher.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I don’t know if they were male or female.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Q11= What is your opinion on the quality of the instructor?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 3</td>
<td>“She was a nice lady.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“She had patience with us and everything.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“She was a real good teacher.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The presenters were real good.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“We had a lady and a guy.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“She act like, she knew what she was talking about.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“She broke it down to us so we could understand.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“At first the group was real shy and she said your coolness was on trial.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Q11= What is your opinion on the quality of the instructor?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 6</td>
<td>“They did not keep it boring.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The way they did it was very good.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“It was very good for them and for me.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The instructors were good.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“They made learning fun for two days.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Q12= What is your opinion on the quality of the instructions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Participant 1** | “The lady never put us down.”  
| | “She took what we said in a positive way.”  
| | “She gave us something that will help us the rest of our life.”  
| | “She let us know that it was a wrong and a right.”  |
| **Participant 2** | “They had to do an alright job because I got something out of the program.”  
<p>| | “I don’t know if they were teacher.”  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Q12= What is your opinion on the quality of the instructions?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Participant 1 | “The lady never put us down.”
|               | “She took what we said in a positive way.”
|               | “She gave us something that will help us the rest of our life.”
|               | “She let us know that it was a wrong and a right.” |
| Participant 4 | “Good teachers.”
|               | “They made it fun and exciting.”
<p>|               | “That will make you come back again.” |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Q12= What is your opinion on the quality of the instructions?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant 1</td>
<td>“The lady never put us down.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“She took what we said in a positive way.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“She gave us something that will help us the rest of our life.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“She let us know that it was a wrong and a right.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 5</td>
<td>“Well, our instructors layed down and broke down what we were doing.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“She broke down everything we did.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“She was a pretty good teacher.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Q12= What is your opinion on the quality of the instructions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 1</td>
<td>“The lady never put us down.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“She took what we said in a positive way.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“She gave us something that will help us the rest of our life.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“She let us know that it was a wrong and a right.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 3</td>
<td>“She explained it to us and she broke it down to us so we could understand it.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“She was a real good teacher.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The quality of the instruction was real clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Q12= What is your opinion on the quality of the instructions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 1</td>
<td>“The lady never put us down.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“She took what we said in a positive way.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“She gave us something that will help us the rest of our life.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“She let us know that it was a wrong and a right.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 6</td>
<td>“The presentation was very good.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I have nothing against the presentation that they did.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I learned from it and the other people learned”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Q13= What factors influence selection of conflict resolution?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Participant 9** | “Another thing is the selection of people picked cause you just couldn’t pick people that don’t nobody know cause then the people that’s quiet and aint gone say nothing, no way.”  

“It seemed like the people he picked are the big mouths and the people that aint scared to talk.” |
| **Participant 8** | “Yeah, I think it was good pretty much. I’m not trying to say that we’re trouble makers or nothing, but a lot of the times we always be in the middle of things and when something comes across us, now we can stop it and smooth it out a little before it goes too far.” |
| **Participant 7** | “Yeah, we know we gone hear it or somebody talking about it anyway, cause they gone come on our end.”  

“We should be like, well I should gone ahead and mediate this before getting it bigger than it already is.” |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Q13= What factors influence selection of conflict resolution s?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participant 9</strong></td>
<td>“See it’s not more of a point that people come to me or look up to me like I’m big or something.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“It’s more like I was always thinking of something to do.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I be like, lets do this, alright.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participant 4</strong></td>
<td>“We like the people that can persuade other people not to do something.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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