1

PM-13 . x4 PHOTOGRAPHIC MICROCOPY TARGET
NBS 1010a ANSI/ISO #2 EQUIVALENT

1.0

1.25

2.2

1.1

2.0

1.8

1.25

1.4

1.6

PRECISION^{SM} RESOLUTION TARGETS

**EVALUATION OF A CONFLICT MANAGEMENT PROGRAM
IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS**

by

KELLY E. ASTRI

A thesis submitted to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfilment of
the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Department of Psychology

Carleton University

Ottawa, Ontario

Sept., 1996

Copyright

1996, Kelly Astri

Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Library
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Number / Votre référence

Date / Notre référence

—

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-612-19411-6

Canada

Dissertation Abstracts International is arranged by broad, general subject categories. Please select the one subject which most nearly describes the content of your dissertation. Enter the corresponding four-digit code in the spaces provided.

U-M-I

SUBJECT TERM

SUBJECT CODE

Subject Categories

THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

COMMUNICATIONS AND THE ARTS

Architecture 0729
Art History 0377
Cinema 0900
Dance 0378
Fine Arts 0357
Information Science 0723
Journalism 0391
Library Science 0399
Mass Communications 0708
Music 0413
Speech Communication 0459
Theater 0465

EDUCATION

General 0515
Administration 0514
Adult and Continuing 0516
Agricultural 0517
Art 0273
Bilingual and Multicultural 0282
Business 0688
Community College 0275
Curriculum and Instruction 0727
Early Childhood 0518
Elementary 0524
Finance 0277
Guidance and Counseling 0519
Health 0680
Higher 0745
History of 0520
Home Economics 0278
Industrial 0521
Language and Literature 0279
Mathematics 0280
Music 0522
Philosophy of 0998
Physical 0523

Psychology 0525
Reading 0535
Religious 0527
Sciences 0714
Secondary 0533
Social Sciences 0534
Sociology of 0340
Special 0529
Teacher Training 0530
Technology 0710
Tests and Measurements 0288
Vocational 0747

LANGUAGE, LITERATURE AND LINGUISTICS

Language 0679
General 0289
Ancient 0290
Linguistics 0291
Modern
Literature 0401
General 0294
Classical 0295
Comparative 0297
Medieval 0298
Modern 0298
African 0316
American 0591
Asian 0305
Canadian (English) 0352
Canadian (French) 0355
English 0593
Germanic 0311
Latin American 0312
Middle Eastern 0315
Romance 0313
Slavic and East European 0314

PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION AND THEOLOGY

Philosophy 0422
Religion 0318
General 0321
Biblical Studies 0319
Clergy 0320
History of 0322
Philosophy of 0469
Theology

SOCIAL SCIENCES

American Studies 0323
Anthropology 0324
Archaeology 0326
Cultural 0327
Physical
Business Administration 0310
General 0272
Accounting 0770
Banking 0454
Management 0338
Marketing 0385
Canadian Studies
Economics 0501
General 0503
Agricultural 0505
Commerce Business 0508
Finance 0509
History 0510
Labor 0511
Theory 0358
Folklore 0366
Geography 0351
Gerontology
History 0578
General

Ancient 0575
Medieval 0581
Modern 0582
Black 0328
African 0331
Asia, Australia and Oceania 0332
Canadian 0334
European 0335
Latin American 0336
Middle Eastern 0337
United States 0585
History of Science 0398
Law
Political Science 0614
General
International Law and Relations 0616
Public Administration 0617
Recreation 0814
Social Work 0452
Sociology 0626
General
Criminology and Penology 0627
Demography 0938
Ethnic and Racial Studies 0631
Individual and Family Studies 0628
Industrial and Labor Relations 0629
Public and Social Welfare 0630
Social Structure and Development 0700
Theory and Methods 0709
Transportation 0999
Urban and Regional Planning 0451
Women's Studies

THE SCIENCES AND ENGINEERING

BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

Agriculture 0473
General 0285
Agronomy
Animal Culture and Nutrition 0475
Animal Pathology 0476
Food Science and Technology 0359
Forestry and Wildlife 0478
Plant Culture 0479
Plant Pathology 0480
Plant Physiology 0817
Range Management 0777
Wood Technology 0746
Biology 0306
General 0287
Anatomy 0308
Biosciences 0309
Botany 0379
Cell 0329
Ecology 0353
Entomology 0369
Genetics 0793
Limnology 0410
Microbiology 0307
Molecular 0317
Neuroscience 0416
Oceanography 0433
Physiology 0821
Radiation 0778
Veterinary Science 0472
Zoology
Biophysics 0786
General 0760
Medical

Geodesy 0370
Geology 0372
Geophysics 0373
Hydrology 0388
Mineralogy 0411
Paleobotany 0345
Paleoecology 0426
Paleontology 0418
Paleozoology 0985
Palynology 0427
Physical Geography 0368
Physical Oceanography 0415

HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

Environmental Sciences 0768
Health Sciences
General 0566
Audiology 0300
Chemotherapy 0992
Dentistry 0567
Education 0350
Hospital Management 0769
Human Development 0758
Immunology 0982
Medicine and Surgery 0564
Mental Health 0347
Nursing 0569
Nutrition 0570
Obstetrics and Gynecology 0380
Occupational Health and Therapy 0354
Ophthalmology 0381
Pathology 0571
Pharmacology 0419
Pharmacy 0572
Physical Therapy 0382
Public Health 0573
Radiology 0574
Recreation 0575

Speech Pathology 0460
Toxicology 0383
Home Economics 0386

PHYSICAL SCIENCES

Pure Sciences
Chemistry 0485
General 0749
Agricultural 0486
Analytical 0487
Biochemistry 0488
Inorganic 0738
Nuclear 0490
Organic 0491
Pharmaceutical 0494
Physical 0495
Polymer 0754
Radiation 0495
Mathematics 0605
Physics 0986
General
Acoustics
Astronomy and Astrophysics 0606
Atmospheric Science 0608
Atomic 0748
Electronics and Electricity 0607
Elementary Particles and High Energy 0798
Fluid and Plasma 0759
Molecular 0609
Nuclear 0610
Optics 0752
Radiation 0756
Solid State 0611
Statistics 0463

Applied Sciences

Applied Mechanics 0346
Computer Science 0984

Engineering 0537
General
Aerospace 0538
Agricultural 0539
Automotive 0540
Biomedical 0541
Chemical 0542
Civil 0543
Electronics and Electrical 0544
Heat and Thermodynamics 0545
Hydraulic 0546
Industrial 0547
Marine 0794
Materials Science 0794
Mechanical 0548
Metallurgy 0743
Mining 0551
Nuclear 0552
Packaging 0549
Petroleum 0765
Sanitary and Municipal 0554
System Science 0796
Geotechnology 0428
Operations Research 0796
Plastics Technology 0797
Textile Technology 0994

PSYCHOLOGY

General 0622
Behavioral 0384
Clinical 0622
Developmental 0620
Experimental 0623
Industrial 0624
Personality 0625
Physiological 0989
Psychobiology 0349
Psychometrics 0632
Social 0451

EARTH SCIENCES

Biogeochemistry 0425
Geochemistry 0996

The undersigned recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
and Research acceptance of the thesis

**EVALUATION OF A CONFLICT MANAGEMENT PROGRAM
IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS**

submitted by Kelly Astri

in partial fulfilment of the requirements for
the degree of Master of Arts

Chair

Department

Thesis Supervisor

Carleton University

September 1996

Abstract

A preliminary evaluation of the Conflict Management Outreach Program was conducted. This six week problem-solving program was implemented by classroom teachers. A trained personnel oversaw the implementation of this program. The program's implementation and its cognitive, behavioural and affective impact on the participants was assessed. 184 grade 4, 5, and 6 students, 30 teachers and 4 principals from four Ottawa area schools served as participants. Two schools received the program and two schools functioned as comparison. The students' questionnaire package examined the students' assertive behaviour, attitudes about conflicts, school climate, self efficacy, conflict motivation and conflict skill knowledge and use.

The results indicate that the program was implemented with fidelity; however, improvements in delivery could be made. After six months of the program, cognitive impact was established by the marked increase in the children's knowledge of the skills. Behavioural change was demonstrated by the majority of the children reporting increased use of the skills. Also, interview data revealed that more program than comparison students, who could not generate an alternative conflict solution at pre-test, were able to generate an alternative at the post-test.

The impact of the program on teachers was evidenced by their perception of an improvement in the school's climate since the implementation of the Conflict Management Outreach Program.

The findings are discussed in regard to measurement issues and the need for longitudinal research.

Acknowledgements

The time has come for me to reflect upon the incredible academic journey I have been on. The path is well worn and riddled with memories that are both painful and momentous. A myriad of individuals have aided me in this process and I would like to take this opportunity to thank them.

First, I would like to thank my advisor, Tina Daniels. You have given me direction when I felt lost, guidance to make the road smoother and support to help me believe in my abilities again. Thank you Tina.

Thanks also goes to the staff at Carleton: Dr. Webster for her invaluable statistical prowess and Lynn Giff, Jacqui Kellough, Linda Saslove and Kim Marchildon (Agnes too) for their humour and their support.

I also would like to thank the Developmental Lab for helping me collect this enormous amount of data in such a short time. Thanks everyone.

The final group of people are the ones who deserve the most praise and honour: my family, my husband and God. This work is dedicated to you because of your unwavering support and your bountiful love. Thank you so much.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Discussion of the Program's Key Terms and Questions	1
What needs to be enhanced?	3
Social Competence	3
Conflict Management	5
When to assist and where?	7
Primary Prevention	7
Interventions in the Schools	13
How can we enhance children's lives?	14
Problem-Solving	14
Interpersonal Cognitive Problem-Solving Skills (ICPS)	16
Social Problem-Solving (SPS)	19
Conflict Management Outreach Program	22
Program Evaluation	25
Evaluation Considerations	28
Program Fidelity	29
Goal Attainment and Personal-Resources Assessment	29
Affective Personal Resources	30
Cognitive Personal Resources	31
Behavioural Personal Resources	31
Multiple Sources, Levels and Methods of Assessment	32
Evaluative Model	32
Summative Evaluation Model	33
Hypotheses	36
Conclusion	36
Method	37
Participants	37
Design	38
Part A: Student Questionnaire Package	38
Procedure	38
Description of Measures	39
The Children's Assertive Behavior Scale	39
Conflict Management Motivation	39
The School Climate Questionnaire	39
The Student's Attitudes About Conflict	40
Peaceful Problem-Solving Abilities Scale	40
Test of Knowledge	41
Program Post-test Supplemental Questions	41
Part B: Open-Ended Interview	41
Procedure	41
Teacher Pre- and Post-tests Measures	42
Procedure	42
Principal Monthly Report Form	42
Procedure	42
Methodology Summary	43
Results	46
Program Fidelity	46
Program Impact	47
Students' Questionnaire Data -Pre-Test	47
Pre-Test Students' Questionnaire Summary of Results	48
Pre-test Conclusions	51
Students' Questionnaire Data -Post-Test	52
Post-Test Percentages for the CMM Questions 1-3	52
Post-Test Results of Consistency in Answering-Program Students	52
Post-test Test of Knowledge	52

Post-Test Percentages -Program Supplemental Questions	54
Post-test Summary of Results	57
Student's Questionnaire Data - Change Scores	59
Change Score Results-CABS, SCLIM and SAAC	59
Change Score Results-CABS "Aggressive" Score	64
Change Score Results-CABS "Passive" Score	66
Change Score Results-SAAC Factors	71
Change Score Results-PPSAS	71
Change Score Results-CMM Question 4	75
Change Score Conclusions	75
Students' Interview Data	77
Teachers' Questionnaire Data	81
SCLIM	81
CLO	83
Program Teachers' Supplemental Questions	87
Principals' Questionnaire Data	90
Monthly Report Form	90
Principals' CLO	90
Program Principals' Post Supplemental Question	92
Summary of Program Impact Results	92
Discussion	98
Program Fidelity	98
Program Goal Attainment	101
Goal #1 and Goal #2	101
Goal #3	103
Exploratory Goal Attainment	104
Assertive Behaviour	105
Attitudes and School Climate	108
Motivation, Self Efficacy and Feelings Identification	109
Qualitative Findings and General Program Insights	110
Evaluation Issues	111
Meta-analytic Studies	112
Statistical Issues	114
Gain Scores	114
Nested Design	114
Power and Effect Size	115
Methodology	115
Design	115
Procedure	117
Measures	118
Evaluative Model Revisited	120
Future Research	122
Conclusions and Recommendations	124
Contributions	128
Footnotes	129
References	136
Appendix A	
Criteria for Comparison School Selection	159
Appendix B	
Consent Letter to Program Parents/Guardians	161
Appendix C	
Instructions to Students	169
Appendix D	
Children's Assertive Behavior Scale	171

Appendix E	
Conflict Management Motivation	180
Appendix F	
School Climate Questionnaire	183
Appendix G	
Student Attitudes About Conflict Scale	187
Appendix H	
Peaceful Problem-Solving Abilities Scale	194
Appendix I	
Test of Specific Knowledge	197
Appendix J	
Post-test Questions	200
Appendix K	
Open-Ended Interviewing After Recess	202
Appendix L	
Teacher Pre and Post-test Measures	206
Appendix M	
Monthly Report Form For Principals	217
Appendix N	
Oral Debriefing	235
Appendix O	
Threats to Internal and External Validity	237
Appendix P	
Pre-Test Student Questionnaire Analyses	243
Appendix Q	
Factor Analysis	274
Appendix R	
Test of Knowledge Scoring Key	281
Appendix S	
Conflict Management Outreach Program Manual	286

goal of interventions, then it is necessary to assess whether the intervention actually fulfils this sine qua non. An external evaluation of the present conflict management program adds to the growing body of research that documents the utility of theory in practice.

A thorough examination of the underlying rationale of this program is in order. This review, completed by the present author, demonstrates the program's complexities and underpinnings. Thus, the next section presents an explanation of the key terms that are the bases of this program and addresses the guiding program questions of (a) what needs to be enhanced in children, (b) when the assistance is given, (c) where the enhancement programs are conducted, and (d) how the program can ameliorate problems in children's lives. This will be followed by a description of the Conflict Management Outreach Program. Program evaluation issues will then be discussed followed by the evaluative plan for the present research.

Discussion of the Program's Key Terms and Questions

What needs to be enhanced?

Social Competence. The importance of socially competent children has been well documented in the literature. Not only do peer relations aid in a child's development (Hartup, 1979; Selman, 1980; Sullivan, 1953), but promotion of social competence also may serve as a protective factor against psychopathology and problem behaviours (Asher & Parker, 1989; Cowen, Pederson, Babigian, Izzo, & Trost, 1973; Garnezy, 1987; Garnezy, 1989; Garnezy, Masten, Nordstrom, & Ferrarese, 1979; Richard & Dodge, 1982; Weissberg & Allen, 1986; Zins & Forman, 1988[a]). As a result, many researchers have advocated the adoption of social competency building in children (Albee, 1985; Cowen, 1985; Elias & Clabby, 1984; Weissberg, Caplan & Sivo, 1989). The Conflict Management Outreach Program aspires to bring this recommendation to fruition.

Many different definitions of social competence have been proposed (see Schneider, 1993, for a review of dimensions useful for classifying

TEACHER		
22	Means and Standard Deviations for the SCLIM	82
23	Ratings of the Most Frequent Cause of their Students Conflicts	84
24	Ratings of the Most Frequent Location of their Students' Conflicts	85
25	Ratings of Outcome 1 (Teacher Intervenes) and Outcome 2 (Students Resolve Problem Themselves)	86
26	Ratings of Outcomes 3 to 6	88
27	Percentages for Program Teachers' Supplemental Questions	89
PRINCIPALS		
28	Monthly Report Form Information	91
DISCUSSION		
29	Levels of Implementation	121
30	Evaluation Model Recapitulated	123
PRE-TEST		
31	Alpha Values for The CABS, SAAC and SCLIM	245
32	Cell Means and Standard Deviations of CABS, SCLIM and SAAC	247
33	CABS, SCLIM (SAAC)-Pooled Within-Cell Correlations with Standard Deviations on Diagonal	248
34	Univariate F Tests for SCLIM and CABS by School within Program/Comparison	249
35	Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficients and Structure Coefficients for the Nested School Effects - Without SAAC	252
36	Without Comparison School #2 -Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficients and Structure Coefficients -Program/Comparison	256
37	Without Comparison School #2 -Cell Means and Standard Deviations of CABS, SCLIM and SAAC	257
38	Cell Means and Standard Deviations for CABS -Passive Scores	261
39	Cell Means and Standard Deviations for SAAC Subscales	263
40	SAAC Factors-Pooled Within-Cell Correlations with Standard Deviations on Diagonal	264
41	Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficients and Structure Coefficients -Gender by SAAC Factors	266
42	Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficients and Structure Coefficients -Grade by SAAC Factors	267

43	Percentages for CMM Questions 1-3 - Program vs. Comparison	270
44	Factor Analysis - CABS	275
45	Factor Analysis - SAAC	277
46	Factor Analysis - SCLIM	279

List of Figures

<u>Figure</u>	<u>Description</u>	
1	Change Scores CABS Aggressive/Passive - 2nd Comparison School	68
2	Group Centroids	251

Introduction

The development of socially competent children has been the focus of a tremendous amount of research (e.g., Garnezy, Masten, Nordstrom & Ferrarese, 1979; Schneider, Attili, Nadel & Weissberg, 1989). It has been recognized that social competence with peers predicts later adjustment (Asher & Parker, 1989; Cowen, Pederson, Babigian, Izzo, & Trost, 1973) and is essential to effective functioning in this increasingly complex world (Gardner, 1983). Building competence in individuals may be the most persuasive way to assist people in dealing with social and personal problems (Bloom, 1979). A particularly pressing problem for elementary school children is learning how to deal with conflict situations more effectively. Thus, it is postulated that developing conflict management skills within a child enhances his or her social competence (Putallaz & Gottman, 1982; Putallaz & Sheppard, 1992).

Theory suggests that conflict arises from a deficit in conflict resolution strategies and the aim is to ameliorate this by providing social problem-solving training (Spivack & Shure, 1974; Weissberg, Gesten, Carnrike, et al., 1981; Weissberg Gesten, Rapkin, et al., 1981). Intervention programs have been developed that enhance a child's ability to think through and solve their interpersonal problems (Allen, Chinsky, Larcen, Lochman & Selinger, 1976; Battistich, Elias & Branden-Muller, 1992; Spivack & Shure, 1974; Weissberg, Gesten, Rapkin, et al., 1981). Many of these programs have been primary prevention, school-based approaches. These programs endeavour to promote competencies in "at risk" children before the development of a serious problem (Gesten, Flores de Apodaca, Rains, Weissberg & Cowen, 1979; Kent & Rolf, 1979).

Price and Smith (1985) contend that an essential component in any program is an effective evaluation of its impact. While many preventive efforts have been conducted in the schools, only a few of these efforts have performed an effective evaluation of the program's impact (Linney, 1989).

The purpose of this study was to conduct an external-preliminary evaluation of a preventive conflict management program offered by the Ottawa Board of Education -- the Conflict Management Outreach Program. This program endeavours to promote problem-solving skills in the elementary school child. The investigative focus was to determine whether children's social competence could be enhanced by this primary prevention program. Two questions guided this research. The first inquiry was to determine whether the program was implemented with fidelity and the second inquiry was to determine the impact of this program.

The evaluative plan included multiple methods of assessment, multiple sources of data, and multiple levels of analysis as advocated by many researchers (Allen, Chinsky, Larcen, Lochman & Selinger, 1976; Finch, & Rogers, 1984; Hops, 1982; Kelly, 1971; Kendall, 1981; Kendall, Pellegrini & Urbain, 1981; La Greca, 1990; Linney, 1989; Lorion, 1983, 1987; Ollendick & Hersen, 1984; Pellegrini, 1987; Pellegrini & Urbain, 1985; Price & Smith, 1985; Schneider, 1993; Seidman, 1987; Urbain & Savage, 1989; Weissberg & Gesten, 1982; Wodarski, 1989). Open-ended interviewing and questionnaires were the assessment methods. As well, data collected from teachers, principals and students provided insight into the radiating effects of the intervention on different sources. Finally, students' and teachers' perceptions of their conflicts and the school's climate were assessed. This multi-level approach provides insight into the program's impact upon the participants and the school environment.

The trend to integrate theory, methodology and application has provided an opportunity to form a link between research and practice. Kelly (1977) and Carroll (1984) have outlined the opportunity that exists for integrating the intellectual tradition of psychology with the applied needs of schools and communities. Furthermore, if theory proposes that enhancement of children's social competence should be the

goal of interventions, then it is necessary to assess whether the intervention actually fulfils this sine qua non. An external evaluation of the present conflict management program adds to the growing body of research that documents the utility of theory in practice.

A thorough examination of the underlying rationale of this program is in order. This review, completed by the present author, demonstrates the program's complexities and underpinnings. Thus, the next section presents an explanation of the key terms that are the bases of this program and addresses the guiding program questions of (a) what needs to be enhanced in children, (b) when the assistance is given, (c) where the enhancement programs are conducted, and (d) how the program can ameliorate problems in children's lives. This will be followed by a description of the Conflict Management Outreach Program. Program evaluation issues will then be discussed followed by the evaluative plan for the present research.

Discussion of the Program's Key Terms and Questions

What needs to be enhanced?

Social Competence. The importance of socially competent children has been well documented in the literature. Not only do peer relations aid in a child's development (Hartup, 1979; Selman, 1980; Sullivan, 1953), but promotion of social competence also may serve as a protective factor against psychopathology and problem behaviours (Asher & Parker, 1989; Cowen, Pederson, Babigian, Izzo, & Trost, 1973; Garnezy, 1987; Garnezy, 1989; Garnezy, Masten, Nordstrom, & Ferrarese, 1979; Richard & Dodge, 1982; Weissberg & Allen, 1986; Zins & Forman, 1988[a]). As a result, many researchers have advocated the adoption of social competency building in children (Albee, 1985; Cowen, 1985; Elias & Clabby, 1984; Weissberg, Caplan & Sivo, 1989). The Conflict Management Outreach Program aspires to bring this recommendation to fruition.

Many different definitions of social competence have been proposed (see Schneider, 1993, for a review of dimensions useful for classifying

definitions of social competence). Dodge (1985) contended that the "number of definitions of social competence in the developmental literature today approaches the number of investigators in the field" (p. 3). Social competence has been referred to as a "catch-all" phrase (Oppenheimer, 1989). Definitions submitted have been as general as the management of social encounters (Wrubel, Benner & Lazarus, 1981), or as specific as a list of socially competent behaviours (Anderson & Messick, 1974).

Emphasis on the definitions has varied among researchers. One viewpoint emphasized that social competence is more than just the possession of social skills or personal goals; one must also be able to apply them (Sarason, 1981; Battistich, Elias & Branden-Muller, 1992). Concomitant with this assertion is the need for positive self-perceptions and a sense of efficacy when encountering social situations (Ford, 1985). Other researchers have noted that socially competent behaviours should be situation specific and appropriate for each developmental stage (Attili, 1989; Eisenberg & Harris, 1984; Ford, 1982; Goldfried & D'Zurilla, 1969; McFall, 1982; Waters & Sroufe, 1983; White, 1959). Moreover, definitions also have highlighted the need for the judgement of appropriate behaviours by significant others (e.g., peers or teachers) and the need for meeting society's expectations of social competence (Dodge, 1986; Gresham, 1986; Hops & Finch, 1985; McFall, 1982; Zigler & Trickett, 1978). Still others contend that the criterion of psychological or physical risk should be used to determine socially competent behaviours (Putallaz & Gottman, 1982). For example, good peer relations and self-efficacy are associated with later-adjustment and have been used as indices of social competence (Asher & Parker, 1989; Cowen, Pederson, Babigian, Izzo, & Trost, 1973; Rutter, 1987).

Drawing from the many definitions that exist, two definitions were chosen with one addendum. These definitions encompass many of the dimensions thought to be necessary by previous researchers. First,

Rubin and Krasnor (1992) refer to social competence as "the ability to achieve personal goals in social interaction while simultaneously maintaining positive relationships with others over time and across situations" (p. 285). This definition includes the need for appropriate situation and developmental competencies. As well, it identifies the active role of the child in building protective qualities (i.e., achieving personal goals). While this definition focuses on the achievement of personal goals, it does not emphasize the appropriate behaviours required to be deemed socially competent.

A definition proposed by Schneider (1993) defines social competence as "the ability to implement developmentally-appropriate social behaviours that enhance one's interpersonal relationships without causing harm to anyone" (p. 19). This definition advances the need for appropriate behaviours but negates the need for a sense of efficacy (Ford, 1985). Therefore, to improve the definitional scope, a sense of efficacy towards social encounters should be added. Taken together, these conceptualizations of social competence demonstrate the complexity of this term. A restatement of the aggregated definition is:

Social competence is having a sense of efficacy in social encounters, as well as, having the ability to achieve personal goals and behaviours in social interaction that are situation specific and developmentally-appropriate. These abilities maintain and enhance positive interpersonal relationships.

The Conflict Management Outreach Program being presently researched attempts to enhance children's social competence by teaching conflict-management skills. The next section reviews the topic of conflict and examines the role that conflict plays in children's lives.

Conflict Management. To enhance children's social competence, researchers have focused on particular social tasks, rather than developing a general sense of competency within children (Dodge, 1985; Dodge, 1986; Putallaz & Sheppard, 1992). One of the social tasks that

has been focused on extensively is children's conflict management. As noted by Arrington (1987), there is an enormous potential for conflict in the elementary and middle school environment. Pressure stemming from school, from home or from society, has made conflict management a particularly essential element in a child's life. The definition of conflict is "one person's overt opposition to another's conduct or statements because of incompatible behaviours or goals" (Shantz, 1987). One advantage of this conception of conflict is that it encompasses both mundane and momentous disagreements.

In regard to child development, conflict has both positive and negative implications. For many theorists, conflict plays a central role in human development and adaptation (e.g., Selman, 1980; Piaget, Freud, and Erikson as cited in Shaffer, 1985) (refer to Furman & McQuaid, 1992; Hartup & Laursen, 1993; Shantz, 1987 for reviews). Conflicts (whether intrapsychic or interpersonal) contribute to a child's socialization by helping the child reach a mature understanding of the differences between themselves and others (Piaget, 1928, 1932). It also plays a critical role in the maintenance of friendships and illuminates the similarities between individuals or friends (Gottman, 1983; Putallaz & Gottman, 1983; Selman, 1980). Interaction with others also serves as a mechanism through which children learn social mores and decrease their egocentrism (Piaget, 1932, Sullivan, 1953).

Unfortunately, not all conflicts lead to cognitive or interpersonal progress (Berndt, 1981). According to Selman (1980), conflicts have both progressive and regressive consequences for relationships. He maintained that individuals must be able to differentiate between conflicts that are mundane (or resolvable) and those that threaten the relationship itself. These two types of disputes have been described as destructive and constructive conflict (Deutsch, 1973). Destructive conflicts amplify the initial issue, involve an escalation through threats and coercion and result in

feelings of dissatisfaction for both individuals. In constructive conflicts, both parties remain focused on the issue, they engage in problem-solving and they come to a mutually satisfying outcome.

The term "conflict" often conjures up images of an aggressive confrontation. It should be noted that not all conflicts involve aggression. Many conflicts are fleeting or even result in humour (Hartup & Laursen, 1993). Therefore, a distinction should be made between aggression and conflict. Aggression refers to a wide variety of acts that involve attack or hostility (Reber, 1985). Conflict, on the other hand, only has the potential to involve aggression.

The Conflict Management Outreach Program advocates the development of socially competent children by enhancing their conflict management skills. While conflicts can have negative consequences, avoidance of all conflicts seems impossible and detrimental to one's development (Furman & McQuaid, 1992). Conflict is part of our everyday lives. The program's strategy is to promote constructive conflict management to avert psycho-social dysfunction in the future.

Primary Prevention in the Schools

When to assist and where?

Primary Prevention. Typically, the treatment employed by the mental health system to ameliorate physical illness and psychopathology in children has been client-centred, one-to-one therapy. The strategy behind this type of intervention is to minimize or repair any harm that has been incurred by the child. This orientation is reactive; the problem is presented and responded to. An alternative to this method is to take a proactive stance regarding children's health (Seidman, 1987). This move toward the prevention of disorders has been seen as a paradigm shift (Bloom, 1979), and as the fourth mental health revolution (Albee, 1980; Cowen, 1983[a] & 1983[b]). While some individuals see prevention as a new concept, it has been a method of intervention for many years (See Bloom, 1971; Cowen, 1980, 1983b; Edelstein & Michelson, 1986;

Felner, Jason, Moritsugu & Farber, 1983; Kessler & Albee, 1977; Long, 1986; Lorion, 1983; Price, 1986; Roberts & Pederson, 1984; for historical reviews of prevention efforts).

The necessity to construct an alternative strategy stems from many sources. Albee (1982, 1985), Alpert (1985), the President's Commission on Mental Health (1978), and Weissberg, Caplan and Sivo (1989) have documented the inefficacies of the mental health system's response to dysfunction. They pointed out that the present strategy is inequitably distributed (i.e., not to children, adolescents and the elderly), and is poorly suited to the majority of the population. Further, the mental health system's strategy lacks the resources to meet the need (i.e., the need of a qualified professional for each child who is experiencing problems). Albee (1985) cogently reported, "One does not get rid of mass plagues afflicting humankind, including the plague of mental and emotional disorders, by attempts at treating the individual" (p. 213).

Another shortcoming is the expense of one-to-one therapy. This intervention requires a great deal of time and expertise (Weissberg, Caplan & Sivo, 1989). By contrast, prevention programs are often mass-targeted. This provides a more cost-effective means of supplying services because it assists larger numbers of people (Gesten, Weissberg, Amish & Smith, 1987; Zigler, Kagan, Muenchow, 1982).

Lastly, Cowen (1983b) and Cowen and Hightower (1990) recognized that it is more humane and pragmatic to use preventive measures. They noted that the prognosis is worse for clients who have an established disorder, since rooted dysfunction tends to resist change. The hope is to prevent the individual from ever suffering from a disorder.

There have been many attempts at defining prevention (e.g., Cowen, 1980, 1983b; Goldston, 1977a, 1977b; Kessler & Albee, 1975, 1977; Price & Smith, 1985). Difficulty in accomplishing this task has been due to the term's broad scope. It can include the prevention of any physical or psychological disorder using a multitude of methods. To narrow the

focus of the present exegesis, the more appropriate term of prevention in mental health will be used (Cowen, 1980, 1983a, 1986). Though this is a narrower term, it still incorporates tripartite strategies. Table 1 presents the three approaches to intervention.

Tertiary prevention seeks to reduce or rehabilitate the adverse effects of a chronic mental disorder. Secondary prevention targets vulnerable or impaired individuals during the incipient stage of their illness. The goal of this strategy is to reduce the duration of the disorder and to lessen the sequelae. Primary prevention is designed to reduce the incidence of a mental disorder. These programs are aimed at the entire population to promote well-being as an inoculant against dysfunction. For many clinicians, primary prevention is the only true prevention strategy because it endeavours to assist individuals prior to the onset of the condition (Cowen, 1977, 1980, 1983b; Goldston, 1977b; Kessler & Albee, 1975; Klein & Goldston, 1977[b]; Loeber, 1983).

Four different strategies are employed in primary prevention efforts (see Table 2). The first is a systems-level approach that attempts to reform social policy to alleviate human stress (Cowen, 1985, 1986; Kessler & Albee, 1975). The next is an ecological-level approach that strives to transform the atmosphere or the physical surroundings of a location (Felner & Felner, 1989). An example of this would be to restructure a classroom to enhance learning and well-being. The person-centred approach endeavours to enhance the level of competency within individuals (Cowen, 1985, 1986). These are mass targeted efforts to build protective resources. Finally, the last strategy is called the transactional-ecological approach (Felner & Felner, 1989). The transactional-ecological perspective recognizes the benefits of promoting children's adaption as well as altering the children's ecological context. This strategy takes into account the

Table 1

Prevention in Mental Health Approaches

Approach	Is Disorder Present?	Goal	Targets
Tertiary	Yes	Rehabilitate or reduce the effects of a severe dysfunction	Individuals with dysfunction
Secondary	Yes	Reduce duration/lessen consequences of a newly acquired disorder	Individuals with dysfunction
Primary	No	Reduce incidence/promote well-being and protective competencies	Mass Targeted/ Competency enhancement/ Environmental change/ Social change.

Table 2

Primary Prevention Strategies

<u>Strategy</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Focus</u>
System-Level	Society	Reform of Social Policy
Ecological Level	Environment	Changes to Setting
Person-Centred	Individual	Competency Enhancement
Transactional-Ecological	Individual/ Environment	Enhancement and change in individual and milieu.

interdependence of the child and its environment. Because disorders are mediated by many elements, mounting preventive efforts in both realms has been suggested (Weissberg, Caplan & Sivo, 1989).

The Conflict Management Outreach Program presently being evaluated utilizes a primary prevention approach. This program endeavours to promote competencies in the individual child and to promote change within the environment. Thus, this program uses a transactional-ecological strategy.

There has been a tremendous fervour surrounding primary prevention in mental health. Titles from books and journal articles capture this paradigmatic tide. Names such as "Primary Prevention: An idea whose time has come" (Klein & Goldston, 1977[a]); "The Argument for Primary Prevention" (Albee, 1985); "The Wooing of Primary Prevention" (Cowen, 1980); and "Primary Prevention in the Schools: What are we waiting for?" (Zins & Forman, 1988[a]) all indicate the enthusiasm in the field. As well, in Canada, the Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services (1989) has produced a document that recognized the need to encourage and to set guidelines for the burgeoning field of primary prevention. Research also has been conducted advocating for primary prevention efforts (Cowen & Work, 1988; Sterling, Cowen, Weissberg, Lotyczewski & Boike, 1985; Felner, 1984). These studies document the effect of stressful life events on resilient children and have recommended proactive interventions to bolster protective factors.

Some have cautioned that "baby steps" should be taken toward primary prevention efforts because:

Primary prevention is a glittering, diffuse, thoroughly abstract term. Its aura is so exalted that some put it on the same plane as the Nobel prize. It holds the mysterious, exciting promise of 'breakthrough.' It offers a sharp contrast to all that mental health has done, a shadowy, but nevertheless grand, alternative. (Cowen, 1977, p. 1)

Part of taking 'baby steps' involves developing effective primary prevention programs (Baker, Swisher, Nadenichek & Popowicz, 1984; Cowen, 1982; Price, Cowen, Lorion & Ramos-McKay, 1988, 1989). To assess the effectiveness of the Conflict Management Outreach Program, being implemented by a local school board, the present research was initiated.

The next question that guided the development of this program involves the location of service provision - where can assistance for children's conflict management be given?

Interventions in the Schools. A caveat was issued by Urie Bronfenbrenner in the 1970's (1974, 1979), regarding the alienation of children. He believed that young people were failing to integrate into society due in part to the segregating school environment. He felt children were being insulated from the life that they were supposedly being prepared for. He urged educators to prepare children for the demands of living within society. Others also have recognized that it is not sufficient for schools to attend to students' intellectual needs alone (Alpert, 1985; Battistich, Elias & Branden-Muller, 1992; Battistich, Watson, Solomon, Schaps & Solomon, 1991; Elias & Clabby, 1984; Linney, 1989; Pancer & Weinstein, 1987; Zigler, Kagan & Muenchow, 1982). They felt that schools should develop socio-emotional skills in the children, as well as academic ability.

In addition, research has demonstrated that the school environment plays an important role in children's mental health (Cowen, 1977; Cowen & Hightower, 1990). Rutter (1979) reported that schools serve as a protective factor for children who are at risk for maladjustment. He purported, "Good schools can and do exert an important protective effect" (p. 60). Gesten, Flores de Apodaca, Rains, Weissberg, and Cowen (1979) also reported that no other institution plays as large a role in the child's life as does the school. Thus, the Conflict Management Outreach Program was established within learning institutions to foster a salutary environment by promoting conflict management skills.

Schools are a logical site for primary prevention programs because much of children's early lives are spent there (Cowen & Hightower, 1990; Weissberg & Allen, 1986). Further, schools reach all children regardless of age or class (Alpert, 1985; Zigler, Kagan & Muenchow, 1982).

The need to conduct primary prevention programs in learning centres has been widely promoted (Allen, Chinsky, Larcen, Lochman & Selinger, 1976; Alpert, 1985; Bond & Compas, 1989; Shaw & Goodyear, 1984; Zins & Forman, 1988[a]). In addition, journals have dedicated special issues to the study of primary prevention in schools (Barclay, 1984; Zins & Forman, 1988[b]). Their goal was to encourage school personnel to incorporate this alternative approach into their efforts.

Many school interventions have been focused on competency enhancement programs that endeavour to effect change in the individual and in the milieu of the school. The present program is an example of such a program; a primary prevention - school based strategy that promotes conflict management.

The focus of the next section will be to review the method used by the Conflict Management Outreach Program to assist children with their conflicts. This competency enhancement method involves teaching social problem-solving skills to children in their school environment.

Social Problem-Solving

How can we enhance children's lives?

Problem-Solving. One of the first to place theoretical emphasis on the relationship between problem-solving and positive mental health was Jahoda (1958). She highlighted the process of problem-solving, rather than its end product, as the criteria for adjustment. Problem-solving was defined as "a conscious awareness of a problem and an initial intention to deal with this problem" (p. 63). She asserted that the maximal degree of healthy problem-solving combines appropriate feelings and direct problem focus, as well as a tendency to go through

the following stages:

1. awareness of the problem
2. consideration of the means toward a solution
3. making a decision and
4. implementation of the decision.

More recently, research on the vulnerability of children emphasized problem-solving abilities as central to adapting to change and coping with stress (Felner, 1984; Rutter, 1983). A number of theorists and researchers also have maintained that a primary contributor to social competence is a child's capacity for problem-solving (Eisenberg & Harris, 1984; Krasnor, 1985; Shure, 1981).

In the early 1970's, D'Zurilla and Goldfried (1971) expanded Jahoda's work on problem-solving. They defined problem-solving as: a behavioral process, whether overt or cognitive in nature, which (a) makes available a variety of potentially effective response alternatives for dealing with the problematic situation and (b) increases the probability of selecting the most effective response from among these various alternatives. (p. 108)

For them the problem-solving process consisted of five steps:

1. general orientation--the assumption that problem situations are a normal part of life and that one can cope with such situations
2. problem definition and formulation--definition of the problem in concrete terms
3. generation of alternatives--brainstorming all possible solutions
4. decision making--evaluating each alternative in terms of its likelihood of solving the problem and
5. verification--acting on the decision and evaluating the extent to which the decision was a good one.

The theoretical work of D'Zurilla and Goldfried has influenced virtually

all of today's successful problem-solving programs (Gesten, Weissberg, Amish & Smith, 1987).

Earlier work (Davis, 1966; Gagné, 1977) focused on problem-solving in the non-social context, such as puzzles, mazes and anagrams. Evidence did not demonstrate that the ability to solve impersonal tasks also would translate to an ability to handle interpersonal tasks (Spivack & Shure, 1974). Thus, research and interventions were devised that focused on interpersonal cognitive problem-solving skills (ICPS) or social problem-solving skills (SPS) to ameliorate children's social encounters.

The Conflict Management Outreach Program, that promotes student's conflict management through problem-solving techniques, was developed as a function of this research and the seminal work of Spivack and Shure, as well as Weissberg and his colleagues.

Spivack and Shure's work will be the focus of the next section. This will be followed by an examination of the contribution of Weissberg and his colleagues. For a comprehensive review of other research in this area, please refer to Pellegrini & Urbain (1985), Spivack & Shure (1982), Urbain & Kendall (1980), and Urbain & Savage (1989).

Interpersonal Cognitive Problem-Solving Skills (ICPS). One of the more prolific and influential research groups in the area of social problem-solving is based at Hahnemann University and is led by George Spivack and Myrna Shure. They proposed that the capacity to solve interpersonal problems is mediated by a set of interrelated ICPS skills (Shure & Spivack, 1987; Spivack, Platt & Shure, 1976). These are:

1. Generation of alternate solutions--the ability to generate a variety of solutions to problems
2. Consideration of consequences of social acts--the tendency to consider the consequences of one's social actions on oneself and others and the ability to generate a range of possible consequences for a completed action

3. Development of means-end thinking--the ability to generate the step-by-step means by which an interpersonal problem could be resolved
4. Development of social-causal thinking--the recognition that one's actions and feelings are reciprocally related to the actions and feeling of others.

The ICPS approach focuses upon how people think, not what they think, about their conflicts. This approach assumes that the ability to think straight also paves the way for emotional relief (Shure & Spivack, 1988). This is the opposite view to the widely held idea that relieving emotional tension paves the way to clear thinking. Emphasis is placed on developing adaptive cognitive processes as opposed to adaptive behaviours. The goal of the strategy is to generate a way to think and to use one's individual beliefs to guide decision making (Spivack & Shure, 1982). Underlying this goal is the assumption that teaching social cognitive skills will radiate to behavioral change. It is hoped that children will become better problem-solvers in the future and will develop the confidence to face interpersonal conflicts successfully by learning these ICPS abilities (Michelson & Mannarino, 1986).

Shure and Spivack have worked extensively with young urban, poor children. In a series of 46 lessons and activities led by classroom teachers, pre-school children were taught two skills believed to be critical to social competence: alternative solutions and consequential thinking (Spivack & Shure, 1974). The first group of lessons (approximately 10-12 lessons) focused on basic language and thinking skills. The next group (approximately 20 lessons) focused on identifying feelings within themselves and within others. The final set of lessons (approximately 15 lessons) pertain to the two major interpersonal problem-solving skills, as mentioned above. In addition to the formal lessons, the teachers used "dialoguing" to help the children employ the problem-solving skills in their daily lives.

Dialoguing refers to the teacher's verbal assistance of the child's problem-solving skills (Shure & Spivack, 1987; Spivack & Shure, 1982). It is a structured process that helps the child conform their thoughts to the problem-solving steps (see D'Zurilla & Goldfried, 1971, above for steps).

The results from this intervention demonstrated positive correlations between overt behavioural adjustment, as measured by teacher ratings, and the ability to generate alternative solutions and anticipate consequences (Spivack & Shure, 1974). Specifically, ICPS training resulted in significant increases in problem-solving ability. The effects were still present a year later (Shure & Spivack, 1982). As well, these newly acquired skills were found to mediate healthy behavioural functioning, independent of intelligence. Stated differently, interpersonal cognitive problem-solving skills were found to be independent of a normal-range of intellectual abilities (Spivack, Platt & Shure, 1976).

Spivack and Shure's work has been both praised and criticized. Their contributions include: (a) establishment of social competence promotion in the schools, (b) implementation of cost-effective primary prevention programs, (c) development and dissemination of detailed practical training manuals and materials, and finally, (d) the spawning of many programs and treatise in problem-solving research. Criticisms of their work involve: (a) the absence of attention-placebo control groups in many studies, (b) the heavy reliance on potentially biased teacher behaviour ratings, and, (c) the fact that not all replications have been successful. Refer to Denham & Almeida (1987), Durlak (1983), Pellegrini & Urbain (1985), and Urbain & Kendall (1980) for reviews of ICPS effects. Overall, these reviews indicate that in spite of these criticisms, the model and interventions delineated by Shure and Spivack show reliable effects across studies.

Other programs have been modelled closely on the work by the

Hahnemann cadre (e.g., Allen, Chinsky, Larcen, Lochman & Selinger, 1976; McClure, Chinsky & Larcen, 1978). One of the programs that was influenced by Spivack and Shure's work is the Rochester Social Problem-Solving Training program developed by Weissberg and his colleagues (Gesten, Flores De Apodaca, Rains, Weissberg & Cowen, 1979; Weissberg, Gesten, Carnrike, et al., 1981; Weissberg Gesten, Rapkin, et al., 1981).

Social Problem-Solving (SPS). A pilot project to teach conflict resolution strategies to children began the work by Weissberg and his colleagues at the University of Rochester (Gesten, Flores De Apodaca, Rains, Weissberg & Cowen, 1979). This project led to the implementation of a SPS intervention in elementary schools (Gesten, Rains, Rapkin, Weissberg, Flores de Apodaca, Cowen & Bowen, 1982). Components of the program included both cognitive problem solving skills (e.g., alternative solutions and consequential thinking) as well as a sequential SPS process. The sequential steps were as follows:

1. Look for signs of upset feelings
2. Say exactly what the problem is
3. Decide on your goal
4. Stop and think before you act
5. Think of as many solutions as you can
6. Think ahead to what might happen next
7. When you have a really good solution, try it
8. If your first solution doesn't work, try again.

This procedure modifies and expands D'Zurilla and Goldfried's steps to problem-solving (Gesten, Flores De Apodaca, Rains, Weissberg & Cowen, 1979). The program emphasizes both skills and the conflict management process to aid children in applying and adapting the skills to real life problems.

While Spivack and Shure's program emphasized cognitive skills, SPS emphasized the integration of the cognitive, affective, and behavioural dimensions of problem-solving (Gesten, Weissberg, Amish & Smith, 1987).

Moreover, Spivack and Shure theorized that adjustment is improved through changes in the individual's ability to think, and not through direct behavioural modification. The SPS method contends that social adjustment is mediated through the interaction of the cognitive, affective, and behavioural domains. This is apparent in the problem-solving process where carrying out a strategy necessitates behavioural competence (see step 7 and Weissberg, 1985 for a discussion). Though SPS is based on the formulations of Spivack and Shure, the program differences warranted the use of another name (i.e., SPS rather than ICPS) (Weissberg, 1985).

Three successive implementations and modifications of the SPS program have been conducted (Gesten, Flores De Apodaca, Rains, Weissberg & Cowen, 1979; Weissberg, Gesten, Carnrike, et. al., 1981; Weissberg, Gesten, Rapkin, et. al., 1981). In their first effort, 17 lessons were utilized that focused on identification of feelings and problems, generation of alternative solutions, consideration of consequences, and the integration of problem-solving behaviour. Results indicated that the trained children improved more on a variety of SPS skills compared to those in the comparison groups. However, the children did not receive higher behaviour-adjustment ratings by their teachers. At the one-year follow-up, the program children maintained their advantage over the comparison groups regarding the skills, but did not have a significantly greater improvement on adjustment measures.

The second intervention lengthened the program from 17 lessons to 52 (Weissberg, Gesten, Rapkin, et. al., 1981). Subjects were low-income, black, urban children and middle-income, white, suburban children. Both sets of children showed significant improvement on several cognitive skills; however, only the suburban children received positive adjustment ratings from their teachers. By contrast, urban children declined in their adjustment ratings. These findings were interpreted as being a result of the differences in the suburban and

urban teachers' reactions to the intervention. As well, they demonstrate the complexity of conducting SPS interventions in the schools.

The third study involved reducing the number of lessons from 52 to 42 (Weissberg, Gesten, Carnrike, et. al., 1981). Stronger emphasis was placed on modelling conflict resolution skills and the number of aggressive solutions generated was limited. It was found that second-to fourth-grade children showed improvement in problem-solving skills as well as in teacher adjustment ratings, over the comparison group. Nevertheless, no relationship was found between the SPS skills and adjustment gains.

While the three evaluations showed inconsistent adjustment gains, they also demonstrated improved program effectiveness as refinements were made (Weissberg & Gesten, 1982). Weissberg and Gesten caution that it is unrealistic to expect behavioural changes in propaedeutic interventions -- it takes time for new programs to promote change.

Weissberg and Gesten (1982) believe that the most important contribution of the Rochester group is their development and subsequent alteration of social competency programs. Thus, they recognized the merits of evaluation to guide program changes and to assess the effectiveness of social competence/conflict management interventions.

In summary, the Conflict Management Outreach Program is based on the work of Spivack and Shure, as well as Weissberg and his colleagues. This program seeks to enhance social competency in children by focusing on the social task of conflict management. The strategy employed by the program is to promote change in the child and their environment by teaching social problem-solving skills to children in their schools. The hope is to avert adjustment problems in the future by developing the protective resources of interpersonal conflict management skills in elementary students.

The next section will explore the Conflict Management Outreach

Program, its history and its components. This will be followed by a review of the key program evaluation terms and then the evaluation recommendations.

Conflict Management Outreach Program

Twenty years ago the Ottawa branch of the Canadian Mental Health Association and the Ottawa Board of Education saw the need for primary prevention within the schools. With this purpose in mind, the Children Learning for Living program was developed. This program involves the use of Mental Health Workers who are assigned to particular elementary schools. Eighteen schools in the Ottawa Board of Education now have a Mental Health Worker (1995-1996). They instruct and coordinate three key components of the intervention. These include a curriculum of ten life-skill lessons appropriate for each grade level, a child and family resource centre, and a school-wide program aimed at conflict management. Due to the growing desire for conflict management training in the schools that did not have a Mental Health Worker, in 1992 one Mental Health Worker was assigned to coordinate a Conflict Management Outreach Program. This program is based on the conflict management component of the Children Learning for Living program.

A curriculum manual was developed to guide the implementation of the Conflict Management Outreach Program (Silverman, 1993; please refer to Appendix S). The manual is comprised of six lessons for the primary grades and six lessons for the junior grades. The lessons have an accompanying poster that gives a visual reminder and focus to the instructions. Each depicts an aspect of the social problem-solving process: 1) Calming Down Ideas, 2) Feelings, 3) "I" Talk, 4) Steps to Problem-solving, 5) Constructive Ways to Handle Conflict, and 6) Steps for Managing Conflict. Reinforcement work sheets for each lesson also are provided.

Teachers, principals and support staff are given a one-day

training session by the Outreach Worker so they can implement the program by themselves with accuracy. In the training, clarification is made between the terms discipline and problem-solving. When a child breaks a school rule (e.g., fighting), the teacher first disciplines that behaviour (e.g., send them to the office). After the child is disciplined, then there is a possibility to use the problem-solving skills to help the child avoid the same outcome in the future. This is an important distinction because problem-solving does not replace discipline. However, problem-solving can be an important follow-up. Teachers are instructed on the appropriate times to use the problem-solving techniques.

The Outreach Worker further supports the staff by assisting them in teaching the first and last lessons in every classroom. They also supply resources and regularly visit the schools to provide encouragement and aid. Within the classroom, a "problem-solving area" is set up where the posters are displayed and the children are encouraged to visit if they have a problem. This acts as a physical and a visual reminder of the steps to resolving conflicts.

After the six lessons have been taught, class-wide and school-wide booster activities are initiated. This encourages the use of the skills after the lessons have been completed and fosters a peaceful school climate. During the first or second year of the program, parents also are offered the opportunity to learn the skills to extend the skills to the home environment. Thus, the classroom, the school and the home are all given the vocabulary and the tools to promote peaceful problem-solving.

Table 3 displays the three social problem-solving programs for comparison. They are ICPS (Spivack & Shure, 1974), SPS (Weissberg, et.al.) and the Conflict Management Outreach Program (Silverman, 1993). The table illustrates the different focuses, assumptions, emphasis, lesson units, lesson number, and teaching strategies of the three

Spivack and Shure (1974)	Weissberg and Colleagues ('81)	Silverman (1993)
ICPS = Interpersonal Cognitive Problem-Solving Skills	SPS = Social Problem-Solving Skills	Based on Weissberg et al.'s work. Called problem-solving.
Focus: Discrete Skills	Focus: Process of SPS	Focus: Process+Calming Down
Assumptions: That the ability to think straight paves the way for emotional relief. Teaching social cognitive skills will radiate to behavioral change.	Assumptions: Ability to think and act appropriately will facilitate development. Social adjustment is mediated by the Cognitive Affective and Behaviour.	Assumptions: Same as Weissberg et al. and in order to think clearly, you must calm down.
Emphasis: On developing adaptive cognitive processes as opposed to adaptive behaviours. Focus is upon HOW people think, not WHAT they think.	Emphasis: Both the skills and the conflict management process were emphasized. Constructive solutions encouraged.	Emphasis: Calming down. Constructive solutions given. Different units for different ages.
Units: 3 major units 1. Basic Language 2. Identifying Feelings 3. Alternative solutions and Consequential thinking.	Units: 5 Major units 1. Feelings Recognition 2. Problem Sensing/Identification 3. Alternative Solutions 4. Consequences 5. Problem-Solving Behaviour	Units: 6 Major Units -Primary 1. Calming Down Ideas 2. Identifying Feelings 3. "I" Talk 4. Conflict Strategies 5. Brainstorming 6. 3 steps to Conflict Management
Number of Lessons -46	Number of Lessons -42	Number of Lessons -6
Teaching Strategy: Dialoguing	Teaching Strategy: Role-Play Dialoguing/Modelling "Encore" Activities	Teaching Strategies: Same as Weissberg et al. plus the use of a Problem-Solving Area

programs.

Although substantially shorter than the other two programs, the Conflict Management Outreach Program addresses the different developmental levels of the students by having a primary and a junior set of lessons. The advent of the problem-solving area within the classroom also presents an opportunity for the children to reinforce the problem-solving steps on their own. The students fill out the sheets that contain the problem-solving steps to continue the lessons and to expand the modelling of the skills.

The goals of the Conflict Management Outreach Program are:

- To develop within the school a common language and a process that all students and staff can use to resolve problems
- To encourage students to learn more constructive ways of handling conflicts and
- To encourage students to handle their everyday conflicts and problems on their own.

The next section reviews program evaluation and is followed by the evaluation considerations for the present research.

Program Evaluation

Evaluation is a broad term that encompasses many events. For example, university students have been asked to evaluate their professors and merchandisers have requested that we sample (or evaluate) their products. For clarification, two more precise terms have been used interchangeably in the evaluation literature (Babbie, 1989; Rutman, 1984). These terms are evaluation research and program evaluation. For the present treatise, program evaluation will be employed.

Program evaluation refers to "the use of scientific methods to measure the implementation and outcomes of programs for decision-making purposes" (Rutman, 1984, p. 10). While other types of evaluations that do not emphasize scientific methods have been developed (see Herman, Lyons Morris & Fitz-Gibbon, 1987 and Smith & Glass, 1987 for reviews), the present overview will focus on scientific program evaluations.

During the lifetime of a program, accountability for its impact has become a necessary phase (Lorion, 1983). However, each stage in the development of a program entails different considerations. Programs are initiated, planned, implemented, and evaluated and then changes are made. This process is cyclical in that each phase affects the one that follows (Cowen, 1984; Price & Smith, 1985). Program evaluations usually take place during the program's implementation and outcome phases. Information gleaned from this research can then be used to alter program plans so that improvements can be made.

Assessment of the program's implementation has been referred to as a formative evaluation (Scriven, 1967, as cited in Weiss, 1972). Formative information describes or analyses how the program was conducted (Herman, Lyons Morris & Fritz-Gibbon, 1987). The focus is on providing information to planners and implementers so improvements in the program delivery can be made.

The program's outcomes are assessed using the summative strategy (Scriven, 1967, as cited in Weiss, 1972). This approach assesses the quality and the impact of the program for accountability and policy making. Table 4 presents the comparative emphases in formative and summative evaluations. Herman, Lyons Morris and Fitz-Gibbon (1987) have noted that it is rare to find an evaluation that does not include both formative and summative evaluation components. Thus, program evaluations can have a multiplicity of purposes. Understanding the differences between these two types of assessment may help investigators decide which type of evaluation to emphasize (Herman, Lyons Morris &

Table 4

Emphases in Formative vs. Summative Evaluations

	Formative -----	Summative -----
Primary Emphasis In Data Collection	Clarification of goals + implementation problems The nature of program process/implementation Micro-level analyses of implementation and outcomes	Documentation of Outcomes Documentation of Implementation Macro-level analyses of implementation + outcomes
Primary Role of Evaluator	Interactive	Independent
Typical Methodology	Emphasis in Qualitative and then Quantitative	Emphasis on Quantitative enriched by Qualitative

SOURCE: Adapted from Herman, Lyons Morris & Fitz-Gibbon, 1987.

Fitz-Gibbon, 1987).

For the present research, focus was placed upon summative data. Formative information also was used to enhance the understanding of the program's outcomes.

Setting research boundaries has proven to be one of the challenges that investigators encounter when planning an evaluation (Herman, Lyons Morris & Fitz-Gibbon, 1987; Quinn Patton, 1984; Weiss, 1972). Deciding what to assess, how to assess it, who to assess and when to assess, involves difficult decisions. Careful examination of the program and its expected outcomes has been emphasized (Babbie, 1989; Herman, Lyons Morris & Fitz-Gibbon, 1987; Linney, 1989; Rutman, 1984; Weiss, 1972). Furthermore, recommendations from previous evaluation research has been used to facilitate the design process. An overview of the Conflict Management Outreach Program, its theoretical underpinnings and its goals have already been addressed. Therefore, the next section will address the evaluation considerations of the present research.

Evaluation Considerations

Social programs are complex undertakings (Weiss, 1972). Their complexity necessitates identifying evaluative guidelines to help elucidate a program's significance. Proposals have been suggested that have heuristic value for the present research. The recommendations that guided the current research design include:

- assessment of the program's fidelity,
- assessment of program goals and multiple personal resources,
- assessment of multiple sources, levels, and methods, and
- the development of an evaluative model.

A discussion of each of these issues follows.

Program Fidelity

Program fidelity refers to whether or not the program was implemented as prescribed. As noted earlier, formative evaluations provide information about the intervention's procedural integrity. Many researchers have advocated that the program's fidelity must be evaluated (Battistich, Watson, Soloman, Schaps & Soloman, 1991; Battistich, Elias & Branden-Muller, 1992; Durlak, 1985; Fitz-Gibbon & Lyons Morris, 1987; Jason, Durlak & Holton-Walker, 1984; Linney 1989; Lorion, 1987; Pellegrini, 1987; Rutman, 1984; Weissberg & Allen, 1986; Weissberg, Caplan & Sivo, 1989). Nonetheless, a neglected area of research has been program implementation (Durlak, 1985).

A caveat was offered by Rutman in 1984. He speculated that a failure to look at a program's implementation can restrict causality statements. Rutman proposed that if nonsignificant program effects were found, this result could be due to the inefficacious program or due to the program being poorly implemented. Jason, Thompson and Rose (1986) also advised monitoring the treatment's integrity. They suggested that:

If the treatment procedures are implemented in a way different from what had been proposed, or the procedures lack careful specification, then it will be difficult, if not impossible to determine what were the factors accounting for the outcome. (p. 12)

Thus, for the present research, the program's procedures and the outcomes were assessed concurrently.

Goal Attainment and Personal-Resources Assessment

A common question posed by researchers has been: to what extent does the program succeed in reaching its objectives (Gesten, Flores De Apodaca, Rains, Weissberg & Cowen, 1979; Pellegrini, 1987; Price & Smith, 1985; Weiss, 1972). While goal attainment is the primary purpose of an evaluation, it is not the only effect a program can have (Caplan &

Weissberg, 1989; Weissberg & Allen, 1986; Weissberg, Caplan & Sivo, 1989). Problem-solving in real life situations has been characterized as a complex interplay between a child's affect, their cognitions and their behaviours (Butler & Meichenbaum, 1981; Goldfried & D'Zurilla, 1969). Each of these three areas is comprised of a vast array of potential mediator variables theorized to be enhanced by a social problem-solving (SPS) program. Weissberg and his colleagues have labelled these mediator variables as "personal resources" (Caplan & Weissberg, 1989; Weissberg, Caplan & Sivo, 1989). Each personal resource area (affective, cognitive, behaviour) will be addressed in turn with reference to the potential changes.

Affective Personal Resources (Feelings Identification, Self-Efficacy and Motivation). Affective competence has been identified as a critical social-cognitive problem-solving skill (Elias & Clabby, 1984) and as a criterion for positive mental health (Jahoda, 1958). Being able to recognize affective states when dealing with social and emotional problems has been emphasized by Pancer and Weinstein (1987). While feelings identification is important for affective competence, it is not the only personal resource that SPS programs have been hypothesized to effect (Caplan & Weissberg, 1989; Weissberg, Caplan & Sivo, 1989). Other affective personal resources include feelings of self-efficacy and feelings of motivation.

Enhancement of self-efficacy has been shown to be a protective factor for children (Rutter, 1987). As well, Weissberg, Caplan and Sivo (1989) advised that having a sense of effectiveness is a key objective for mental health interventions. Butler and Meichenbaum (1981) have proposed that self-appraisals may successfully predict effective problem-solving behaviour. Thus, the children's sense of efficacy regarding their conflict situations was assessed.

Enhancing or evaluating a child's motivation has been another key element in problem-solving research. Schneider (1989) contended that

programs should actively encourage and motivate their participants. As well, others have noted that children who do not possess the motivation to learn the skills will unduly affect a program's impact (Cowen, 1985; Sarason, 1981).

Therefore, feelings identification, feelings of self efficacy and motivation were utilized as potential outcomes for the present research.

Cognitive Personal Resources (Problem-Solving Skill, Knowledge and Attitudes). Cognitive resources proposed to be influenced by SPS programs are the participant's problem-solving skill (generation of alternative solutions), their knowledge of the program's components and their attitudes (Weiss, 1972; Weissberg, Caplan & Sivo, 1989). There has been evidence that the ability to give alternative solutions plays a significant part in social adjustment (Spivack & Shure, 1982). Changes in a person's attitudes and knowledge have been hypothesized as necessary preconditions for changes in behaviour (Weiss, 1972). In addition, attitudes or beliefs have been found to mitigate conflict situations (Caplan & Weissberg, 1989; Weissberg, Caplan & Sivo, 1987). Hence, the children's problem-solving skill, knowledge and attitudes towards conflicts were assessed.

Behavioural Personal Resources. The last area of potential program impact is the behavioural area. The ultimate goal of most problem-solving programs has been to demonstrate improved behavioural adjustment (Spivack & Shure, 1974; Weissberg, Gesten, Carnrike, et al., 1981; Weissberg Gesten, Rapkin, et al., 1981). Nonetheless, the attainment of this goal is difficult to establish. Still, assessment of behavioural gains is essential (Butler & Meichenbaum, 1981). Increased assertiveness, skill use and independent problem-solving are the behavioural domains that were assessed in the present study.

Most of the variables discussed so far (e.g., attitudes) can be seen as bridging variables (Weiss, 1972). Bridging variables such as attitudes, self-efficacy, motivation and assertiveness are presumed to

assist in skill acquisition and behaviour changes (Caplan & Weissberg, 1989; Weiss, 1972; Weissberg, Caplan & Sivo, 1989). These bridging variables serve as exploratory or supplemental goals for the present program.

Thus, the present research evaluated whether the program obtained its goals. As well, the cognitive, affective and behavioural resources of the participants were assessed. Specifically, the exploratory goals (or personal resources) of increased attitudes, self-efficacy, motivation and assertiveness were assessed.

Multiple Sources, Levels and Methods of Assessment

As mentioned at the beginning of this introduction, many researchers have advocated evaluations with multiple sources (e.g., students, teachers, principals), multiple methods (e.g., self-reports and interviews) and multiple levels (e.g., individual and environment) of assessment (Allen, Chinsky, Larcen, Lochman & Selinger, 1976; Finch, & Rogers, 1984; Hops, 1982; Kelly, 1971; Kendall, 1981; Kendall, Pellegrini & Urbain, 1981; La Greca, 1990; Linney, 1989; Lorion, 1983, 1987; Ollendick & Hersen, 1984; Pellegrini, 1987; Pellegrini & Urbain, 1985; Price & Smith, 1985; Schneider, 1993; Seidman, 1987; Urbain & Savage, 1989; Weissberg, Caplan, Sivo, 1989; Weissberg & Gesten, 1982; Wodarski, 1989).

This comprehensive investigation provides several different perspectives of the program's potential effectiveness. Due to the multifaceted causation of social competence, an extensive program evaluation design was employed.

Evaluative Model

The need for an evaluative model stems from the work of Seidman (1987), and Swift and Healey (1986). Their work on building a framework for primary prevention research outlined the exigency of a research

model. As Weiss (1972) cogently pointed out, "what looks elementary in theory turns out in practice to be a demanding enterprise. Programs are nowhere near as neat and accommodating as the evaluator expects" (p. 25). Each element presumed to be affected by a program has to be classified and assessed (Weiss, 1972). Consequently, an evaluative model was developed to assist the present research. This model will be presented in the next section.

Conflict Management Outreach Program

Summative Evaluation Model

Purpose: The purpose of the present research was:

- To determine if the program was implemented with fidelity and
- To determine whether the program successfully accomplished its articulated goals and the exploratory goals posited by the present researcher.

For the students, impact was assessed in three different areas: cognitive, affective and behaviour.

As well, multiple sources of program impact were assessed (students, teachers and principals); along with multiple methods (self-reports and interviews) and multiple assessment levels (individual and environment).

Please refer to Table 5 for an overview of this model. Table 5 illustrates the multiple levels (individual / environmental) and sources (students / staff) of data collection. The area (affective / cognitive / behaviour) that is to be measured and the specific domains (e.g., motivation) addressed are the next two regions. Finally, the goals of the present program and the method (questionnaire / interview) used to access the goals are given.

The legend is given on the page that follows Table 5.

Table 5

Level	Source	Area	Domain	Goal	Method
Individual	Students	Affective	Interview - Feelings Identification	E	I
			Self Efficacy	E	Q
			Motivation	E	Q
		Cognitive	Interview - Problem-Solving Skill	1	I
			Test of Knowledge	1,2	Q
			Attitudes	E	Q
		Behaviour	Interview - Problem-Resolution	3	I
			Assertive Behaviour	E	Q
			Use of Skills	1,3	Q
			Children's Independent Problem-Solving	3	Q
Environment	Teachers and Principals		Modelling of Skills	1	Q
		Students	School Climate	E	Q
			School Climate	E	Q

Table 5 Continued

Legend:

Goal #1: To develop within the school a common language and a process that all students and staff can use to resolve problems.

Goal #2: To encourage students to learn more constructive ways of handling conflicts.

Goal #3: To encourage students to handle everyday conflicts and problems on their own.

E = Exploratory Research Goal

Q = Questionnaire Data

I = Interview Data

Hypotheses

It was anticipated that the program would be implemented with fidelity and that the goals of the program would be obtained.

As well, the program's exploratory goals were expected to be influenced by the Conflict Management Outreach Program. Specifically, expectations were:

- The students would become more assertive (i.e., less aggressive and/or less passive) due to the program.
- The students' attitudes towards conflicts would be improved.
- Perception of their school climate would improve for both students and teachers, and
- Their feelings identification, feelings of efficacy toward conflict situations and their motivation to handle them peacefully would improve or remain high throughout the program.

The staff are expected to model the skills and to observe a change in how the children handle their conflicts.

Conclusion

Therefore, the purpose of the present study is to evaluate the effectiveness of a six lesson, social problem-solving based, social competency-primary prevention intervention in elementary schools.

Method

Participants

Initially the sample consisted of 199 students in grades 4-6, 30 teachers and 4 principals from 4 Ottawa area. Two schools that received the Conflict Management Outreach Program were selected (student $n = 98$) and two schools acted as comparison (student $n = 101$). Selection of the comparison schools was based upon their similarity with the Program schools in the areas of SES, age, and gender of the students (see Appendix A). As well, it was determined that no other competency programs were operating within these schools. Due to subject mortality at post-test time, the final sample consisted of 184 students (program $n = 89$; comparison $n = 95$). Therefore, the sample of students decreased by less than 0.1%. The teachers and principals who participated at pre-test also completed the post-test measures.

The mean age for the grade 4 students ($n = 63$) was 9 years ($SD = .46$), for the grade 5 students ($n = 58$) was 10 years ($SD = .47$), and for the 6 students ($n = 63$) was 11 years ($SD = .50$). There were 96 female students and 88 male students. The participants were of mixed race and from primarily middle to lower socioeconomic class.

Letters and consent forms were sent home with the children to their Parents or Guardians (see Appendix B). Each child received two consent forms; one for consent to fill out the questionnaire and another for consent to participate in the open-ended interview. Junior teachers were provided with a set of stickers to encourage the children to return the forms. When the forms were returned, a sticker was placed beside a child's name. Also, new forms were given to children who had not returned the forms within a week.

The sets of questionnaires were administered to the children and teachers immediately before the program was implemented and again six months after the program was implemented. Principals completed a monthly form. A set of sign-up sheets were given to each junior teacher

in the program schools to be used in the problem-solving area. These were to be collected weekly by the teacher to determine if the children were using the area.

In the potential test schools, for many of the students, English was not their first language. Therefore, prior to the administration of the test material, each junior teacher was asked to determine if the participating children had the ability to complete the measures. Due to the heavy language component in the measures, only the responses of the children deemed to be capable of completing the tests were used. Please refer to Appendix O for internal/external validity threats.

For the open-ended interviewing after recess, participants were randomly selected from the participating students. Five subjects per grade were assessed prior to the implementation and then again six months later (N= 60). Due to one subject moving, one student per grade was randomly excluded from the interview data analysis (N = 48). There were 22 males and 26 females who participated in the interviews (age M = 10).

Design

A quasi-experimental, non-equivalent groups, pre- and post-test design was conducted (Cook & Campbell, 1979).

Part A: Student Questionnaire Package

Procedure

Students were administered the questionnaires in the classroom 1/2 an hour before recess and 1/2 an hour after recess during pre and post testing. The time of day was determined by each teacher. Masters students in psychology administered the tests orally in groups to the junior grades. Each questionnaire and its instructions had been reviewed by educators and pilot tested to determine its suitability for junior grades. Every effort was made to make the questions simple and

straight-forward. To reduce the amount of unanswered questions, the students were asked periodically to check their questionnaire package for omissions. As well, all the students' answers were kept confidential. (please refer to General Instructions, Appendix C and the Debriefing, Appendix N).

Description of Measures

The Children's Assertive Behavior Scale - CABS. (Michelson & Wood, 1982). (see Appendix D) This questionnaire presents 27 scenarios with 5 possible answers for each question. For each scenario the child is asked what they would usually do. Responses range from a very passive response (scored -2), a partially passive response (scored -1), an assertive response (scored 0), a partially aggressive response (scored +1), and a very aggressive response (scored +2). Subjects obtain an assertiveness (total) score as well as a passive and aggressive score. Grades 4-6 have been tested using this measure in a number of studies. Internal consistency is in the range .78-.80. Test-retest reliability over 4 weeks is .66-.87. Concurrent validity has been established with behavioural observations and peer, parent, and teacher ratings of social skill. Convergent validity has been established with measures of social competence. Factor analysis revealed homogeneous factor structure. The CABS has demonstrated that it will differentiate children trained in social skills from children untrained in social skills (Michelson & Wood, 1980).

Conflict Management Motivation - CMM. (Astri, unpublished - see Appendix E) To assess children's motivation to handle their upset feeling peacefully, the present measure was developed by this author. The children are asked about their upset feelings and about the importance of handling their upset feelings peacefully.

The School Climate Questionnaire - SCLIM. (Lam, 1989[a] - see Appendix F) This questionnaire was developed by Lam for use with peer mediation programs. It is designed to assess changes in the general

student body's opinion of their school that might be attributed to the school conflict management program. The authors suggest that this measure may tap the more subtle changes in attitude and behaviour that occur as a result of a conflict management program. It is designed to be administered to the whole student body or a random sample of the student population (and to teachers and staff) both before the program is introduced and at least a semester after it has been operating. The authors note the necessity of a control group in order to separate out change due to the program and change due to other factors such as maturation, learning etc. Information on reliability and validity are not available.

The Student's Attitudes About Conflict Scale - SAAC. (Jenkins & Smith, 1987 - see Appendix G). This questionnaire was developed as part of a package of instruments designed to evaluate school mediation programs. Using seven areas of program impact (1. problem-solving knowledge, 2. development of communication skills, 3. attitudes and behaviour toward conflict and violence, 4. improved self-concept and personal outlook, 5. peer relations, 6. attachment to others and 7. commitment to school activities) for guidance a 32-item measure was developed. Children are asked to complete a four-point Likert scale with strongly agree and strongly disagree as endpoints. The items were pretested on 1200 children in grades 4-12. A total score and four factors scores: 1. self-concept & peer relations, 2. school attachment & commitment, 3. conflict resolution & problem solving and 4. perceptions of social skills, can be calculated. Internal consistency reliability is .83 for the total score and .72, .75, .71 and .50 for each of the four factors respectively. No validity data is reported.

Peaceful Problem-Solving Abilities Scale - PPSAS. (Daniels & Astri, unpublished - see Appendix H) This questionnaire was developed by this author and her advisor to assess student's feelings of efficacy towards peaceful problem solving. They are asked to place an "X" beside

the words that best describe what they feel they can do regarding conflict situations. For example, they are asked, if someone calls them a name, can they do something peaceful about that or can't they do anything peaceful about that. Examples were chosen based on conflict situations used in the program.

Test of Knowledge. (see Appendix I) A test of knowledge developed in concert with the Mental Health Program was administered to the children who took part in the conflict management program. This test was used to assess the children's knowledge acquisition. It was comprised of ten questions for the junior grades.

Program Post-test Supplemental Questions - POSTQ. (see Appendix J) Supplemental questions were added to the post-test package for the program students only. They were based on the questions found in Lam, 1989[a]. The students were asked specific questions pertaining to their school climate since the implementation of the program.

Part B: Open-Ended Interview

Procedure

A random sample of students were assessed after recess for conflict management skills (see Appendix K). Based on the problem-solving steps, children were asked about how they handled a problem they had recently. Questions involved problem and feelings identification, alternative solutions generated and the outcome of the problem. A 4th year psychology student (who was blind to the experimental condition) collected the data. The students were told prior to the assessment that there was a possibility that they would be asked to answer some questions for the researcher after recess. Teachers were informed prior to recess, of the child that would be interviewed. The questioning took approximately 5-10 minutes and was held in a private area. A tape recorder was utilized to record the responses of the child as they discussed their conflict episode. Blind ratings of the content of the

child's conflict incident were conducted. Inter-rater reliability was calculated.

Teacher Pre- and Post- tests Measures

Procedure

Teachers were given prior to the intervention a set of questionnaires encompassing the School Climate Questionnaire (SCLIM) (Lam, 1989[a]), and Causes, Locations and Outcome Measure (CLO) (Araki, 1990; Jenkins & Smith, 1987) (see Appendix L). During post-testing, program teachers were given supplemental questions to the School Climate Questionnaire and asked to fill out implementation-frequency data. This took approximately five minutes for each administration. The supplemental questions were the same as the students' version but the last two questions were teacher ratings of the children's use of the skills, and ratings of their use of the skills.

The problem-solving area sign-up sheets were also collected at the post-test. These sign-up sheets were used to glean whether the children used the problem-solving area or not.

Principal Monthly Report Form

Procedure

Principals were asked to fill out a monthly report form indicating the number of conflicts that were brought to their attention that they felt could have been solved by students themselves - Conflict # (see Appendix M). Also, they received the Causes, Locations and Outcome Measure (CLO) (Araki, 1990; Jenkins & Smith, 1987) to determine the types of conflicts they were observing.

Principals in the program schools were also asked to indicate the number of conflicts that they were able to use the conflict management charts to help resolve the problem. From December, 1994, until May, 1995, principals receiving the program were also asked to indicate the number of school-wide booster activities that were implemented during

the month. At post-test, they were given the same set of supplemental questions that the teachers were receiving. This was used to determine their overall feelings about the program and whether they modelled the program's concepts.

Methodology Summary

Please refer to Table 6 for a summary of the evaluative plan for the students, the teachers and the principals.

Table 6

Methodology OverviewStudents'
Questionnaires - n = 184

	Pre-test	Post-test	Program & Comparison	Program Only
CABS	X	X	X	
CMM	X	X	X	
SCLIM	X	X	X	
SAAC	X	X	X	
PPSAS	X	X	X	
Test of Knowledge	X	X		X
POSTQ		X		X

Students'
Interviews - n = 48

	Pre-test	Post-test	Program & Comparison	Program Only
Interviews	X	X	X	

Teachers'
Questionnaire - n = 30

	Pre-test	Post-test	Program & Comparison	Program Only
SCLIM	X	X	X	
CLO	X	X	X	
POSTQ		X		X
Implementation Data		X		X
Weekly Problem- Solving Sheets		Collected		X

Table 6 (continued)

Methodology Overview**Principals'****Questionnaire - n = 4**

	Monthly	Post-Test	Program & Comparison	Program Only
Conflict #	X		X	
Poster Use	X			X
# of School-Wide Boosters	X			X
CLO	X		X	
POSTQ		X		X

Results

The results are organized in relation to the two guiding research questions of program fidelity and program impact. First, the findings pertaining to program fidelity are addressed. The number of lessons taught and the number of booster activities initiated are presented. This is followed by accounts of the teachers' use of the problem-solving skills, as well as, the students' use of the problem-solving area.

The second research question involves the program's impact on several sources (students, teachers and principals). These results include pre-test, post-test and possible change score effects. First, the students' questionnaire data are analyzed. This is followed by the students' interview findings. The final two sections examine the results from the teachers' and principals' questionnaires.

Data collection occurred at pre and post-test times. For all of the students, analyses were conducted on the pretest data and on the subsequent change scores. As well for the program students only, data collected at the post-test will be analyzed under the post-test section.

Program Fidelity

Program teachers were asked to report the number of lessons they taught to ensure common instruction. Non-classroom teachers (e.g., French teachers) were not included in the calculations because they were not expected to teach the lessons ($n = 16 - 4 = 12$ teachers). Of the 12 teachers who were trained to give the lessons, 11 taught all the lessons. However, it should be noted that one of these teachers taught only parts of each lesson. The one teacher who did not teach all of the lessons, taught four of the lessons. Both instances of instruction variation were caused by extraneous events (e.g., illness).

Next, the 12 program teachers reported how many classroom booster activities they employed. 75% ($n = 9$) of the program teachers initiated at least 2 classroom booster activities; however, 25% ($n = 3$) did not

complete any boosters in their classroom. Principals of the program schools reported the number of school-wide booster activities held. Over a two month period, the program schools conducted between 5 and 10 school-wide boosters. These events took place during the winter term (January to the middle of March).

To address whether the staff modelled the skills for the children, all the program-teachers ($n=16$) were asked to rate their use of the skills with the children. Of the 16 program teachers, 9 (56%) reported using the skills "most of the time" to help a child solve a problem and 7 (44%) reported "sometimes". In regards to the just the 7, grade 4, 5, and 6 teachers, 4 (57%) reported using the skills "most of the time" and 3 (43%) reported using the skills "sometimes". A similar result was found with the two program principals. One used the skills "most of the time" and the other used the skills "sometimes". Therefore, none of the staff used the skills "all of the time" with their students. However, over half of the program teachers used the skills "most of the time".

The last area reviewed to ensure program fidelity was the children's use of the problem-solving area in their classroom. Unfortunately, conclusions could not be drawn due to the lack of data. The weekly sign-up sheets proved to be cumbersome and were not filled out assiduously. Verbal reports given by the teachers did indicate that the children were using the problem-solving area regularly.

Program Impact

Students' Questionnaire Data -Pre-Test

The preliminary analysis of the students' scoring on the Children's Assertive Behaviour Scale (CABS), Students Attitudes About Conflicts (SAAC), School Climate (SCLIM), Peaceful Problem Solving Abilities Scale (PPSAS) and Conflict Management Motivation (CMM) are presented in Appendix P. Thus, the pre-test findings are summarized in the section that follows. Pre-test analyses were used to determine the

equivalence of the students' functioning prior to the intervention.

Following the summary of pre-test results will be the post-test analyses and then the change score analyses. Student interviews and Teacher/Principal data will conclude the result section.

PRE-TEST

Pre-Test Students' Questionnaire Summary of Results.

Pre-test CABS, SCLIM and SAAC Summary - (Children's Assertive Behaviour Scale, School Climate Measure and Students' Attitudes About Conflict Scale).

Multivariate examination of the nested school effect (see footnote 1 and 2) on the students' CABS, SCLIM and SAAC scores lead to two analytical strategies. In the first, the SAAC was eliminated from the analysis (to prevent a singularity problem). The subsequent nested MANOVA revealed a significant school effect due to the combined influence of the CABS and SCLIM. Inspection of the results indicated that the students in the two comparison schools were obtaining significantly different scores on the CABS and the SCLIM. The second comparison school received significantly higher scores on the CABS (indicating that these students were less assertive) and higher scores on the SCLIM (indicating that these students perceived a better school climate) than the first comparison school. The two program schools were not significantly different at pre-test on the three measures.

Next, nested program vs. comparison effects were not found (please note that the degrees of freedom were small and the observed power for this test was .05).

Overall (regardless of school) gender and grade main effects were found. Mean scores on the CABS indicated that the boys were receiving higher scores (less assertive), and mean scores on the SCLIM indicated that girls were receiving higher scores. As well, the grade 4 students' SCLIM mean was higher than the grade 5 and 6 students. Therefore, girls

and grade 4 students had better perceived school climates.

For the second analytical strategy, the second comparison school was eliminated from the analyses to deal with the singularity problem. Differences between the two program schools were not found, so the error due to two program schools was pooled. Next, the differences between the program schools and first comparison school was examined. A significant program vs. comparison effect was found. The comparison students from the first comparison school performed better on the SCLIM and the SAAC than the program students. Thus, the students from this school had (on average) better conflict attitudes and school climate perceptions than the program students.

Thus, incorporating the results from the first analytical strategy (the second comparison school being different from the first) and then the second analytical strategy (the finding that the first comparison school was significantly different from the two program schools), resulted in a conclusion that both the comparison schools were different from the program schools at pre-test (on all of the measures). Observance of the means indicated that the comparison schools received higher scores on the CABS (indicating less assertive), the SCLIM (better perceived school climate) and on the SAAC (indicating better conflict attitudes) than the program schools.

As with the first strategy, overall analysis of gender and grade effects were significant. Boys received higher CABS mean scores (less assertive), but the girls received higher SCLIM and SAAC mean scores. Grade 4 students on the SCLIM and the SAAC performed better than the Grade 5 and 6 students. Thus, female students and grade 4's felt their schools had a better school climate and they possessed better attitudes towards conflicts.

Now analyses of the subscales for the CABS and the factor scores for the SAAC will be reviewed.

Pretest CABS Subscale Summary

Subscale analysis of the CABS was then addressed. The CABS generated two scores other than the total or assertiveness score. These two scores were an "aggressive" score and a "passive" score. Non-parametric tests on the "aggressive" scores indicated significant gender effects. Male students received higher mean "aggressive" scores than the female students. Program and comparison and grade effects were not found. The students were obtaining, on average, low "aggressive" scores at pre-test.

The CABS "passive" score yielded non-significant school, program/comparison, gender and grade effects. Therefore, the students CABS "passive" scores were not significantly different at pre-test.

Therefore, the significant difference found between the boys and girls on the CABS total score (or assertive score) is mainly due to the higher aggressive scores obtained by the boys. The males were found to be less assertive because they obtained (on average) more aggressive scores on the CABS than the female students.

Pretest SAAC Factors Summary

For the three SAAC factors, non-significant school and program/comparison effects were found. However, the SAAC factors exhibited significant main effects due to gender and grade variables. These analyses indicated that the girls in this study (regardless of school) scored higher than the boys on all three SAAC factors. As well, Grade 4 students received higher scores than both Grade 5 and 6 students on the SAAC factors. Thus, girls and grade 4's obtained higher scores than their counterparts on the SAAC factors of Self Concept/Peer Relations, School Attachment/ Commitment and Conflict Resolution/Problem-Solving.

Pretest PPSAS and CMM Summary - (Peaceful Problem Solving Abilities Scale and Conflict Management Motivation).

For the PPSAS and the CMM, similar results were found.

Significant differences between the groups were not found at pre-test. On both measures, the students were receiving high scores. The students felt that they could peacefully handle their problems and they felt motivated to handle their upset feelings peacefully.

Pretest Consistency in Answering Summary

Finally, the students' scores on Question 4 of the CABS and Question 6 of the Test of Knowledge indicated that the students were answering similarly, when similar questions were given at the beginning and the end of the questionnaire package.

Pre-test Conclusions

Before the program was implemented, several differences between the schools were evident. The comparison schools were found to be non-equivalent to the program students based on their higher mean scores on the CABS, SAAC and the SCLIM. No differences between the schools were found on the PPSAS or the CMM.

Overall gender and grade differences indicated that the boys were less assertive (higher CABS scores), and the girls and grade 4s had better conflict attitudes (SAAC), and perceived school climate (SCLIM) (on average).

Gender differences found on the CABS aggressive subscale indicated that the boys were more aggressive than the girls (on average). Grade and gender effects on the SAAC factors indicated that the girls and grade 4s had better Self Concept/Peer Relations, School Attachment/Commitment and Conflict Resolution/Problem-Solving scores than their counterparts (on average).

The PPSAS and the CMM did not evidence any gender or grade differences.

The children were also consistently answering questions that were similar in content, but given at the beginning and the end of the questionnaire package.

POST-TEST

Students' Questionnaire Data -Post-Test

Qualitative information regarding all the students' Conflict Management Motivation-questions 1-3 will be addressed in this post-test section. As well, only the program students were given an extra set of questionnaires at post-test, and these analyses will be presented here.

Post-Test Percentages for the CMM Questions 1-3.

Please refer to Table 7 for the response percentages for the program and comparison schools on the CMM Questions 1-3. At pre-test and post-test, a high percentage of students in all the schools responded with "Yes, sometimes" to the three questions.

Post-Test Results of Consistency in Answering-Program Students.

The fourth question in the CABS and the sixth question in the Test of Knowledge again were tested for consistency in answering.

The Spearman's r and Kendall's τ correlation coefficients were calculated for the post-test data. Again, similar results of the two tests were found. Kendalls $\tau(n = 89) = .4309$, $p = .000$ and Spearman's $r(n = 89) = .4909$, $p = .000$. Thus, at the pre-test and post-test, the program students answered question 4 on the CABS and question 6 on the Test of Knowledge similarly.

Post-test Test of Knowledge

Interrater reliability was assessed on the scoring of the program students' Test of Knowledge. A random sample of tests was selected (= 30% of the total number of Tests) from the program students' data at both pre and post-test times. At pre-test, Cohen's kappa revealed that there was a range of 79 - 100 agreement. At post-test, the kappa values increased to a range of 84 -100. In both testing times, the agreement between the raters was adequate (refer to Appendix R for test scoring).

A repeated measures ANOVA was performed on the pre-test and post-test scores. Gender and grade effects on the data formed the IVs for the analysis. A significant difference was found in the program

Table 7

PRE/POST TEST -Percentages for CMM Questions 1-3 - Program vs.
Comparison

Answer	<u>Pre Test</u>		<u>Post test</u>	
	Program	Comparison	Program	Comparison
Do you sometimes feel angry, jealous, hurt or worried?				
No, Not At All	3.4%	4.2%	9.0%	3.2%
Yes, Sometimes	96.6%	95.8%	91.0%	96.8%

Do you think that these feelings can sometimes be uncomfortable?

No, Not At All	15.7%	7.4%	18.0%	5.3%
Yes, Sometimes	84.3%	92.6%	82.0%	94.7%

Do you think that these feelings can sometimes cause problems?

No, Not At All	11.2%	12.6%	12.4%	12.6%
Yes, Sometimes	88.8%	87.4%	87.6%	87.4%

Note: Program n = 89, Comparison n = 95

students' scores from pre to post-test times, $F(1, 83) = 178.69$, $p = .000$, $\eta^2 = .655$, Power = 1.00^a. Scores on the Test of Knowledge ranged from 0-20. The program students mean at pre-test was 8.48 (SD = 2.38) and their mean at post-test was 12.72 (SD = 3.00). Tests of the gender and grade effects showed significant gender effects, $F(1, 83) = 4.01$, $p = .048$, $\eta^2 = .002$, Power = .51; however, grade effects and the interaction were nonsignificant ($p > .05$). Table 8 presents the means and standard deviations. Thus, the program students increased their knowledge of the program skills after receiving the intervention. As well, program girls received higher mean scores than the boys at pre-test and at post-test times.

Post-Test Percentages -Program Supplemental Questions-POSTQ

Table 9 displays the percentages for the four supplemental questions given to the program students. The mean for POSTQ 1 to 3 are 2.1, 2.3, and 2.4, respectively. The largest percentage for the first three questions pertained to the answer "The Same". Thus, most of the program students did not see a change in their enjoyment of school, a change in the students/teacher relationship, or a change in the student/student relationship due to the conflict management program. It should be noted that a higher percentage of students observed a positive change in these relationships (POSTQ #1 = 21.3%, POSTQ #2 = 31.4%, POSTQ #3 = 38.2%) than a negative change (POSTQ #1 = 13.5%, POSTQ #2 = 4.5%, POSTQ #3 = 6.7%) due to the program.

POSTQ #4 referred to the students use of the conflict management skills when they had a problem (again refer to Table 9). 71% indicated that they had tried using the skills during the six months. The mean for Question 4 was 1.5 (SD = 1.2). After six months of the program, 23% of the program students indicated that they used the skills "most of the time" or "always". However, 29% indicated that they had sometimes or never used the skills.

Gender and grade percentages for POSTQ #4 were also examined.

Table 8

PRE/POST TEST -Test of Knowledge -Means and Standard Deviations for
Program Students

---

	n	Pre-Test		Post-Test	
		<u>M</u>	SD	M	<u>SD</u>
Girls	41	8.68	2.16	13.54	2.59
Boys	48	8.31	2.57	12.02	3.18

Note: Score Range = 0-20

Table 9

POST TEST -Percentages for Program Students Supplemental Questions

	Value	Frequency	Percentage
Students Enjoy School			
Not at all	0	7	7.9
Worse	1	5	5.6
The Same	2	58	65.2
Better	3	13	14.6
A Lot Better	4	6	6.7
Students and Teachers get Along			
Not at all	0	3	3.4
Worse	1	1	1.1
The Same	2	57	64.0
Better	3	19	21.4
A Lot Better	4	9	10.1
Students get Along			
Not at all	0	2	2.3
Worse	1	4	4.5
The Same	2	49	55.1
Better	3	28	31.5
A Lot Better	4	6	6.7
Students' Use of Skills			
Never	0	26	29.2
Rarely	1	16	18.0
Sometimes	2	26	29.2
Most of the Time	3	18	20.2
Always	4	3	3.4

"Since the Conflict Management Program started, students at this school seem to enjoy going to school..."

"Since the Conflict Management Program started, students and teachers get along with each other..."

"Since the Conflict Management Program started, students get along with each other..."

"When you had a problem, how often did you use the Conflict Management skills?"

Table 10 displays these figures. The highest percentage of girls are using the skills "sometimes", whereas, the highest percentage of boys are using the skills "never". Highest grade percentages indicated that the grade 4s were using the skills "sometimes", the grade 5s and 6s were using the skills "never" over the six months. For the grade 5s and 6s though, the next highest percentage of use was "sometimes" and "most of the time", respectively.

These percentages suggest that the girls (75.6%) were using the skills more often than the boys (66.7%) and the grade 4 students (83.3%) were using the skills more often than the grade 5 (64.5%) and the 6 students (64.3%).

Post-test Summary of Results

The majority of students indicated that they felt angry, jealous, hurt or worried. Also, the majority of students felt that these feelings can be uncomfortable and can cause problems.

The students continued to consistently answer similar questions at post-test. These questions dealt with the students response to being called a name.

A pre vs. post test ANOVA found significant differences between the program students' scores on the Test of Knowledge. The program students increased their knowledge about the program skills significantly at post-test. As well, female program students obtained higher scores than their male counterparts.

At the post-test, program students were given supplemental questions pertaining to observed effects of the program. The program students did not perceive a change in their enjoyment of school, the students' and teachers' relationships or the students' relationships due to the intervention. However, a higher percentage of students saw a positive change in these relationships than a negative change due to the program. When the program students were asked if they used the skills, 71% said they had used them to some degree (the majority indicated that

Table 10

**POST TEST -Gender/Grade Percentages for Program Students' Supplemental
Question #4 - Use of Conflict Management Skills.**

	Boys		Girls	
	n	%	n	%
Never	16	33.3	10	24.4
Rarely	8	16.6	8	19.5
Sometimes	13	27.1	13	31.7
Most of the Time	9	18.8	9	22.0
Always	2	4.2	1	2.4
	N = 48	M = 1.4	N = 41	M = 1.5

	Grade 4		Grade 5		Grade 6	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Never	5	16.7	11	35.5	10	35.8
Rarely	4	13.3	7	22.6	5	17.8
Sometimes	11	36.7	10	32.2	5	17.8
Most of the Time	7	23.3	3	9.7	8	28.6
Always	3	10.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	N = 30	M = 1.9	N = 31	M = 1.2	N = 28	M = 1.4

Note: Question 4 = When you had a problem, how often did you used the
Conflict Management skills?

Score Range = 1-4

they had used the skills "sometimes". The percentages suggest that girls and Grade 4s used the skills more often than their confederates.

CHANGE SCORES

Student's Questionnaire Data - Change Scores

To deal with the significant pre-test differences, gain scores or change scores were calculated for each quantitative variable (Fitz-Gibbon & Lyons-Morris, 1987; Price & Smith, 1985). This involved the post-test scores minus the pre-test scores. The pre-test analyses can be found in Appendix P. A brief summary of the pre-test results are:

CABS, SCLIM and SAAC:

Comparison Schools were higher on the CABS, SCLIM and SAAC

Boys received higher CABS scores (less assertive)

Girls received higher SCLIM and SAAC scores

Grade 4s obtained higher SCLIM and SAAC scores than the Grade 5s
and 6s.

CABS Subscales:

Boys received higher CABS "aggressive" scores

No Differences found on CABS "passive" scores

SAAC Factors:

Girls received higher scores on the SAAC factor

Grade 4s obtained higher scores on the SAAC factors than the
higher grades.

PPSAS / CMM:

No differences were found in the PPSAS or the CMM - the students
felt efficacious and indicated that they were motivated to
handle their upset feelings peacefully at pre-test.

Change Score Results-CABS, SCLIM and SAAC. -(TOTAL SCORES -
Children's Assertive Behavior Scale, School Climate and Student's
Attitudes About Conflict)

Change Scores on the CABS, SAAC and the SCLIM were examined to

determine the effect due to "schools" and "program/comparison". Again, a nested design MANOVA was utilized, with "schools" nested under "program/comparison" (Kirk, 1982). With the full design (i.e., 3 DVs and 4 schools), the combined Dvs revealed that there was not a significant "school" effect on the students' change scores, $F(6, 356) = 1.28$, $p > .25$, $\eta^2 = .021$, Power = .81. Cell means and standard deviations for the CABS, the SCLIM and the SAAC are presented in Table 11. Thus, the two program schools' change scores were not significantly different from each other. As well, the two comparison schools' change scores were not significantly different.

A MANOVA examining the "program/comparison" effects on the three Dvs was then performed. The error due to schools was pooled with the within-subjects error. This analysis did not reveal significant differences between the program or comparison students, $F(3, 180) = 2.19$, $p = .090$, $\eta^2 = .035$, Power = .55. The SCLIM's change score mean for program schools was -1.97 ($SD = 4.83$, $n = 89$) and the mean for comparison schools was -3.48 ($SD = 5.53$, $n = 95$). The CABS' program mean change was 2.98 ($SD = 8.14$) and the comparison mean change was 1.73 ($SD = 7.56$). The SAAC mean change for the program and comparison schools was -4.36 ($SD = 8.18$) and -4.86 ($SD = 8.17$), respectively. Thus, the program and comparison schools did not change significantly from pre-test to post-test (refer to Table 11). In general, the comparison schools were still receiving higher scores at post-test on the CABS (less assertive), the SCLIM (better perceived school climate) and the SAAC (better conflict attitudes).

Overall gender and grade effects were then examined for change score differences on the three Dvs (regardless of treatment level). Another MANOVA was performed and nonsignificant main effects and interaction were found. Table 12 reports the details of the analysis and Table 13 reports the descriptive statistics. Thus, the male students continued to obtain higher CAB scores (less assertive) and the

Table 11

PRE/POST/CHANGE -Cell Means and Standard Deviations for the CABS, SCLIM and SAAC by Schools

Group	Pre		Post		Change	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
CABS^a						
Prog School #1	14.04	9.46	17.53	9.72	3.49	8.35
Prog School #2	14.31	7.40	16.53	9.65	2.22	7.89
Comp School #1	14.84	8.66	17.52	10.36	2.69	7.00
Comp School #2	19.21	10.08	18.64	9.16	-.57	8.46
SCLIM^b						
Prog School #1	36.49	5.13	34.70	5.15	-1.79	4.92
Prog School #2	35.33	6.43	33.11	5.93	-2.22	4.75
Comp School #1	38.33	5.77	35.22	5.98	-3.10	4.92
Comp School #2	39.89	3.98	35.50	7.15	-4.39	6.77
SAAC^c						
Prog School #1	94.42	12.23	89.76	14.12	-4.62	8.73
Prog School #2	95.56	11.98	91.58	12.26	-3.97	7.39
Comp School #1	98.12	10.87	93.46	12.80	-4.66	8.60
Comp School #2	98.64	9.22	93.28	10.44	-5.36	7.18

Note: Program School #1 n = 53
 Program School #2 n = 36
 Comparison Sch.#3 n = 67
 Comparison Sch.#4 n = 28

^aChildren's Assertive Behavior Scale - Score Range = 0-54 -50%=27
 - Lower Scores = More Assertive.

^bSchool Climate - Score Range = 13-52 -50% = a score of 32.5.

^cStudents' Attitudes About Conflict.- Score Range = 32-128 -50%=80

Table 13

PRE/POST/CHANGE -Means and Standard Deviations for CABS, SCLIM and SAAC
- Gender, Grade

Group	Pre		Post		Change	
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
CABS^a						
Boys	17.08	10.24	20.57	10.61	3.49	8.13
Girls	13.41	7.32	14.67	8.08	1.27	7.48
Grade 4	13.87	8.22	15.87	10.41	2.00	7.65
Grade 5	15.53	9.04	17.52	9.71	1.53	7.95
Grade 6	16.13	9.65	19.52	9.04	3.40	7.97
SCLIM^b						
Boys	36.50	5.53	33.91	5.77	-2.59	5.89
Girls	38.32	5.67	35.43	6.05	-2.89	4.59
Grade 4	39.82	4.84	37.24	5.73	-2.59	4.77
Grade 5	36.00	5.59	33.69	5.53	-2.31	5.51
Grade 6	36.41	5.80	33.10	5.78	-3.32	5.47
SAAC^c						
Boys	94.42	12.23	88.74	11.67	-4.91	8.01
Girls	95.56	11.98	95.01	13.06	-4.35	8.32
Grade 4	99.60	11.41	94.21	13.63	-5.40	8.92
Grade 5	95.76	10.21	91.03	11.53	-4.72	7.98
Grade 6	94.46	11.73	90.71	12.88	-3.75	7.54

Note: Program School #1 n = 53
 Program School #2 n = 36
 Comparison Sch.#3 n = 67
 Comparison Sch.#4 n = 28

^aChildren's Assertive Behavior Scale - Score Range 0-54
 - Lower Scores = More Assertive

^bSchool Climate - Score Range 13-52.

^cStudents' Attitudes About Conflict - Score Range 32-128.

girls and grade 4s continued to obtain higher SCLIM and SAAC scores from pre to post-testing times.

In summary, no significant changes in the students' scores on the SCLIM, the CABS and the SAAC were found after six months of the program. At pre-test, the comparison schools received higher scores on all three measures (as compared to the program schools) indicating that the comparison schools were less assertive, had better perceived school climates and had better conflict attitudes. The differences between the schools on the three measures were lessened by the post-test, but it was not a significant change. All the schools had similar scores at the post-test times.

Significant gender and grade changes also were not evidenced. The boys obtained higher scores on the CABS and girls obtained higher scores on the SCLIM and SAAC at both testing times. Also, grade 4s compared to the grade 5s and 6s received the highest mean scores at both testing times on the SCLIM and the SAAC.

Change Score Results-CABS "Aggressive" Score. -(SUBSCALE #1)

The Mann-Whitney U test of the program vs. comparison effects on the "aggressive" change scores was nonsignificant, $U(n_1 = 89, n_2 = 95) = 4194.5, p > .016$. An effect due to gender was found, $U(n_1 = 88, n_2 = 96) = 3340.5, p = .014$. However, grade level differences were not found using the Kruskal-Wallis test, $\chi^2(2, N = 184) = 1.87, p > .016$. As well, an interaction between gender and grade was not found. Table 14 presents the means and standard deviations for all the testing periods. Of note, is the consistently low "aggressive" mean score. Gender differences in the CABS' "aggressive" scores revealed that male students (on average) received higher "aggressive" scores than the female students at pre-test and post-test times. Also, male students' mean "aggressive" scores increased significantly more than the female's scores at post-test. Increases were evidenced for both the program and the comparison schools.

Table 14

PRE/POST/CHANGE -Cell Means and Standard Deviations for the CABS
"Aggressive" Score

Group	Pre		Post		Change	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
CABS Aggressive						
Program	4.81	6.14	7.03	7.77	2.22	6.71
Comparison	5.65	8.47	7.27	8.39	1.62	6.14
Prog Sch #1	4.74	6.78	7.68	7.17	2.94	6.08
Prog Sch #2	4.92	5.15	6.08	7.79	1.17	7.52
Comp Sch #1	4.69	6.41	6.13	7.75	1.44	5.25
Comp Sch #2	7.96	11.89	10.00	9.36	2.04	7.97
Boys	6.91	8.91	9.94	9.23	3.03*	7.42
Girls	3.72	5.35	4.60	5.82	.88*	5.15
Grade 4	4.36	6.99	5.98	7.02	1.62	5.78
Grade 5	5.12	7.52	6.41	7.14	1.29	6.47
Grade 6	6.24	7.74	9.02	9.11	2.78	6.94

Note: Score Range = 0-54

* p < .016

Change Score Results-CABS "Passive" Score -(SUBSCALE #2)

A nested ANOVA was used to analyze the CABS "passive" change scores. A significant change due to the "school" variable was found, $F(2, 180) = 4.64$, $p = .011$, $\eta^2 = .049$, Power = .94. However, nested "program/comparison" effects were not found, $F(1, 2) = .13$, $p = .753$, $\eta^2 = .061$, Power = .28. The school and program/comparison means and standard deviations for the CABS "passive" scores are presented in Table 15. Observance of the means indicated that the two comparison schools received significantly different change scores. Once again, the significant nested school effect was mainly due to the second comparison school. Students from this school were responding more passively to the CABS questions at post-test (on average). Figure 1 displays the pairwise plot of aggressive and passive change scores for the second comparison school only. The plot indicated that the majority of students who decreased in passivity from this school, also increased in aggressiveness. Therefore, the significant decrease in passivity for the second comparison school was accompanied with an increase in aggression.

Gender and grade effects were then addressed by completing an ANOVA. Main effects were not found (gender, $F(1, 178) = .01$, $p = .935$, $\eta^2 = .000$, Power = .006; grade, $F(2, 178) = .07$, $p = .933$, $\eta^2 = .001$, Power = .032), but an interaction was found between gender and grade, $F(2, 178) = 3.94$, $p = .021$, $\eta^2 = .042$, Power = .60. Upon inspection of the distribution, one subjects score was very divergent. This subject was eliminated and the analysis was re-run. Once subject number 112 (from the first comparison school) was eliminated, significance levels were not met for the interaction. Summary of the univariate statistics for this analysis are displayed in Table 16. The mean CABS "passive" scores for gender and grade was presented in Table 17 (omitting subject number 112).

Thus, the second comparison school did show a significant change

Table 15

PRE/POST/CHANGE -Cell Means and Standard Deviations for the CABS"Passive" Score

Group	Pre		Post		Change	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
CABS Passive						
Prog School #1	9.30	5.51	9.85	5.94	.55	8.35
Prog School #2	9.39	5.13	10.44	6.21	1.06	4.44
Comp School #1	10.15	8.66	11.39	6.54	1.24	6.26
Comp School #2	11.25	6.16	8.64	4.78	-2.61	4.59
Program	9.34	5.33	10.09	6.02	.75	5.46
Comparison	10.47	5.55	10.58	6.18	.10	6.06
Boys	10.17	6.05	10.62	6.67	.45	6.01
Grade 4	8.82	5.52	11.07	7.53	2.25	7.43
Grade 5	11.16	6.23	10.84	6.65	-.32	5.78
Grade 6	10.41	6.32	9.96	5.95	-.45	4.30
Girls	9.70	4.87	10.08	5.54	.38	5.58
Grade 4	10.06	4.84	8.94	5.70	-1.11	5.13
Grade 5	9.56	3.91	10.44	5.21	.89	5.29
Grade 6	9.44	5.66	10.97	5.58	1.53	6.03

Note: Boys - Grade 4 (n = 28), Grade 5 (n = 31), Grade 6 (n = 29)
 Girls- Grade 4 (n = 35), Grade 5 (n = 27), Grade 6 (n = 34)

Score Range = 0-54

Figure 1

Table 17

PRE/POST/CHANGE -Means and Standard Deviations for CABS "Passive" -
Omitting Subject 112- Gender and Grade

Group	Pre		Post		Change	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
CABS Passive						
Boys	10.24	6.05	10.37	6.25	.12	5.19
Girls	9.70	4.87	10.08	5.54	.38	5.58
Grade 4	9.60	5.14	9.52	5.96	-0.08	5.32
Grade 5	10.41	5.29	10.66	5.98	0.24	5.54
Grade 6	9.89	5.94	10.51	5.73	0.62	5.36

Note: Boys - Grade 4 (n = 27), Grade 5 (n = 31), Grade 6 (n = 29)

Girls- Grade 4 (n = 35), Grade 5 (n = 27), Grade 6 (n = 34)

Score Range = 0-54.

in their passivity scores, but this result was attenuated by an increase in their CABS "aggressive" score. Gender and grade differences were not found in the CABS "passive" scores when a disparate subject was eliminated.

Change Score Results-SAAC Factors -(FACTOR SCORES)

A nested MANOVA revealed that the schools within program and comparison were not significantly different on their SAAC Factor scores, $F(6, 356) = .36, p < .25, \eta^2 = .006, \text{Power} = .45$. The error due to schools was then pooled and a MANOVA investigating program/comparison effects was completed. This analysis demonstrated that there were not any significant program and comparison differences, $F(3, 180) = .52, p > .025, \eta^2 = .009, \text{Power} = .16$. Gender and grade effects were then examined. A gender by grade interaction was not found, $F(6, 352), = .70, p = .650, \eta^2 = .012, \text{Power} = .19$. Also, main effects for gender and grade were not found, $F(3, 176) = .34, p > .025, \eta^2 = .006, \text{Power} = .07$, and $F(6, 352) = 1.36, p > .025, \eta^2 = .023, \text{Power} = .42$, respectively. Cell means and standard deviations are presented in Table 18. Therefore, there were not any significant changes found on the SAAC Factors. Girls continued to score the highest on the means for each Factor. As well, grade 4s were continuing to receive high mean scores in comparison to the grade 5s and grade 6s.

Change Score Results-PPSAS

The Mann-Whitney U test of the program vs. comparison effects on the PPSAS change scores revealed nonsignificant differences, $U(n_1 = 89, n_2 = 95) = 3988.0, p > .016$. Gender effects also were found to be nonsignificant, $U(n_1 = 88, n_2 = 95) = 3851.5, p > .016$. As well, grade level differences were not found using the Kruskal-Wallis test, $\chi^2(2, N = 184) = .6302, p > .016$. An interaction between gender and grade was not evidenced by the present data. Means and standard deviations at pre, post and change score times are presented in Table 19. Therefore, the students in both the program and comparison schools were receiving

Table 18

PRE/POST/CHANGE -Cell Means and Standard Deviations for SAAC Factors

SAAC Factor	Pre		Post		Change	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Self Concept/ Peer Relations						
Program #1	30.55	4.06	29.55	4.55	-1.00	3.45
Program #2	31.03	4.37	29.61	4.44	-1.42	3.33
Comparison #1	31.18	3.99	29.96	3.98	-1.22	3.10
Comparison #2	32.04	3.53	30.43	3.40	-1.61	4.22
Program	30.74	4.17	29.57	4.48	-1.17	3.39
Comparison	31.43	3.86	30.09	3.81	-1.34	3.45
Boys	30.65	3.78	29.53	3.73	-1.11	3.56
Girls	31.51	4.20	30.12	4.49	-1.38	3.29
Grade 4	32.05	4.19	30.05	4.27	-2.00	3.56
Grade 5	30.20	3.81	29.02	4.10	-1.19	3.55
Grade 6	30.97	3.88	30.40	4.01	-0.57	2.97
School Attachment/ Commitment						
Program #1	26.17	5.07	24.90	5.37	-1.26	4.23
Program #2	27.56	4.78	25.75	5.31	-1.80	2.92
Comparison #1	28.49	4.05	26.42	4.86	-2.07	3.87
Comparison #2	28.46	3.68	26.07	4.29	-2.39	3.38
Program	26.73	4.97	25.25	5.33	-1.48	3.74
Comparison	28.48	3.93	26.32	4.68	-2.17	3.72
Boys	26.51	4.85	24.46	4.99	-2.04	3.78
Girls	28.67	3.98	27.02	4.76	-1.64	3.70
Grade 4	28.63	4.38	26.89	5.06	-1.75	3.70
Grade 5	27.40	4.58	25.76	4.22	-1.64	3.38
Grade 6	26.86	4.54	24.75	5.48	-2.11	4.10
Conflict Resolution/ Problem Solving						
Program #1	20.92	4.34	19.60	4.07	-1.32	3.72
Program #2	20.72	3.70	19.97	3.93	-0.75	2.85
Comparison #1	21.92	3.46	20.67	3.87	-1.25	3.02
Comparison #2	21.68	4.37	20.71	3.10	-1.46	3.14
Program	20.84	4.07	19.75	4.00	-1.09	3.39
Comparison	21.85	3.73	20.54	3.65	-1.32	3.04
Boys	20.22	3.98	19.01	3.71	-1.20	3.42
Girls	22.42	3.57	21.21	3.65	-1.21	3.02
Grade 4	22.33	3.68	21.08	3.66	-1.25	2.93
Grade 5	21.45	3.83	19.95	3.83	-1.50	3.34
Grade 6	20.32	4.04	19.43	3.88	-0.89	3.36

Table 18 Continued**'Students' Attitudes About Conflict - Factor 1****Self Concept/Peer Relations.****Score Range = 10-40****"Students' Attitudes About Conflict - Factor 2****School Attachment/Commitment****Score Range = 9-36****'Students' Attitudes About Conflict - Factor 3****Conflict Resolution/Problem Solving****Score Range = 7-28**

Table 19

PRE/POST/CHANGE -Cell Means and Standard Deviations for PPSAS

Group	Pre		Post		Change	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
PPSAS^a						
Program	7.92	1.63	7.71	1.74	-0.21	1.61
Comparison	7.78	2.04	7.65	2.23	-0.13	2.14
Boys	7.70	1.89	7.49	2.12	-0.22	1.84
Girls	7.98	1.81	7.85	1.88	-0.12	1.95
Grade 4	7.89	1.98	7.87	1.90	-0.02	1.77
Grade 5	7.78	1.79	7.50	2.04	-0.28	1.61
Grade 6	7.87	1.79	7.65	2.07	-0.22	2.25

^aPeaceful Problem Solving Abilities Scale - Score Range - 0-10.

high scores on the PPSAS at pre-test and at post-test.

Each PPSAS item was then reviewed for response percentages. For most of the items, the majority of students indicated that they could do something peaceful about the problem situation. However, for two of the problem situations, the majority of students indicated that they could not do something peaceful. These statements were:

If someone tells lies about me behind my back.

If someone blames me for something I did not do.

The majority (68%) of students (program or comparison) found these two situations problematic at pre-test and at post-test.

Change Score Results-CMM Question 4.

The fourth question in the Conflict Management Motivation ("How important is it to you that you handle your upset feelings peacefully?") was assessed using non-parametric tests. The Mann-Whitney U test of the program vs. comparison effects on the CMM Question 4 change scores did not reach significance, $U(n_1 = 89, n_2 = 95) = 4062.0, p > .016$. A further analysis examining the effect of gender on the CMM Question 4 change scores also did not exhibit a significant difference, $U(n_1 = 88, n_2 = 96) = 3673.0, p > .016$. Using the Kruskal-Wallis test, significant differences between the grades were not evident, $\chi^2(2, N = 184) = 2.10, p > .016$. As well, an interaction between gender and grade was not found. Table 20 presents the means and standard deviations for each IV on the CMM Question #4. Therefore, on average, the students in both the program and comparison schools indicated that it was important to handle their conflicts peacefully at both testing times. Gender or grade effects were not demonstrated by these analyses.

Change Score Conclusions

Change score analyses revealed that the comparison schools continued to be less assertive (CABS), and to have better conflict attitudes (SAAC) and school climate (SCLIN) than the program schools

Table 20

PRE/POST/CHANGE -Cell Means and Standard Deviations for CMM Question #4

Group	Pre		Post		Change	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
CMM #4*						
Program	3.03	0.61	2.99	0.82	-0.04	0.77
Comparison	3.09	0.72	3.02	0.71	-0.07	0.78
Boys	2.94	0.78	2.78	0.82	-0.16	0.87
Girls	3.18	0.52	3.21	0.65	0.03	0.66
Grade 4	3.14	0.64	3.19	0.78	0.05	0.81
Grade 5	3.10	0.61	2.96	0.65	-0.14	0.71
Grade 6	2.95	0.73	2.86	0.82	-0.10	0.78

*Conflict Management Motivation Question #4 - Score Range = 0-4

"How important is it to you that you handle your upset feelings peacefully?"

(on average). Thus, there were no significant changes from pre to post on these measures.

The subscales of the CABS revealed that the boys (who were significantly more aggressive on average than the girls at pre-test) increased their aggressive mean scores at post-test (compared to the girls). This effect applies to all male students. As well, the passive subscale indicated that the 2nd comparison school decreased in passivity significantly at post-test, but this was accompanied by an increase in aggression (as compared to the other schools).

The factor scores on the SAAC revealed no significant changes for the schools. The girls and the grade 4s continued to receive higher conflict attitude scores on the SAAC factors of Self Concept/Peer Relations, School Attachment/ Commitment and Conflict Resolution/Problem-Solving scores than their counterparts (on average).

No significant changes were observed in the CMM or the PPSAS. The students were already scoring high at both testing times. Thus, the students felt motivated and efficacious in handling their problems peacefully.

Students' Interview Data

A random sample of students, who consented to both the questionnaire and the interviews, was asked to complete pre and post open-ended interviews. The original sample consisted of 60 students. However, this sample was reduced (due to one subject leaving the school) to 48 (4 subjects per grade, per school). There were 22 boys and 26 girls who participated in the interviews. The mean age of the students was 10 years. Inter-rater reliability values for the interview data ranged from 83 - 100 (using Cohen's Kappa) indicating acceptable agreement between the raters. Non-parametric statistics were used to

analyze the interview data. Because a full summation of the results have been reported elsewhere (Austin, 1995), only a detailed summary of the one significant finding will be addressed. Please refer to Austin (1995) for the complete analyses.

Non significant changes were found for the students' affective and behaviour area skills. Most of the students (regardless of treatment) were able to identify their feelings and resolved their problems on their own.

The program students' cognitive problem-solving skill was then addressed. The students were asked, "Was there anything else that you thought of doing?", to determine if they could generate alternative solutions to their conflicts. The ability to generate alternative solutions is a component of the cognitive problem-solving. If the student identified an alternative solution they were given a score of 1. If they were unsuccessful at generating an alternative, they received a score of 0. The students could obtain four possible scores after the interviews were completed. They were:

- 0=pre 0=post - no alternatives given at both testing times.
- 1=pre 1=post - alternatives given at both testing times.
- 1=pre 0=post - an alternative solution given at pre-test but not at post-test.
- 0=pre 1=post - no alternative solution given at pre-test, alternative solution given at post-test.

Table 21 shows the frequencies and percentages of these responses for the program and comparison students. As the table indicates, most of the students did not generate an alternative solution at either testing times (regardless of whether they were from program or comparison schools). Of note is the percentage of program students who were not able to generate an alternative in the pre-test, but were able to at post-test (as compared to comparison students) (29.2%).

Consequently, an analysis was completed that examined only the students that had changed from pre-test to post-test (Allen, Chinsky, Larcen, Lochman & Selinger, 1976). Students who maintained the same score were eliminated from the analysis (i.e., $0 = \text{pre}$ $0 = \text{post}$ and $1 = \text{pre}$ $1 = \text{post}$). A Mann-Whitney U test of the program vs. comparison effects was then performed on the selected data. This test revealed that there was a significant difference between the program and comparison students' alternative solution "change scores", $U(n_1 = 10, n_2 = 7) = 15.5$, $p = .028$. Therefore, the students in the program schools who did not generate an alternative solution at pre-test, were more often able to generate an alternative at post-test (as compared to the comparison students). Further, the comparison students who gave an alternative solution at the pre-test, more often did not give an alternative at post test (as compared to the program students).

Overall, at the pre-test, 21% of the program subjects and 42% of the comparison subjects gave more than one solution. The reverse occurred at the post-test. 38% of the program students and 21% of the comparison students gave an alternative solutions. Thus, the program students, increased their overall percentage of alternatives generated, while the comparison students decreased their overall percentage of alternatives.

Thus, this result from the interviews suggests that the program students who changed from pre to post test, changed by generating more alternative solutions after receiving the conflict management program.

Table 21

INTERVIEW -Frequencies and Percentages for Alternative Solutions

	0-0'		1-1"		1-0'		0-1"	
Group	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Program	(12)	50.0%	(3)	12.5%	(2)	8.3%	(7)	29.2%
Comparison	(13)	54.1%	(6)	25.0%	(4)	16.7%	(1)	4.2%

Note. n = 24 program subjects and 24 comparison subjects.

"0-0 =no alternatives given at pre/post.

"1-1 =alternatives given at pre/post.

"1-0 =alternative solution at pre; not at post.

"0-1 =no alternative solution given at pre; alternative given at post.

The comparison students who changed, conversely, decreased in the number of alternatives at post-test. Nonetheless, after the six months of the program, most of the students (program or comparison) did not give an alternative solution.

Teachers' Questionnaire Data

SCLIM. 30 teachers from the four schools completed the School Climate measure (SCLIM) at pre-test and post-test times. The SCLIM scores were analyzed using ANOVAs. Analysis of the pre-test data and then the change scores will follow.

The SCLIM pre-test analysis of variance indicated a significant effect due to the variable "program/comparison" on the teachers' SCLIM scores, $F(1, 28) = 11.95$, $p = .002$, $\eta^2 = .299$, Power = .92. Means and standard deviations are presented in Table 22. Examination of the means indicated that the comparison teachers were, on average, obtaining higher SCLIM scores than the program teachers at pre-test.

The teachers' SCLIM change scores were then examined to see if changes had occurred. The Analysis of Variance indicated that there were significant differences between the program and the comparison teachers' change scores, $F(1, 28) = 15.13$, $p = .001$, $\eta^2 = .351$, Power = .96. Table 22 reveals that the program teachers significantly increased their SCLIM scores, whereas, the comparison teachers decreased their scores.

In summary, though the comparison teachers received higher SCLIM scores at pre-test than did the program teachers, they decreased their scores by post-test. Program teachers however, increased their SCLIM scores at post-test. Both sets of teachers received similar mean scores at the post-test time.

Also in Table 22, a comparison is made between the teachers' and the students' SCLIM scores over the testing periods. This table indicates that the mean scores for the teachers were consistently higher than that of their students.

Table 22

TEACHER PRE/POST/CHANGE -Means and Standard Deviations for the SCLIM

	Pre		Post		Change	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Program						
Teachers	39.69	2.96	41.63	4.00	1.94	2.14
Students	36.02	5.68	34.06	5.50	-1.97	5.53
Comparison						
Teachers	44.00	3.86	42.78	3.62	-1.21	2.29
Students	38.78	5.33	35.31	6.31	-3.48	5.53

Note: Program Teachers $n = 16$

Program Students $n = 89$

Comparison Teachers $n = 14$

Comparison Students $n = 95$

*School Climate - Score Range = 13-52 -50) a score of 32.5.

CLO. The teachers were asked to fill out the Causes, Location and Outcomes measure (CLO) at pre and post-test periods. Table 23 shows the frequency and percentage of causes that were rated as "Mostly" the cause of students' conflicts. As the table demonstrates, the teachers from both the program and comparison schools rated "Harassment - Name Calling" as the most frequent cause of their students' conflicts. "Harassment" was given the highest response percentage for the two testing periods.

The most frequent location for the children's conflicts was the playground (please refer to Table 24). Again, the most prevalent location was the same at both testing times.

The last question in the CLO pertained to how conflicts were resolved in the school. Six possible outcomes were presented to the teachers. The outcomes were:

- Teacher intervenes
- Students resolve problem themselves
- Other student intervenes
- Parent conference
- Referred to principal, and
- Referred to counsellor.

Each outcome was rated by the teacher as 'Mostly', 'Sometimes' or 'Hardly Ever' the outcome of their students' conflicts. The first two outcomes (teacher and student resolves) were the main focus of this section. Percentages were calculated to compare the ratings of the program and comparison teachers on these two outcomes. Table 25 presents these pre and post response percentages. In general,

Table 23

TEACHERS' Reports of the Most Frequent Cause of their Students'
Conflicts

Causes	Pre-test	Post-Test	Total
Rumours/Gossip	2	4	6.7
Arguments	8	8	26.7
Dirty Looks	1	3	5.0
Difficulties in class	0	0	0.0
Harassment/Name Calling	13	22	45.0
Jealousy	2	4	6.7
Physical Fighting	7	7	14.3
Invasion of Privacy	4	6	10.0
Group Inclusion/Exclusion	4	8	20.0
Tattling	5	7	20.0
Other	1	0	1.7

n = 30 program and comparison teachers tested for 1 year

2

PM-1 3 1/2" x 4" PHOTOGRAPHIC MICROCOPY TARGET
NBS 1010a ANSI/ISO #2 EQUIVALENT

PRECISION^{SM} RESOLUTION TARGETS

Table 24

TEACHERS' Reports of the Most Frequent Location of their Students' Conflicts

Locations	Pre-test	Post-Test	Total %
Bathroom	0	3	5.0
Classroom	2	2	6.7
Hallway	3	4	11.7
Playground	21	22	71.7
Other	2	1	5.0

n = 30 program and comparison teachers, tested twice.

Table 25

TEACHERS' Ratings of Outcome 1 (Teacher Intervenes) and Outcome 2
(Students Resolve Problem Themselves)

	Mostly		Sometimes		Hardly Ever	
	Pre%	Post%	Pre%	Post%	Pre%	Post%
Teacher Intervenes						
Program	69%	62%	25	38%	6%	0%
Comparison	36%	36%	64	64%	0%	0%

Student Resolves Problem Themselves

Program	19%	13%	56%	81%	25%	6%
Comparison	14%	7%	86%	93%	0%	0%

---

n = 16 program teachers

14 comparison teachers

comparison teacher rated the outcome of 'teacher intervening' as "sometimes" occurring at pre and post-test; whereas, program teachers rated teacher intervention as "mostly" occurring (at both testing periods). For both sets of teachers, the most frequent response to the outcome of "students resolve problem themselves" was "sometimes".

For the rest of the possible outcomes, please refer to Table 26. This table presents the response frequencies and percentages for all the teachers combined.

Program Teachers' Supplemental Questions - POSTQ

Table 27 displays the percentages for four of the supplemental questions given to the program teachers (the fifth question - "How often were you able to use the skills to help a child solve a problem?" - was discussed under the Program Fidelity section of the results). The teachers were asked to circle the best answer to each question. The choices were: A lot, More, The Same, Less or Not at all. Question 1 asked, "Since the conflict management program started, students at this school seem to enjoy going to school...". The highest percentage of teachers chose the response "The Same". The second question asked about how well the students and teachers were getting along since the program. A highest percentage of program teachers chose the response "Better" for this question. The third question inquired about how the students were getting along. The highest percentage of teachers chose the response "Better" for question 3. Thus, most of the program teachers observed an increase in student/teacher relations and student relations; however, the teachers did not observe a change in their students' enjoyment of school due to the conflict management program.

Question 4 referred to the teachers' observations of the students use of the conflict management skills when they had a problem (again refer to Table 27). 100% of the teachers indicated that they had noticed the students using the skills during the six months. The mean for Question 4 was 1.9 ($SD = .57$). After six months of the program,

Table 26

TEACHERS' Ratings of Outcomes 3 to 6

Outcomes	Pre-test	Post-Test	Total
#3 Other Student Intervenes			
Mostly	1	2	5.0
Sometimes	18	17	58.3
Hardly Ever	11	11	36.7
#4 Parent Conference			
Mostly	4	1	8.3
Sometimes	21	20	68.3
Hardly Ever	5	9	23.3
#5 Referred to Principal			
Mostly	2	4	10.0
Sometimes	25	22	78.3
Hardly Ever	3	4	11.7
#6 Referred to Counsellor			
Mostly	0	1	1.7
Sometimes	8	9	28.3
Hardly Ever	22	20	70.0

n = 30 program and comparison teachers, tested twice.

Table 27

POST -Percentages for Program Teachers Supplemental Questions n 16

	Value	Frequency	Percentage
Students Enjoy School			
Not at all	0	0	0.0
Less	1	0	0.0
The Same	2	12	75.0
More	3	1	18.8
A Lot More	4	1	6.2
Students and Teachers get Along			
Not at all	0	0	0.0
Worse	1	0	0.0
The Same	2	1	43.8
Better	3	9	56.2
A Lot Better	4	0	0.0
Students get Along			
Not at all	0	0	0.0
Worse	1	0	0.0
The Same	2	5	31.3
Better	3	10	62.5
A Lot Better	4	1	6.2
Students' Use of Skills			
Never	0	0	0.0
Rarely	1	1	18.7
Sometimes	2	11	68.8
Most of the Time	3	2	12.5
Always	4	0	0.0
"Since the Conflict Management Program started, students at this school seem to enjoy going to school..."			
"Since the Conflict Management Program started, students and teachers get along with each other..."			
"Since the Conflict Management Program started, students get along with each other..."			
"When your students had a problem, how often did they use the Conflict Management skills?"			

12.5% of the program teachers indicated that they had observed a student using the skills "most of the time". 18.8% indicated that they had rarely seen the students use the skills. Most of the teachers had sometimes observed the students using the conflict management skills.

Principals' Questionnaire Data

Monthly Report Form. The principals were asked to fill out a monthly report form indicating the number of conflicts they observed that could have been solved by the students. Program principals were also asked to indicate how often they used the posters to help solve a student's conflict. Both sets of principals also received the Causes, Locations and Outcome Measure (CLO) to glean information about the conflicts they were observing.

Unfortunately, the monthly forms proved to be cumbersome for most of the principals, so they were not filled out assiduously. Consequently, the information being reported is not complete.

Table 28 presents the program principals' monthly report information. Collection of this data began in November, 1994 and finished in April, 1995. Data are not available for the comparison schools. The table shows that on average the program principals were observing 2.4 conflicts per month that their students could have solved by themselves. On average, the program principals use the posters for 3.3 conflicts per month.

Principals' CLO. The CLO was also not assiduously filled out. The principals' observations gleaned from this measure were:

- Harassment was most often the cause of students' conflicts
- The Playground was the most frequent location for conflicts
- The teacher intervened to resolve the students' conflicts "sometimes" or "most of the time"
- And, the students resolved their conflicts "sometimes" according to the principals.

Table 28

PROGRAM PRINCIPALS Monthly Report Form Information

Month	No. of Conflicts Observed*	Use of Program Posters*
November	3	6
December	6	6
January	9	9
February	5	5
March	6	8
April	0	6
	Total 29	Total 42

* The combined number of conflicts that were brought to the program principals' attention that they felt the students could have solved by themselves.

* The combined number of conflicts with which the program principals were able to use the conflict management charts to help resolve the problem.

Note - the average per month is based on the original data and not on the aggregated data of the two principals.

Overall Mean Conflict No. $M=2.4/\text{month}$

Overall Mean Poster Use $M = 3.3/\text{month}$

Program Principals Post Supplemental Question - POSTQ. Only the program principals were asked to fill out the POSTQ. For the first 3 questions, both principals indicated that since the conflict management program began, they had observed the students enjoying school more and getting along better with their teachers and classmates.

When the principals were asked if they had noticed their students using the skills, the principals indicated that "sometimes" or "most of the time" they had seen the students use the skills.

Summary of Program Impact Results

A summary of the quantitative and qualitative results for each source of data will be presented. First, the quantitative results from the students' questionnaire and interview data will be reviewed. This will be followed by a summary of the students' qualitative results. Next the teacher's and the principals' results will be presented. Finally, a brief review of the significant changes that were observed will be given.

Students Quantitative Results Summary. The comparison schools received significantly higher mean scores on the three measures (CABS, SCLIM, SAAC) at both testing periods than did the program schools. However, the program and comparison schools did not significantly change their scores on these measures after the Conflict Management Program had been in place for 6 months. Therefore, on these measures a significant change over the testing period was not evidenced by the schools. The comparison schools' mean scores indicated that the comparison students were less assertive, yet; they had better perceived school climate scores and conflict attitudes scores than the program students at pre and post-test times. Overall gender differences (i.e., regardless of the treatment given) for these measures were assessed. Male students in

all of the schools received significantly different CABS scores (less assertive) than the female students. The boys were less assertive mainly because they had higher aggressive scores than the girls on the CABS. As well, boys' aggressive scores significantly increased at post-test (as compared to the girls' score). These results are attenuated by the finding that all of the students obtained relatively low aggressive scores.

Gender and grade differences were found for the SCLIM, the SAAC and the SAAC factors. Female students and Grade 4 students (regardless of school) obtained higher mean scores than their counterparts. No gender and grade level interactions were evidenced. Girls and Grade 4s had better perceived school climate, better conflict attitudes, better self-concept/peer relations, better school attachment/commitment and better conflict resolution/problem solving skills.

For the PPSAS and the CMM, the students in all the schools received high scores at both testing times. The children indicated that they felt efficacious about solving their problems peacefully and they also felt motivated to handle their upset feelings peacefully.

The Test of Knowledge showed that the program students had increased their knowledge of the conflict management skills. Specifically, program girls acquired higher knowledge scores than the program boys at both testing times.

For the forty-eight students who participated in the interview portion of this evaluation, few differences were found (Austin, 1995). The students in the program and comparison schools were able to identify their feelings and were able to resolve their problems by themselves (at both testing times). The one significant finding reported by the present author involves the generation of alternative solutions to a problem. Most of the students (regardless of treatment) could not generate alternatives at both testing times. Of the students who did, the program students were able to generate alternative solutions after

the intervention; however, the comparison students did not. Thus, the majority of program students who could not generate an alternative before the program, were able to do so after the program. The opposite was true for the comparison schools. Comparison school children who could generate an alternative at pre-test, were not able to at post-test.

Students' Qualitative Results Summary. The CMM and the PPSAS also provided information regarding affective knowledge and problematic situations for the children. Questions 1-3 of the CMM revealed that the children recognized that they had upset feelings and that these feelings were uncomfortable and can cause problems. From the PPSAS, the majority of students found two problems difficult to deal with. They were:

If someone blames me for something I did not do

If someone tells lies behind my back.

The majority of children felt that they could do something peaceful about the rest of the problem situations.

Consistency in answering was determined by asking the children similar questions at the beginning and at the end of the questionnaire package. At both testing times, the children answered these questions similarly.

And finally, the program children were asked questions about the programs effect. The majority of students felt that they enjoyed going to school about the same after the program. Also, the students did not observe a change in how the teachers and the students or how the students got along with each other. When asked if they used the conflict management skills, 71% had tried them. 23% of the students had used them most of the time. The majority of students used the skills sometimes or never. As well, the percentages indicate that girls and grade 4s reported using them the most.

Teachers' / Principals' Questionnaire Data Summary. A significant change in the teachers' school climate scores was found. Program

teachers SCLIM scores increased after six months of the program; whereas, the comparison teachers scores decreased at post test. Program teachers also indicated on the POSTQ measures that the students and teachers and the students themselves, got along better since the program. As well, the teachers indicated that the students seemed to enjoy going to school the same since the program. 100% of the teachers observed the children using the skills and most of the teachers indicated that the students were using the skills sometimes. As mentioned in the program fidelity section, all of the program teachers used the skills either sometimes or most of the time to help their students handle their problems.

The principals in the program schools also were given the POSTQ measure to determine if they observed a difference in schools climate since the conflict management program. The program principals indicated that their students seemed to enjoy going to school more, that the teachers and the students got along better and that the students got along better since the program. Both program principals had observed their students using the skills and the majority of their students used the skills sometimes or most of the time. Again, the principals used the skills with their students either sometimes or most of the time.

The CLO measure revealed the most predominate cause, location and outcome of the students problems. For both the teachers and the principals, the most common cause of the conflicts was due to harassment or name calling. The location for most of the students problems was the playground. The staff in the program and in the comparison schools did not observe a change in how the children were resolving their problems. Percentages suggest that the program teachers continued to intervene in their students problems to help solve them. As well, program staff observed their students continuing to handle their problems sometimes.

And finally, principals in the program schools observed (on average) 2.4 conflicts per month and they were able to use the posters

with an average of 3.3 conflicts per month.

Demonstrated Changes. Changes were observed in a few areas after this preliminary testing period. Changes in the students performance occurred in the CABS "aggressive" scores and the CABS "passive" score. Boys (as compared to girls) from all of the schools increased their CABS aggressive scores significantly at post-test. However, this result is attenuated by the finding that both the boys and the girls obtained low aggressive scores.

On the CABS "passive" score, the second comparison school decrease their scores significantly at post-test (compared to the other schools). This result was attenuated by the finding that these students also increased in aggression at post-test. Therefore, the second comparison school was still demonstrating less assertive approaches.

The test of the program students' knowledge of the conflict management skills demonstrated a significant change at post-test. The program students increased their knowledge scores after receiving the intervention.

For the program students, significant changes were observed in the alternative solutions they gave during the interviews. Program students who were unable to generate alternatives at the pre-test could do so at the post-test, as compared to the comparison students. Attenuation of this finding is that most of the students did not generate an alternative at either testing time.

And finally, 71% of the program students used the conflict management skills during the six month intervention. The percentages also suggest that the female students and the grade 4 students used the skills most often.

Regarding the teachers and the principals' data, changes were observed in the SCLIM and the POSTQ measures. Program teachers' school climate scores (SCLIM) significantly increased at post-test compared to the comparison teachers. As well, the teachers and the principals noted

that the students and teachers relationships improved since the programs inception. They also observed that the students got along better since the program began. The principal noticed that the students seemed to enjoy going to school more since the program. And finally, 100% of the staff utilized the program skills to help their students resolve problematic situations.

Discussion

Two questions guided the present research. They were:

- Was the program implemented with fidelity?
and,
- Did the program successfully accomplish its articulated goals and the exploratory goals posited by the present researcher?

The results indicate that the Conflict Management Outreach Program was implemented with fidelity; however, improvements can be made. Monitoring of the intervention revealed an absence of other social competency programs within the school environment. Further, the program's goals were successfully obtained, with moderate success in behaviour change. While the program shows attainment of its articulated objectives, improvement in the exploratory goals was demonstrated only in the program teachers' perceptions of an enhanced school climate. The lack of student improvement may be due to the short duration of the program and/or to the students' high level of functioning (as assessed by the present measures). Importantly, significant negative changes were not evidenced by the present research.

The lack of improvement on some measures may reflect methodological shortcomings of the design, the measures and the procedures employed in this study. Statistical considerations also warrant further discussion. The sections that follow will address each of the evaluation's objectives and will consider the issues that may have affected these findings.

Program Fidelity

The present researcher's ongoing monitoring of the program's implementation revealed that other social competency programs were not in existence when the Conflict Management Outreach Program was instituted. Thus, changes in social competence may be attributable to

the program.

The finding that most of the program teachers conducted the lessons and the classroom booster activities indicates that the majority of the students in the program schools received the complete intervention. Only two out of 12 teachers did not complete the full lesson plan and three out of 12 did not complete any classroom boosters. This finding highlights the notion that the way a program is taught, is equally important as the specific content conveyed (Weissberg, 1989).

It has been suggested that implementation consistency can have substantial impact on the research process (Durlak & Jason, 1985; Linney, 1989, Weissberg, Caplan & Sivo, 1989). Spivack and Shure (1985) also have underscored the importance of teachers completing the lessons as prescribed. They altered their program to ensure the teachers conducted the lessons assiduously. Unfortunately, research weakening vicissitudes are the ecological norm in the school setting (Durlak & Jason, 1985). Thus, teachers support of a program seems to be an essential ingredient if a positive impact on its participants is to occur (Coie, Rabiner & Lochman, 1989; Furman, Giberson, White, Gavin & Wehner, 1989). The present research suggests that the majority of teachers demonstrated support for the program's goals by performing the lessons.

Booster activities serve the purpose of continuing the program's objectives after the lessons have been taught. Weissberg (1985) stated, "In general, the behavior of most program children starts to change, not while they are learning individual component skills, but rather once the overall cognitive strategies are learned and practiced" (p. 237). Thus, classroom booster activities continue the students' learning and foster behavioural change. It was found that the majority of teachers did complete classroom booster activities after the lessons were taught.

The principals documented the number of school-wide booster activities per month. This finding indicates that for a two month

period, the school environment reinforced the program's goals. Between 5 and 10 booster activities were conducted during the winter term. Of note, is the absence of school-wide booster activities during the spring term. This may reflect a drop in enthusiasm for the program by the staff. Post-test data collection occurred at the end of the school year. Possibly this lack of program emphasis during the post-test data collection may have had deleterious effects on the post-test data.

Another area that addresses the program's fidelity is the use of the skills by the staff. The finding that all the staff (teachers and principals) used the skills either sometimes or most of the time suggests that they may have modelled the skills for the students. The importance of modelling problem-solving skills has been highlighted by many program developers (Denham & Almeida, 1987; Durlak, 1983; Shure & Spivack, 1987, 1988; Spivack & Shure, 1985; Weissberg, 1985; Weissberg & Allen, 1986; Weissberg, Caplan & Sivo, 1989; Weissberg, Gesten, Carnrike, et. al., 1981). Again, the utilization of this important program component (i.e., the staff's use of the skills with the children) is documented in the present study.

Finally, the assessment of the classroom problem-solving area proved problematic. Reports from the program teachers did indicate that their students frequented the problem-solving area to fill out reinforcement sheets. However, data to confirm this observation could not be gleaned (i.e., students did not fill out sign-up sheets when they used the area). Filling out problem-solving reinforcement sheets has been suggested by Spivack and Shure (1985) to be an important remedy to teachers' time constraints. The reinforcement sheets provide the children with their own modelling of the problem-solving steps.

Other researchers also have documented measurement completion difficulties (Resnick, 1985). Resnick suggests that a program evaluator should design a record keeping system that will assist the evaluator and the participants. Possibly, forms with the students' names on them

would have been easier to fill out. As well, completion of forms without the evaluator present might constitute too high of an expectation for the school personnel. Thus, weekly collection of problem-solving area sheets, by the evaluator, may have facilitated this data collection.

Past research and the present study's results, highlight the importance of assessing the implementation of a program. The results indicate that the program was adequately implemented; however, improvements can be made in the areas of lesson completion and booster activity timing. As well, measurement of the students' use of the problem-solving area is needed.

Program Goal Attainment

(Please refer to Table 5 in the introduction)

A program's ultimate justification is measured by how well it meets its stated goals (Gesten, Flores De Apodaca, Rains, Weissberg & Cowen, 1979). The present program had three goals. They were:

- To develop within the school a common language and a process that all students and staff can use to resolve problems
- To encourage students to learn more constructive ways of handling conflicts and
- To encourage students to handle their everyday conflicts and problems on their own.

These goals will now be addressed.

Goal #1 and Goal #2

Attainment of goals #1 and #2 was determined by the children's scores on the Test of Knowledge. As well for goal #1, skill use by the students and the staff, and the students' ability to generate alternative solutions during the interview indicated whether they had learned the problem-solving process.

The finding that the children increased their knowledge of program

concepts and their knowledge of constructive solutions indicates that goals #1 and #2 were successfully obtained. Thus, the students acquired knowledge of the language, process and components of the Conflict Management Outreach Program. Gender differences found in the test scores show that the female program students scored higher, on average, than the male program students. A person's verbal intelligence has been associated with test performance on interpersonal cognitive problem-solving tests (Butler & Meichenbaum, 1981). As well, Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) have documented that females are superior to males in verbal ability (on average). Thus, gender differences found in the children's test scores may be related to the children's verbal prowess.

The goal of developing a common language and process (Goal #1) was further tested by examining the students' and staffs' skill use. Assessment of the program students' skill use indicates that the majority of program students employed the skills during the intervention (71%). As well, 100% of the staff members reported using the skills with their students "most of the time" or "sometimes". Furthermore, percentages suggest that female students and the grade fours seem to be integrating the skills more into their daily lives than their counterparts. This again may explain why the girls had higher scores on the Test of Knowledge. Female students may be more familiar with the skills, therefore, this may have a positive effect on their knowledge scores. It has been suggested that older children's behaviour is more habitual and resistant to change (Cole, Rabiner & Lochman, 1989; Spivack & Shure, 1985; Shure & Spivack, 1987, 1988). As well, developmental theories have suggested that an adult's influence over a child typically declines as a child grows older (Schneider, 1989). These suggestions could possibly account for the apparent age differences in the use of the skills.

Lastly, goal #1 proposes that the program will develop a common process to resolve problems. A component in the problem-solving process

is the ability to generate alternatives. The finding that the majority of the children (in the program and comparison schools) did not generate an alternative during the interviews is in accord with the findings of Allen, Chinsky, Larcen, Lochman and Selinger (1976). They found that 77% of the subjects generated no solution or just one solution. However, they also found that when alternatives were given, it was the experimental group who were able to generate another solution.

This finding concurs with the present study as well. It was found that the program students who could not generate an alternative at pre-test, generated an alternative at post-test significantly more often than the comparison students. The capacity to generate alternatives has been argued to play a significant role in the social adjustment of children and adults (Eisenberg & Harris, 1984; Spivack & Shure, 1974, 1982; McKim, Weissberg, Cowen, Gesten & Rapkin, 1982; Weissberg, Gesten, Carnrike, et al., 1981; Weissberg Gesten, Rapkin, et al., 1981). Though some program students demonstrated alternative thinking at post-test, this finding is attenuated by the fact that the majority of children did not generate an alternative. Nonetheless, the establishment of alternative thinking for some children is noteworthy because the program is still in the preliminary stages of institutionalization.

Goal #3

The final goal of this program was to encourage the students to handle their problems on their own. Three areas were used to assess this goal. Mixed results were found.

First, the teachers were asked at pre-test and post-test how the students were handling their problems (using the CLO measure). The finding that the teachers were mostly intervening in the students' problems does not support the attainment of goal #3. A similar finding was demonstrated by Jenkins and Smith (1987).

However, reports by the children indicate that the children used the skills to resolve their problems. According to the interview data,

the students in all the schools, were able to resolve their own conflicts. Thus, the students' reports indicate that they are resolving their problems by themselves.

Analysis of the measure given to the teachers may clarify these results. The CLO measure asked teachers to rate how the students' conflicts were resolved. Teachers gave a general statement of whether they felt that they intervened, the students resolved it themselves or other consequences predominantly occurred. It is unclear which students the teachers were thinking of when making this outcome rating. Teachers may have been unaware of the students resolving problems by themselves because the teachers were not involved. Thus, the children who resolved their problems on their own may not have been assessed by this measure.

It is suggested that pre and post ratings of how each student handles their conflicts, as well as observational data, may furnish a more precise picture of how the children handled their conflicts. Thus, conclusions are mixed as to whether the children handled their problems on their own. Students' reports indicate that they are using the skills to resolve their conflicts themselves, while teachers' reports contradict this finding. Further study is needed.

Taken together, the findings suggest that the goals of the Conflict Management Outreach Program were accomplished during the six months of the intervention. Further research is needed to determine whether the students resolved their problems on their own. Nonetheless, students' accounts indicate that they were using the skills to handle their problems. As well, the students show cognitive improvements which, with time, may lead to behavioural change (Weissberg, 1985).

Exploratory Goal Attainment

(Please refer to Table 5 in the introduction).

The present research does not confirm the hypotheses of student

improvement in the areas of assertive behaviour, attitudes, school climate, self-efficacy, motivation and affective recognition after six months of the program. While the program did not produce significant improvements in these areas, it also did not produce significant negative effects.

The only exploratory goal that did show improvement is the teachers' perceptions of their school climate. While program students did not perceive an improvement in their school's climate after the intervention, their teachers did.

As mentioned above, the short duration of the Conflict Management Outreach Program may have limited the program's impact on these more complex variables. The timing of the post-test also may have contributed to the lack of change in the students. Possible changes due to the program may have been reduced because of the lack of program focus at the post-test (i.e., no booster activities) and to the coming of summer. As well, the students received high scores on some of these measures limiting the possibility of change. Schneider and Byrne (1985) have advised that high scores during pre-test can make any improvements mathematically difficult to demonstrate. These issues will be discussed further in the "evaluation issues" section of this discussion.

Next, each exploratory goal will be addressed with reference to school, gender and grade effects (where applicable).

Assertive Behaviour

The mean assertive score ($M = 15.17$) for the present study was found to be higher than the mean scores reported in previous studies ($M = 13.85$ - Groot & Prins, 1989; and $M = 12.74, 12.98$ - Michelson & Wood, 1982). This finding is mainly due to the second comparison school's scores. At the pre-test, this school received the highest mean aggressive and passive scores (indicating less assertiveness). Compared to aggressive and passive mean scores reported in Groot and Prins (1989) (aggressive $M = 5.79$, passive $M = 8.06$), the second comparison school

was (on average) more aggressive and passive (aggressive $M = 7.96$, passive $M = 11.25$). The other schools obtained comparable means to those given in Groot and Prins (1989). This finding suggests that the schools were not equivalent at pre-test. Sampling errors may explain this finding. The size of the sample from the second comparison school may not represent the student body. 28 students participated from this school; however, there were potentially 87 students who could have taken part in this study.

The second comparison school continued to demonstrate divergent effects by decreasing in passivity, while increasing in aggression at the post-test. The students from the other three schools did not demonstrate any significant changes after the intervention was completed. The program students, therefore, did not significantly increase in their assertiveness due to the intervention.

The data obtained from the CABS measure was positively skewed, indicating that the majority of the students received low aggressive and passive scores. This limited distribution may have affected the possibility of finding change. It also is probable that the Conflict Management Outreach program did not have a salutary effect on the children's assertiveness because the program is still in the incipient stage. Further research is needed to support these hypotheses.

Across the four schools, gender differences were observed in the children's assertive and aggressive scores. The finding that on average the boys were less assertive than the girls, mainly due to higher aggressive scores, gives credence to the finding that boys are more aggressive than girls (on average) (Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974). As well, others have found that girls are more concerned with maintaining interpersonal harmony; whereas, boys are more concerned with forcefully pursuing their own agendas (on average) (Miller, Danaher & Forbes, 1986; Maccoby, 1990). Conversely, this finding may indicate that boys are more apt to report aggressive responses to a provocation than girls

(i.e., the females are reporting socially desirable responses).

The relevance of test items has been advanced by Butler and Meichenbaum (1981). They contend that test items must be relevant to real life experiences to be valid. Therefore, the question arises, does the CABS address female aggression adequately? Shantz and Shantz (1985) reported that on average, girls have more interpersonal control conflicts; whereas, boys have more object disputes. Crick and Grotpeter (1995) also have identified gender specific types of aggression. Boys' aggression was characterized as direct (physical and verbal attacks); whereas, girls aggression was characterized as indirect or relational (social ostracism). Test items in the CABS often refer to "someone" taking an object from or verbally degrading the test-taker. The anonymity of the instigator may lessen the applicability of the items for the female students. Thus, the items may be measuring stereotypes more than reality (Hyde, 1985).

Boys' aggressive mean scores also increased at the post-test, compared to the girls. This may be due to the testing time. The end of the year and the reinstatement of outdoor recess may have contributed to these increased aggression scores for the male students (Fitz-Gibbon & Lyons Morris, 1987).

It was hypothesized that the assertiveness levels would be changed by the present program. Therefore, changes would be observed in the children's passivity and/or aggressive levels. Ameliorating extreme aggressive behaviours is not expected to be changed by the problem-solving method (Lorion, 1987; Spivack & Shure, 1985). Thus, other programs have been found to be more applicable with this extreme aggressive population (e.g., self control programs, see Beelmann, Pfingsten & Losel, 1994).

In summary, the impact of the Conflict Management Outreach Program on the children's assertiveness levels needs to be studied further to make summative statements.

Attitudes and School Climate

The comparison students, on average, were found to have better conflict attitudes and perceived school climate than the program students (at both testing times). Again, this calls into question whether the schools were equivalent.

Program students did not improve significantly in their conflict attitudes or their school climate scores after receiving six months of the intervention. This may be due to the short duration of the program within the schools. Other incipient programs also have documented the lack of change in students' conflict attitudes and school climate (Jenkins & Smith, 1987; Lam, 1989 [b]). It is possible that six months is not a sufficient amount of time to see student changes in these complex variables.

Conversely, the program teachers did demonstrate a significant increase in their school climate scores. This indicates that the teachers perceived a change in the schools' climate due to the program. The importance of teachers observing program change is documented by Crandall (1983). Crandall found that conveyors of a program need to observe positive program effects to foster their commitment to a new practice.

While the program teachers' perceptions of a school climate change is significant, concomitant changes in the students' perceptions would have strengthened this finding. These conflicting results also have been found by Stern and Van Slyck (1986, as cited in Lam, 1989[b]). A cautionary note forwarded by Weissberg and his colleagues about the use of teacher ratings is applicable to the present finding (Weissberg, Gesten, Carnrike, et. al. 1981). They commented that teachers' awareness of the program's objectives may have an effect on their ratings. Also, constituents in a program may have an invested interest in keeping the program within their school (e.g., the program made their job easier; Jones, 1985). Conversely, teachers' familiarity with the

school's milieu may have caused them to be more attuned to change (even if these changes were subtle). Thus, in the future, independent judgements by individuals within the school environment and a concomitant student result, may strengthen this finding.

Overall gender and grade differences indicate that on average, the female students and the grade 4s consistently had better conflict attitudes and perceived school climate than their counterparts. A reason for this finding may be that girls and the younger students are more apt to give socially desirable responses. Self reports have been found to be positively biased when socially desirable qualities are being assessed (Kagan, Hans, Markowitz, Lopez & Sigal, 1982). For the girls, societal expectations for prosocial behaviour might be impinging on their responses. And lastly for the grade differences, it may be the length of time the students spent going to the school that affected these results. Thus, the grade 4s may be more positive about their school because they have not been attending as long as the older students.

Research to confirm these hypotheses needs to be completed.

Motivation, Self Efficacy and Feelings Identification

For these variables, similar results were found during the pre and post-testing periods. All the students obtained high scores. Thus, the students felt motivated and efficacious to handle their conflicts peacefully. As well, during the interview, the students were able to successfully identify their own and other students' feelings.

These results offer propitious information. Prior to the program being implemented, the students were already professing that peaceful problem-solving was important to them and that they could do something peaceful about problem situations. As well, they already possessed the ability to identify feelings. The importance of having these skills to obtain adjustment gains has been extensively documented (Bandura, 1981;

Berndt, 1981; Butler & Merchenbaum, 1981; Durlak, 1983; Pancer & Weinstein, 1987).

High scores on these measures meant that improvement was unlikely. It was more likely that the student's affective skills would diminish due to the scores being at asymptote. Thus, the finding that the program students' affective skills did not diminish after the intervention suggests that at this time, the program did not have a negative effect on these variables.

Gender and grade differences also were not evidenced on these variables.

Thus, three of the bridging variables hypothesized to support behaviour change were already present prior to this intervention (Weiss, 1972).

Qualitative Findings and General Program Insights

The children's conflicts were reported to predominantly occur on the playground and to be caused by harassment (such as name calling). Similar results were reported by Araki (1990) Jenkins and Smith (1987) and Crick, Bigbee & Howes (in press). As well, two situations proved problematic for the majority of students. These problems pertain to being falsely blamed for something and to being defamed. Role playing problems of this nature may facilitate in vivo behavioural responses (Spivack & Shure, 1985). As well, adult skill modelling during recess may prove to be auspicious. Thus, an emphasis on playground modelling may provide a significant teaching opportunity for the Conflict Management Outreach Program.

The results also present an overall pattern that may affect the program's impact in the future. Specifically, on average, the males were found to be more aggressive (thus, less assertive), to have less favourable conflict attitudes and school climate opinions, and to report lower percentages of skill use than the females students. In addition,

they received lower mean knowledge scores than the female students. Taken together, it appears that ameliorating males' social competence may necessitate special focus and the development of appropriate expectations. Meta-analytic research on social skills programs also demonstrates that program effectiveness increases with the number of female participants (Schneider & Byrne, 1985; Beelmann, Pflingsten & Lösel, 1994). Others also have stated that it is less likely that aggressiveness will change due to social problem-solving interventions (Lorion, 1987; Spivack & Shure, 1985).

While these effects may be due to testing error or testing bias (e.g., males' lower mean verbal ability and its effect on tests scores), the consistent array of gender differences warrants special considerations when conducting program lessons and modelling. Possibly, more male teachers to model the skills for the boys might prove efficacious (Hyde, 1985). As well, behavioural observations may shed light on whether this gender effect is actually ecologically valid. Thus, the boys may be scoring lower on these scales, but exhibiting the necessary skills with their peers. All of these considerations need further study to determine whether there are gender differences in social competency that may effect a program's impact.

Another focus for future research is the differing grade effects. It is possible that the Grade 4s' better conflict attitudes, perceived school climate and skill use might allow them to be more open to social competency intervention (Coe, Rabiner & Lochman, 1989; Spivack & Shure, 1985; Shure & Spivack, 1987, 1988). Again, continued monitoring of the grade effects for this program is imperative to confirm this speculation.

Evaluation Issues

Four issues pervaded this evaluation. These considerations extend the discussion and understanding of the present research. They are:

- Meta-analytic studies of social competency training
- Statistical considerations
- Methodological issues, and
- Evaluation model improvements

Meta-analytic Studies

Several studies using a meta-analytic review procedure have been conducted to summarize the effects of social competency training programs (Beelmann, Pfingsten & Lösel, 1994; Denham & Almeida, 1987; Schneider, 1992; Schneider & Byrne, 1985). Fairly consistent findings have been demonstrated. The studies show that these programs are effective interventions with children.

The meta-analysis conducted by Beelmann, Pfingsten and Lösel (1994) also examined the effect sizes when different outcome measures were used. They presented a meta-analytical review of 49 social competency studies from 1981 to 1990. They found that the type of measure used to assess the impact of a program, significantly affected the effect sizes that were found.

The different categories used to sort the measures were:

- Social-Cognitive Skills (e.g., Preschool Interpersonal Problem Solving Test, Spivack & Shure, 1974)
- Social Interaction Skills (e.g., ratings of actual social behaviour)
- Social Adjustment (e.g., ratings of popularity) and,
- Self-Related (SR) measures (e.g., self concept)

The self-related (SR) measures category could be applied to several of the instruments used in the present research (e.g., conflict attitudes and assertiveness). However, a subtle difference between this category and the present measures exists. This category comprises global self-related measures (self-concept); whereas, the measures in this research would be better categorized as specific self-related measures (conflict

attitudes, as opposed to just attitudes). Nonetheless, a comparison can be made.

Beelmann, Pfingsten and Lösel found that when SR measures were employed, social problem-solving programs did not show significant effect sizes. However, program effects were evidenced in the participants' social-cognitive skills. Beelmann and his colleagues also documented that the effect sizes for social interaction and social adjustment outcomes were nonsignificant.

In the present research, the student's knowledge of the program's skills demonstrated the highest effect. This is consistent with the above meta-analysis findings.

As well, the students were demonstrating high functioning in the self-related variables. Thus, change was not evidenced. Beelmann and his colleagues also documented a lack of change with these measures. The need for the presence of these bridging variables to observe behavioural change has been extensively underscored by many researchers (Weiss, 1972; Bandura, 1981; Berndt, 1981; Weissberg, Caplan & Sivo, 1989). Thus, it may not have been realistic to expect change in these variables. However, documenting their existence may have been a more reasonable goal.

Behavioural ratings were not employed in the present research; however, an effect was found in the teachers' school climate perceptions. Thus, the program's effects were observed at the individual and the environmental levels. Environmental impact measures were not included in the meta-analysis presented above.

Taken together, these findings demonstrate the need for a comprehensive and sensitive assessment strategy. The importance of using multiple measures, sources and levels of assessment is demonstrated by these findings. When Spivack and Shure (1974) began researching problem-solving skills, cognitive change was the predominant measure. Today, with the more complex understanding of social

competency and behaviour change, effects need to be observed in the cognitions, behaviour and affective skills of the children. If change is not possible due to high functioning, then the existence of these important variables needs to be demonstrated.

Limiting the type of assessment measure may limit finding the radiating effects of these programs. Only using measures that will show an effect on the primary goal of a program (i.e., cognitive measures) may lead to the perception that the program is more effective than it actually is.

Nonetheless, the question arises as to why self-related measures are not subject to change. There are many issues that may have affected the present results. Examination of the underlying issues that help explain the finding of a lack of change will now be posited.

Statistical Issues

Gain Scores. Some authors have cautioned the use of gain scores to deal with pre-test differences (Mark & Cook, 1984; Pellegrini, 1987; Weissberg, Gesten, Rapkin, et. al., 1981). They noted the difficulty in finding changes when pre-test scores are high. This seems to be the case with the present data. On several of the measures the students' high pre-test scores limited the observance of post-test change. Nevertheless, due to the non-equivalence of the program and comparison schools at pre-test, gain scores were used (Fitz-Gibbon & Lyons Morris, 1987; Price & Smith, 1985).

Nested Design. The next statistical issue has to do with the use of a nested design. Footnotes #1 and #2 review nested design considerations. Thus, only a synopsis of the key issues will be given here.

By using a nested design, limitations on finding significant results occur. With the small degrees of freedom, power to find a significant effect is drastically lowered (Kirk, 1982). Thus, there may

be program and comparison differences in vivo; however, it is probable that the nested design obfuscates these findings. Nonetheless, this is the appropriate test of the treatment effects (Kirk, 1982).

Power and Effect Size. Next, is the issue of power and effect size (Cohen, 1988). In most of the present findings, the effect sizes were small. With a larger sample size these differences are more likely to be detected (Jason, Thompson & Rose, 1986). The necessary sample size to access these small, but possibly significant differences, was unavailable in the schools and logistically unattainable. Tabachnick and Fidell (1989) have outlined strategies to increase the power of a study. The first is to increase the ability to find a significant difference by lowering the alpha level. This was employed with the nested school effects. The alpha level was set at .25 (Howell, 1987). The next two recommendations have to do with improving the programs' effects (by changing the program) and decreasing variability (using a more homogeneous sample). Both of these issues were not accessible to manipulation.

Field research can be seen as a "necessary evil" from a power perspective. Tabachnick and Fidell (1989) have gone as far as to profess that research with low power usually isn't worth doing. Nonetheless, field research with in-tact groups continues because of the demands of the research setting. Thus, statistical control may have improved the results of this study, but lessened its ecological validity.

Next the methodological issues of the research's design, procedures and measures will be addressed.

Methodology

Design. Quasi experimental research is one of the most frequent designs used by evaluators (Smith & Glass, 1987). These designs, that often employ a non-equivalent control group, possess their own set of

evaluative considerations (Cook & Campbell, 1979). The present research used a quasi-experimental, non-equivalent groups, pre and post-test design.

First, the uniqueness of the school setting demands sensitivity when conducting research (Amabile & Stubbs, 1982; Sarason, 1982). Staff and participants may be apprehensive about an external researcher evaluating their performance. The need to encourage trust with the participants has been outlined by Herman, Lyons Morris & Fitz-Gibbon (1987). In the present research, every effort to alleviate possible concerns was attempted. The researcher frequented the schools, prior to and during the intervention, to answer questions and to build trust.

The logistics of the school setting also affect the research design (Babbie, 1989; Linney, 1989; Lorion, 1983; Resnick, 1985). Time constraints of participants limited the present investigation. The schools agreed to allow their students to participate in a one hour session, twice per year. Longer measures were therefore excluded because of this time factor. As well, data collected from the teachers was limited to five minute sessions at both testing times. From a research perspective, this hampered the evaluation; however, from a compliance and trust perspective, it facilitated the data collection. The knowledge that the questionnaires would not be arduous was imperative for the participants. As well, smooth execution fostered positive feelings about the research (determined from staff comments).

Sacrifices had to be made in research control to satisfy the participant's needs and to increase the ecological validity of the present research. Roberts and Peterson (1984) postulated that the scientific rigor required may change with the setting and with the adaptation to the peculiarities of the school setting. However, they stated that the demand for quality is still imperative. This was the focus of the present research.

The ability to make causal statements about the outcome of a

treatment is critical (Mark & Cook, 1984). By using a quasi-experimental design, threats to internal validity exist. The present researcher addresses each of the possible threats to internal validity in Appendix O.

Mark and Cook (1984) stated that, in general, the major problem with quasi experimental research is non-random assignment. They suggest that without randomization it is more difficult to rule out internal validity threats and hence to make strong causal statements. Smith and Glass (1987) pointed out that some critics have recommended that research without randomization should be abandoned. However, the threats to internal validity do not mean false findings (Smith & Glass, 1987). The threats can be used as alternative explanations for the results that occur. It is the researchers job to assess all possible reasons for a result and judge their plausibility. With the present findings, alternative explanations were given for each of the results.

Procedure. The issue of testing time will now be addressed. Fitz-Gibbon and Lyons Morris (1987) have cautioned against collecting data at the end of a school year. They felt that the children would be too restless for the data to be valid. Thus, completing an hour-long questionnaire, while the playground is beckoning, might have been too high of an expectation for the students in the present research. Further study is needed.

As well, others have noted that the distance between the program's lessons and the post-test can impact upon the results. Ladd (1985) and Linney (1989) have suggested continuously monitoring the program's effects. The need for time so that the cognitive skills may translate into behavioural change, necessitates longitudinal research to observe these changes. Also, Weissberg and Gesten (1982) have stated that it is unrealistic to expect that a new program, taught for the first time by school teachers, would promote children's behavioural adjustment. Thus a plethora of researchers have called for continuously evaluating a

program's effects or longitudinal research (Kessler & Albee, 1977; Battistich, Solomon, Watson, Solomon & Schaps, 1989; Bloom, 1977; Cowen, 1985; Denham & Almeida, 1987; Durlak, 1983; Gesten, Rains, et. al., 1982; Herman, Lyons Morris & Fitz-Gibbon, 1987; Kendall, Pellegrini & Urbain, 1981; Linney, 1989; Lorion, 1983; Lorion, 1987; Lorion, Work & Hightower, 1984; Pellegrini & Urbain, 1985; Price & Smith, 1985; Roberts & Peterson, 1984; Schneider & Byrne, 1985; Solomon, Watson, et. al., 1985; Urbain & Kendall, 1980; Weissberg, 1985; Weissberg, Caplan & Sivo, 1989; Weissberg & Gesten, 1982; Zigler & Trickett, 1978; Zolik, 1983).

Zigler and Trickett (1978) insisted "that adequate social competence assessment can come about only if we commit ourselves to assessing the long-term effects of our intervention programs" (p. 292). Thus, it is recommended that the longitudinal effects of the Conflict Management Outreach Program should be assessed.

Measures. As outlined above, when conducting research, the needs of the participants and the needs of the research should be addressed concomitantly. As well, a thorough knowledge of the program is needed in order to ask the right questions (Weiss, 1972). Social problem-solving programs are complex undertakings (Weiss, 1972; Weissberg & Allen, 1986; Weissberg & Gesten, 1982). Often the program's effects are non-tangible (e.g., stopping and thinking). This makes detecting them a difficult task. Measuring the unmeasurable is therefore common in program evaluations (Babbie, 1989). Thus, measuring these mental events proved to be methodological difficult.

It also has been stressed that the outcome measures should be closely linked to the program's articulated objectives (Babbie, 1989; Price & Smith, 1985; Weiss, 1972). Thus, measures that are sensitive, valid, reliable and appropriate need to be found to assess the specific goals of the program (Baker & Swisher, Nadenichek & Popowicz, 1984; Bandura, 1981; Kendall, Pellegrini & Urbain, 1981; Lorion, 1987; Pellegrini & Urbain, 1985; Price & Smith, 1985; Urbain & Kendall, 1980;

Weissberg & Allen, 1986; Weissberg, Gesten, Carnrike, et. al., 1981). The quality of an evaluation depends upon the outcome measures' rigor and utility.

In the present research, self-reports were predominantly used. The major question concerning this type of measure is the possibility of socially desirable responses. As mentioned previously, Kagan, Hans, Markowitz, Lopez and Sigal (1982) found that children's self-reports of socially desirable qualities seem to be positively biased compared to teachers' ratings. The opposite is true for undesirable characteristics -- they seem valid. Whether or not the children are providing socially desirable responses is a difficult question to answer (Bloom, 1977).

What is known from the present research is that the children were consistently answering similar questions at both testing times. Thus, an observational study to confirm these self-reports of behaviour would be propitious (Bloom, 1977). Again, the call for observational studies seems ubiquitous in the literature (Asher & Gabriel, 1993; Denham & Almeida, 1987; Furman & McQuaid, 1992; Krasnor, 1983, 1985; Ladd, 1985; McClure, Chinsky & Larcen, 1978; Pellegrini & Urbain, 1985; Vitaro & Pelletier, 1991; Weissberg & Gesten, 1982; Weissberg, Gesten, Carnrike, et. al., 1981). The present author can be added to this list recommending observational studies of children's social competence.

The next issue regarding the children's self-reports pertains to their psychometric properties. The majority of measures used in this research project lacked psychometric rigor. The decision to include these measures was based on the rigor vs. utility argument (Babbie, 1989). Weiss (1972) cogently summarized this debate. Weiss stated the following:

Developing new measures can be difficult and time-consuming, but measures that are off-center from the main issue, even when reputable and time-honoured, are likely to be of little use at all (p. 36).

While investigating the literature for applicable measures, it was found that there was a paucity of appropriate and reliable measures. Thus, the present author erred on the side of appropriateness. For many of the measures used in the present research, their psychometric properties were investigated within this evaluation. Developing new more appropriate measures for a particular research project is not uncommon within the literature (e.g., Bierman & Furman, 1984; Weissberg, Gesten, Carnrike, et. al., 1981). Thus, the need for the development of robust and adequate measures is strongly urged.

The last measurement issue relates to the sensitivity of the measures. The differences between skill acquisition and skill proficiency have been noted by Gresham, (1986) and Ladd (1985). This distinction may explain the high scores on most of the measures in the present research. Thus, it is possible that the children already possessed the skills (acquisition); however, they lacked the sophistication (or quality) in using these skills (skill proficiency). These measures might be addressing the students' skill acquisition and not their proficiency. Thus, measures that will discern this subtle difference in program effects will need to be developed.

Evaluative Model Revisited

With the above presentation of the subtleties in individual skill level, other subtleties of the evaluation model were postulated. They are the level of the implementation and the level of environmental change.

The differing levels of an implementation have been posited by Furman, Giberson, White, Gravin & Wehner (1989) and Hord, Rutherford, Huling-Austin and Hall (1987). Furman advocated determining the level of the implementation and its impact on the program's effects. The levels of use for a program are given in Table 29. The present program perhaps could be categorized as being at the mechanical-use level.

Table 29

Program Implementation Level

Level	Description
0 Non use	
1 Orientation	The acquiring skills and program requirements
2 Preparation	Preparing to use of skills
3 Mechanical use	User is primarily engaged in the attempt to use the program's skills
4A Routine	Innovation is stabilized
4B Refinement	Variations on use
5 Integration	Collective impact of school use
6 Renewal	Major modifications of program

Adapted from Furman, Giberson, White, Gravin and Wehner (1989) and Hord, Rutherford, Huling-Austin and Hall (1987).

Therefore, the proficiency of the implementation may be worthwhile looking at, prior to conducting an evaluation because the level of institutionalization may effect the program's impact.

In regard to the environmental measurement level, the present research examines the meso-level effects of the Conflict Management Outreach Program by assessing the school's climate. It might be profitable if the micro (peer group) and macro (community) levels of program impact were assessed as well.

This emphasis on qualitative differences in data collection provides a more precise examination of the program's impact. Thus, revisiting the program evaluation model to make adjustments is in order. Table 30 presents the multiple levels, sources, areas, domains, goals and measures; however, the two new qualitative outcome levels are added.

Future Research

Many of the possible research avenues proposed by the present study have already been addressed. Thus, a brief list of other areas is in order.

Future research areas guided by the results of this study include:

- Testing of the effects of each program component (i.e., lessons, booster type/number/timing) might help delineate whether the omission of a lesson or lesson type/number or timing of a booster, is particularly profitable.
- Researching the role of affect (emotional control) would be a logical extension of this program's lesson on calming down.
- And lastly, it would be interesting to follow this program when it is introduced to the parents of these children.

Table 30

Level	Source	Area	Domain	Measurement Level	Goal	Method
Individual	Students	Affective	e.g. feelings identification	acquisition		
				proficiency		
		Cognitive	e.g., skill knowledge	acquisition		
				proficiency		
		Behaviour	e.g., assertiveness	acquisition		
				proficiency		
Teachers and Principals						
Environment	Students			micro		
				meso		
				macro		
	Teachers			micro		
				meso		
				macro		

Conclusions and Recommendations

The purpose of the present research was to assess the short-term effectiveness of the Conflict Management Outreach Program. Two questions guided this process. They were, "Was the program implemented with fidelity?" and "Did the program successfully accomplish its articulated goals and the exploratory goals posited by the present researcher?"

It was found that the program was implemented with fidelity; however, improvements can be made. Program monitoring indicated that other social competency programs were not present during the implementation of this program. Regarding the program components, the majority of teachers conducted the complete lesson set and initiated classroom booster activities. The staff showed support for the programs' goals by using the skills with their students and by conducting school-wide booster sessions. Students' Problem-solving area use was observed by the teachers; however, data confirming this effect could not be gleaned because sign-up sheets were not filled out assiduously.

Improvements in the program's delivery can be made by monitoring lesson completion and by assisting teachers who are unable to finish the lessons. As well, booster activities throughout the school year might prove efficacious. These boosters continue the program's goals after the lessons have been completed. Research is needed to support these suggestions.

The program's objectives were successfully obtained, with moderate progress in behaviour change. The children's knowledge of the program's components (e.g., constructive solutions) improved and the majority of children used the skills. Female students, on average, obtained higher knowledge scores and they, along with the grade 4s, seem to be using the skills more than their counterparts. Some of the program students also developed alternative thinking skills after receiving the program.

Thus, the students developed knowledge of the program's components and process, that the students and the staff reported using with the children's problems.

Students also indicated that they used the skills to resolve their conflicts. However, the teachers did not observe a change in how the children were handling their problems. Further research is needed to determine whether the children were able to resolve their problems on their own.

Improvement in the exploratory goals was demonstrated only in the program teachers' perceptions of an enhanced school climate. The students did not improve in their school climate perceptions, assertiveness, conflict attitudes, motivation, self-efficacy or their feelings identification. The majority of students were already functioning at a high level on these variables which made improvement difficult.

Nonetheless, the fact that these important bridging variables were present before the intervention, and did not decrease due to the intervention, indicates that the children had many of the skills necessary for behaviour change. What is needed are more sensitive measures to delineate the children's skill proficiency. Mental events are hard to test (Kendall, 1981). Thus, the development of sensitive and appropriate measures would assist future research in this area.

While it is clear that the children increased their knowledge of the skills, it is also important to note that newly acquired cognitive skills do not translate automatically into more adaptive social behaviour (Sharp, 1981). Thus, to develop behavioural change, time is needed (Weissberg, 1985). As well, program emphasis on role-playing playground-harassment problems and adult modelling of the skills during recess may help establish in vivo changes.

It is recommended that the Conflict Management Outreach Program and the evaluation process continue. Longitudinal research will

hopefully determine the impact of this program after it has been integrated fully into the school community. Stability of a program is needed before summative conclusions can be drawn (Bloom, 1977; Herman, Lyons Morris & Fitz-Gibbon, 1987).

Developing an evaluative method that includes more control might also prove efficacious. Bronfenbrenner (1974) noted that much of developmental psychology is the science of behaviour of children in strange situations, with strange adults. Therefore, field studies still present the most valid form of research for this program. It is within real-life situations that the ontogeny of children is embedded (Masterpasqua, 1981). Observational studies might prove to be a useful way of increasing control, however, remaining ecologically valid.

Continued monitoring of the program's implementation is also recommended. Program's can "drift" from their original purpose and strategies, that may produce deleterious effects upon an evaluation (Jones, 1985; Schneider, 1992; Schneider & Byrne, 1985; Weiss, 1972). Program "drift" can have both positive and negative effects on a program's impact. It also may signify the natural progression of a program. Program change does not pose a problem for an evaluation, as long as awareness of the change is monitored. Thus, new questions might need to be formed to address these vicissitudes.

The overall gender and grade differences found, also present useful information to the program developers. These findings provide an opportunity to gain insight into the program's possible impact on various individuals. Recognition of gender and grade differences may help fine tune the program's lessons and objectives. Specifically, adjustments in expectations and program content to older students and boys, may prove worthwhile. Research is needed to support this assertion. Nonetheless, these differences may pose a challenge to the effectiveness of this program.

This evaluation demonstrates that the Conflict Management Outreach

Program successfully executed its goals and its implementation. As well, changes were observed in the children's cognitions, and to a lesser extent, in their behaviours due to the program. The student's affective skills were already established prior to this intervention. Negative effects due to the program were not evidenced by this research. And finally, the teachers perceived an improvement in the schools' climate since the program began.

It was hypothesized that the present program would enhance children's social competence by teaching them conflict management skills, within the schools, using a primary prevention method. A recapitulation of the aggregated definition of social competence is in order.

Social competence is having a sense of efficacy in social encounters, as well as, having the ability to achieve personal goals and behaviours in social interactions that are situation specific and developmentally-appropriate. These abilities maintain and enhance positive interpersonal relationships.

The Conflict Management Outreach Program was successful in teaching social problem-solving skill knowledge. Preliminary behavioural change can be seen in the children's use of the problem-solving skills. The children's skill use can be seen as a preliminary behavioural change. The students indicated that they possessed the motivation (personal goal) and the self-efficacy to handle their problems peacefully. As well, the staff's observations of improved school climate can be seen as an enhancement of positive interpersonal relationships.

Since conflict is part of everyone's life, it is theorized that this knowledge can translate into developmentally-appropriate interactions. What is needed to confirm this supposition is an observation of the children's use of these skills in real-life conflict situations.

Thus, the Conflict Management Outreach Program has had preliminary success towards the program's sine qua non of social competence.

Contributions

Several contributions to the literature on social competence and program evaluation have been made by the present research. First, the aggregated definition of social competence, posited by the present author, may be used in the future to guide program developers' and researchers' decisions. As well, the evaluative model, developed for this research, may assist future program evaluations.

The results of this study contribute to the growing body of literature evaluating social competency enhancing, primary prevention programs in the schools. As well, knowledge of gender and age differences in the areas of assertiveness, conflict attitudes, perceived school climate, problem-solving skill knowledge and skill use can be used to delineate program effects on the various constituents. This information also contributes to the literature on gender and age differences in social competence. Finally, the need to develop valid, sensitive and appropriate measures has been shown.

Since the development of emotional intelligence has been associated with higher functioning (Goleman, 1995), it is probable that more programs, like the Conflict Management Outreach Program, will be developed. Thus, effective evaluations of these programs will need to be made. It is hoped that the present research will aid in this process.

Footnotes

1. Kirk (1982) reviews hierarchical designs (or nested designs). A nested design occurs when each level of an IV appears at a specific level of another IV. For example, school #1 is nested under program and the variance of that school is applied to the program variable. This variance cannot be shared with the comparison variable because this school is not nested under comparison. The comparison variable is receiving variance from the two schools that are nested underneath it. Other Ivs are not nested because they appear at all levels a non-nested variable. For example, gender is not nested because both program and comparison schools have boys and girls in the analyses.

Nested variables (e.g., schools) are usually a nuisance variable. However, ignoring the contribution of this variable will lead to a biased test of the treatment. The variance of the nested variable needs to be addressed if the researcher is to make any valid inferences of an effect due to the treatment.

In the present analyses, schools within program and the schools within the comparison are tested to see if they are significantly different. The error term for this analysis is the within-cell error partitioning out the error due to the nested schools. If the schools under each condition are not significantly different from each other (i.e., program school #1 does not differ from program school #2 and comparison school #1 does not differ from comparison school #2) then we are safe to pool the error due to schools under the appropriate level of treatment (program or comparison).

If there is a difference between the program schools or the comparison schools, then the two strategies that are discussed in Footnote 1 are employed. The appropriate error term for the program/comparison analysis is the error due to the nested schools. The degrees of freedom for this error term are very small and the power of

this test is reduced. Small degrees of freedom result in a large mean square for the nested schools' error term; thus making it hard to find significant program vs. comparison results. This is the appropriate error term for this design.

Kirk points out that an advantage of completing a nested design is the ability to isolate the effects of the nuisance variable. He also points out the disadvantages. They are:

1. The number of subjects required is large.
2. Power of certain tests is low because of the small degrees of freedom used by the error term.
3. If randomization to treatments is not accomplished, interpretation is ambiguous.

2. It is important to consider the issues that can affect the main analyses. Thus, a prior examination of these issues was performed. The issues of importance were identified by Tabachnick and Fidell (1989). The statistical package used for all the analyses was "The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences - SPSS - Windows Version 6.1.2.

The data was first examined for missing data. Only 0.001% ($n = 49$) of the questions were left un-answered by the students, out of a possible 67,712 questions. The missing data was replaced by the mean for the group as advised by Tabachnick and Fidell (1989).

For the nonparametric analyses, a decision was made to examine the effects due to "program/comparison" instead of "schools". The criteria that guided this decision was simplicity of interpretation. Gender and grade effects were also examined. The alpha value of significance was adjusted to lessen the chance of a Type I error due to multiple analyses ($\alpha = .05 / 3 = .016$).

Unequal sample size in the data set was addressed by using the sequential approach in MANOVA and the experimental approach in ANOVA.

The data was inspected for univariate and multivariate outliers.

Univariate outliers were analyzed by examining each DV, grouped by the Ivs of school, grade and gender. Standardized values that exceeded ± 3 were identified as potential univariate outliers (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1989). The analyses indicated that univariate outliers were present; whereas, multivariate outliers were not found using a Mahalanobis distance significance test.

Normality issues also were considered. Frequency histograms, normal probability plots and detrended expected normal probability plots were viewed for normality. These plots provide an overall view of the data's distribution and, for the probability plots, they provide an expected normal-value to compare the data to. As well, examination of the kurtosis and skewness values, divided by their standard error, revealed the peakedness and symmetry of the distribution. Any value greater than three indicated the distribution was not normal in peakedness or symmetry. Many of the normality criteria were violated. Multivariate normality was assessed by verifying there were at least 20 cases per cell.

Linearity was determined by bivariate scatterplots between pairs of variables. If one of the variables in a paired scatterplot was non-normal, then this scatterplot would not be oval in shape (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1989). The homoscedasticity assumption also was addressed by the paired scatterplots. If the bivariate scatterplots were roughly the same width, then the relationships between the variables was homoscedastic. Both assumptions were met by the data.

Due to the presence of univariate outliers and non-normal distributions, transformations of the appropriate variables were completed.

Homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices was identified by the Box's M test. The test did not reach significance ($p < .001$) for any of the measures examined, grouped by each IV.

A correlation matrix containing the variables did not indicate a

problem with multicollinearity ($r = .90$ or above). However, singularity issues were present because of the use of a Multivariate nested design. Singularity occurs when a cell has more Dvs than cases (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1989). Analyses assessing the effect due to "schools" nested under "program/comparison" did not result in a singularity problem. However, a further analysis of the effect due to "program/comparison" resulted in a singularity problem. In this instance, the variable "schools" was nested under the "program/comparison" variable and was considered the "cases" for "program/comparison". Because the variable "schools" has two schools per level of the "program/comparison" variable, any analyses with more than two DVs violated the singularity assumption (i.e., more DVs than cases per cell).

Upon consultation with the Statistical Consulting Centre at Carleton University, a strategy was determined to deal with this singularity issue. First, because it was expected there was an effect due to "school", control for Type II errors was designated. Type II errors entail failing to reject the null hypothesis when there is an effect or difference. The significance level of $p < .25$ was used to lessen the chance of a Type II error (Howell, 1989). Two scenarios could then take place.

- 1) If there was an effect due to "schools" (using the lenient alpha level) while assessing three DVs, then univariate ANOVAs for each DV were performed to delineate the effect due to "schools". The significance level was adjusted to reduce the experiment-wise error rate due to multiple ANOVAs. The significance level for the univariate Fs was $p < .016$ (i.e., $p < .05 - 3 = .016$). This was followed by a Discriminant Function Analysis. The univariate Fs and the Structure Coefficients then were examined. Two analytical strategies were then devised to handle the problem of singularity. The first strategy involved eliminating one of the DVs so there were not be more DVs than cases. The second strategy involved

eliminating the school that caused the significant school effect. Both strategies relied on close examination of the Discriminant Function analysis to decide which DV or School could be eliminated (if any) to control the singularity issue. The analysis was then re-computed using only 2 DVs and then only the 3 schools, so the "program/comparison" effects could be gleaned. Also, gender and grade effects were computed (using an adjusted α value, $\alpha = .025$).

2) If there was not any effect due to "schools" found in the nested design with three DVs (even using the more lenient alpha level), then the error due to "schools" could be pooled with the other residuals. The effect of "program vs. comparison" was assessed using the pooled error, thus, eliminating "schools" as cases. The subjects were now used as cases. Effects due to gender and grade also was assessed. The Alpha levels for gender and grade effects were adjusted to allow for the multiple analyses ($\alpha = .025$).

3. The ranges for scoring each measure are as follows:

CABS	= 0- 54
CABS "Aggressive"	= 0- 54
CABS "Passive"	= 0- 54
SCLIM	= 13- 52
SAAC	= 32-128
SAAC Factor 1	= 10- 40
SAAC Factor 2	= 9- 36
SAAC Factor 3	= 7- 28
PPSAS	= 0- 10
CMM Question #4	= 1- 4
Test of Knowledge	= 0- 20
POST Supplemental	= 0- 4

4. The fourth question of the CABS is,
 "You forget something you were supposed to bring and someone says,
 "You're so dumb!" You would usually:

a) Say "I'm smarter than you any day; besides what do you know!"

+1 = Aggressive Score

b) Say "Yes, you're right, sometimes I do act dumb."

-2 = Very Passive Score

c) Say "If anybody is dumb, it's you!"

+2 = Very Aggressive Score

d) Say "Nobody's perfect. I'm not dumb just because I forgot
 something!"

0 = Assertive Score

e) Say nothing or ignore it.

-1 = Passive Score

The Sixth question on the Test of Knowledge is:

"What would you SAY to someone who just called you "stupid"?"

 Answers were rated on the same 5 point likert scale as the CABS. Inter-rater reliability Kappa values for the Test of Knowledge ranged from 79 to 100 at pre-test and 84 - 100 at post-test.

5. The Test of Knowledge and the Program Post-Test Supplemental Questions were only given to the program students. Change scores were not computed for these scores. Thus, these results only will be discussed in the post-test section of the students' questionnaire results to avoid redundancy of reporting.

6. Effect sizes were evaluated based on η^2 table in Cohen (1988).

Small Effect Size $\eta^2 = .0099$

Medium Effect Size $\eta^2 = .0588$

Large Effect Size $\eta^2 = .1379$

7. Change score analyses address both the pre-test and the post-test findings. Therefore, please refer to the change score section of the results for analyses of the CABS, SCLIM, SAAC, CABS "aggressive" score, CABS "passive" score, SAAC Factors, PPSAS and the CMM Question 4.

References

- Albee, G. W. (1980). The fourth mental health revolution. Journal of Prevention, 1(2), 67-70.
- Albee, G. W. (1982). Preventing Psychopathology and promoting human potential. American Psychologist, 37(9), 1043-1050.
- Albee, G. W. (1985). The argument for primary prevention. Journal of Primary Prevention, 5(4), 213-219.
- Allen, G. J., Chinsky, J. M., Larcen, S. W., Lochman, J. E., & Selinger, H. V. (1976). Community psychology and the schools. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Alpert, J. I. (1985). Change within a profession: Change, future, prevention, and school psychology. American Psychologist, 40(10), 1112-1121.
- Amabile, T. M. (1982). Conversation 1: The gap between teachers and researchers. In T. M. Amabile & M. L. Stubbs (Eds.), Psychological research in the classroom (pp. 9-20). Toronto: Pergamon Press.
- Amabile, T. M., & Stubbs, M. L. (1982). Psychological research in the classroom: Issues for educators and researchers. Toronto: Pergamon Press.
- Anderson, S., & Messick, S. (1974). Social competency in young children. Developmental Psychology, 10, 282-293.
- Araki, C. T. (1990). Dispute management in the schools. Mediation Quarterly, 8(1), 51-62.
- Arrington, E. W. (1987). Managing children's conflict: A challenge for the school counselor. School Counselor, 34(3), 188-194.
- Asher, S. R., & Gabriel, S. W. (1993). Using a wireless transmission system to observe conversation and social interaction on the playground. In C. H. Hart (ed.), Children on playgrounds: research perspectives and applications (pp. 184-209). Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press.
- Asher, S. R., & Parker, J. G. (1989). Significance of peer relationship

- problems in childhood. In B. H. Schneider, G. Attili, J. Nadel, & R. P. Weissberg (Eds.), Social competence in developmental perspective (pp. 5-24). The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic.
- Astri, K. E. (1994). Conflict management motivation scale. Unpublished.
- Attili, G. (1989). Social competence versus emotional security: The link between home relationships and behavior problems in preschool. In B. H. Schneider, G. Attili, J. Nadel, & R. P. Weissberg (Eds.), Social competence in developmental perspective (pp. 293-312). The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic.
- Austin, J. (1995). An external evaluation of a conflict management program in elementary schools. Unpublished bachelor of arts thesis.
- Babbie, E. (1989). The practice of social research (5th ed.). Belmont, California: Wadsworth.
- Baker, S. B., Swisher, J. D., Nadenichek, P. E., & Popowicz, C. L. (1984). Measured effects of primary prevention strategies. The Personnel and Guidance Journal, 62(8), 459-464.
- Bandura, A. (1981). Self-referent thought: A developmental analysis of self-efficacy. In J. H. Flavell & L. Ross (eds.), Social cognitive development: Frontiers and possible futures (pp. 200-239). New York: Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge.
- Barclay, J. R. (Ed.). (1984). "The day after" [Special Issue]. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 62 (8).
- Battistich, V. A., Elias, M. J., & Branden-Muller, L. R. (1992). Two school-based approaches to promoting children's social competence. 1 In G. W. Albee, L. A. Bond & T. V. C. Monsey (Eds.), Improving children's lives: Global perspectives on prevention (pp. 217-234). Newbury Park: Sage.
- Battistich, V., Solomon, D., Watson, M., Solomon, J., & Schaps, E. (1989). Effects of an elementary school program to enhance

- prosocial behavior on children's cognitive-social problem-solving skills and strategies. Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 10, 147-169.
- Battistich, V., Watson, M., Solomon, D., Schaps, E., & Solomon, J. (1991). The child development project: A comprehensive program for the development of prosocial character. In W. M. Kurtines & J. L. Gewirtz (Eds.), Handbook of moral behavior and development (pp. 1-34). Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Beelmann, A., Pflingsten, U. Losel, F. (1994). Effects of training social competence in children: A meta-analysis of recent evaluation studies. Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 23(3), 260-271.
- Berndt, T. (1981). Relations between social cognition, nonsocial cognition, and social behavior: The case of friendship. In J. H. Flavell & L. Ross (Eds.), Social cognitive development: Frontiers and possible futures (pp. 176-199). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bierman, K. L., & Furman, W. (1984). The effects of social skills training and peer involvement on the social adjustment of preadolescents. Child Development, 55, 151-162.
- Bloom, B. L. (1971). Strategies for the prevention of mental disorders. In G. Rosenblum (Ed.), Issues in community psychology and preventive mental health (pp. 1-20). New York: Behavioral Publications Inc.
- Bloom, B. L. (1977). Evaluating achievable objectives for primary prevention. In O. C. Klein & S. E. Goldston (Eds.), Primary prevention: An idea whose time has come (pp. 49-60). (DHEW Publication. No. ADM 77-447). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Bloom, B. L. (1979). Prevention of mental disorders: Recent advances in theory and practice. Community Mental Health Journal, 15, 179-191.
- Bond, L. A. & Compas, B. E. (Eds.). (1989). Primary prevention and

- promotion in the schools. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1974). The Origins of Alienation. Scientific American, 231, 33-61.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). Contexts of child rearing: Problems and prospects. American Psychologist, 34, 844-850.
- Butler, L., & Meichenbaum, D. (1981). The assessment of interpersonal problem-solving skills. In P. C. Kendall & S. D. Hollon (Eds.), Assessment strategies for cognitive-behavioral interventions (pp. 197-225). New York: Academic Press.
- Caplan, M. Z., & Weissberg, R. P. (1989). Promoting social competence in early adolescence: Developmental considerations. In B. H. Schneider, G. Attili, J. Nadel, & R. P. Weissberg (Eds.), Social competence in developmental perspective (pp. 355-370). The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic.
- Carroll, J. L. (1984). Developments in social competence and social skills: opportunities for school psychology. School Psychology Review, 13(3), 339-341.
- Cohen, J. (1988). Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Cole, J. D., Rabiner, D. L., & Lochman, J. E. (1989). Promoting peer relations in a school setting. In L. A. Bond & B. E. Compas (eds.), Primary prevention of psychopathology: Vol. XII: Primary prevention and promotion in the schools (pp. 207-234). Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Comrey, A. L. (1962). The minimum residual method of factor analysis. Psychological reports, 11, 15-18.
- Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (1979). Quasi-experimentation: Design and analysis issues for field settings. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Cowen, E. L. (1977). Baby-steps toward primary prevention. American Journal of Community Psychology, 5(1), 1-22.

- Cowen, E. L. (1980). The wooing of primary prevention. American Journal of Community Psychology, 8(3), 258-284.
- Cowen, E. L. (1982). The special number: A compleat roadmap. American Journal of Community Psychology, 10(3), 239-250.
- Cowen, E. L. (1983[a]). Community mental health and primary prevention. In I. B. Weiner (Ed.), Clinical methods in psychology (2nd Edition) (pp. 634-696). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Cowen, E. L. (1983[b]). Primary prevention in mental health: Past, present, and future. In R. D. Felner, L. A. Jason, J. N. Moritsugu, & S. S. Farber (Eds.), Preventive psychology: Theory, research and practice (pp. 11-30). New York: Pergamon.
- Cowen, E. L. (1984). A general structural model for primary prevention program development in mental health. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 62, 485-490.
- Cowen, E. L. (1985). Person-centered approaches to primary prevention in mental health: Situation-focused and competence-enhancement. American Journal of Community Psychology, 13, 31-48.
- Cowen, E. L. (1986). Primary prevention in mental health: Ten years of retrospect and ten years of prospect. In M. Kessler & S. E. Goldston (Eds.), A decade of progress in primary prevention (pp. 3-45). Hanover: University Press of New England.
- Cowen, E. L., & Hightower, A. D. (1990). The primary mental health project: Alternative approaches in school-based preventive intervention. In T. B. Gutkin & C. R. Reynolds (Eds.), The handbook of school psychology (pp. 777-800). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Cowen, E. L., & Work, W. C. (1988). Resilient children, psychological wellness, and primary prevention. American Journal of Community Psychology, 16(4), 591-607.
- Cowen, E. L., Pederson, A., Babigian, H., Izzo, L. D., & Trost, M. A. (1973). Long-term follow-up of early detected vulnerable children. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 41, 438-446.

- Cowen, J. (1988). Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Crandall, D. P. (1983). The teacher's role in school improvement. Educational Leadership, 41, 6-9.
- Crick, N. R., Bigbee, M. A., & Howes, C. (in press). Gender differences in children's normative beliefs about aggression: How do I hurt thee? Let me count the ways. Child Development.
- Crick, N. R., & Grotpeter, J. K. (1995). Relational aggression, gender, and social-psychological adjustment. Child Development, 66, 710-722.
- D'Zurilla, T. J., & Goldfried, M. R. (1971). Problem solving and behavior modification. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 78, 107-126.
- Daniels, T., Astri, K. E. (1994). Peaceful problem solving abilities scale. Unpublished.
- Davis, G. A. (1966). Current status of research and theory in human problem solving. Psychological Bulletin, 66, 36-54.
- Denham, S. A., & Almeida, M. C. (1987). Children's social problem-solving skills, behavioral adjustment, and interventions: A meta-analysis evaluating theory and practice. Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 8, 391-409.
- Deutsch, M. (1973). The resolution of conflict: Constructive and destructive processes. New Haven: Yale University.
- Dodge, K. A. (1985). Facets of social interaction and the assessment of social competence in children. In B. H. Schneider, K. H. Rubin, & J. E. Ledingham (Eds.), Children's peer relations: Issues in assessment and intervention (pp. 3-22). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Dodge, K. A. (1986). A social information processing model of social competence in children. In M. Perlmutter (Ed.) e Minnesota Symposium on Child Psychology: Vol. 18. (pp. 77-126). Hillsdale, New Jersey: Erlbaum.

- Durlak, J. A. (1983). Social problem-solving as a primary prevention strategy. In R. D. Felner, L. A. Jason, J. N. Moritsugu, & S. S. Farber (Eds.), Preventive psychology: Theory, research and practice (pp. 31-48). New York: Pergamon.
- Durlak, J. A. (1985). Primary prevention of school maladjustment. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 5, 623-630.
- Durlak, J. A., & Jason, L. A. (1984). Preventive programs for school-aged children and adolescents. In M. C. Roberts & L. Peterson (eds.), Prevention of problems in childhood (pp. 103-132). Toronto: John Wiley & Sons.
- Edelstein, B. A., & Michelson, L. (1986). Introduction. In B. A. Edelstein & L. Michelson (Eds.), Handbook of prevention (pp. xxi-xxiii). New York: Plenum Press.
- Eisenberg, N., & Harris J. D. (1984). Social competence: A developmental perspective. School Psychology Review, 13(3), 267-277.
- Elias, M. J., & Clabby, J. F. (1984). Integrating social and affective education into public school curriculum and instruction. In C. A. Maher, R. J. Illback, & J. E. Zins (Eds.), Organizational psychology in the school: A handbook for professional (pp. 143-172). Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas.
- Felner, R. D. (1984). Vulnerability in childhood: A preventive framework for understanding children's efforts to cope with life stress and transitions. In M. C. Roberts & L. Peterson (Eds.), Prevention of problems in childhood (pp. 133-169). Toronto: John Wiley & Sons.
- Felner, R. D., & Felner, T. Y. (1989). Primary prevention programs in the educational context: A transactional-ecological framework and analysis. In L. A. Bond & B. E. Compas (Eds.), Primary prevention and promotion in the schools (pp. 13-49). Newbury Park, Sage.
- Felner, R. D., Jason, L. A., Moritsugu, J. N., & Farber, S. S. (1983).

- Preventive psychology: Evolution and current status. In R. D. Felner, L. A. Jason, J. N. Moritsugu, & S. S. Farber (Eds.), Preventive psychology: Theory, research and practice (pp. 3-10). New York: Pergamon.
- Finch, A. J., & Rodgers, T. R. (1984). Self-report instruments. In T. H. Ollendick & M. Hersen (Eds.), Child behavioral assessment: Principles and procedures (pp. 106-123). New York: Pergamon.
- Fitz-Gibbon, C. T., & Lyons Morris, L. (1987). How to design a program evaluation. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Ford, M. E. (1982). Social cognition and social competence in adolescence. Developmental Psychology, 18, 323-340.
- Ford, M. E. (1985). Primary prevention: Key issues and a competence perspective. Journal of Primary Prevention, 5, 264-266.
- Furman, W., Giberson, R., White, A. S., Gravin, L. A., & Wehner, E. A. (1989). Enhancing peer relations in school systems. In B. H. Schneider, G. Attili, J. Nadel, & R. P. Weissberg (eds.), Social competence in developmental perspective (pp. 355-370). Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Furman, W., & McQuaid, E. L. (1992). Intervention programs for the management of conflict. In C. U. Shantz & W. W. Hartup (Eds.), Conflict in child and adolescent development, (pp. 402-430).
- Gagné, R. M. (1977). The conditions of learning. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Gardner, H. (1983). Frames of mind: The theory of multiple Intelligences. New York: Basic Books.
- Garnezy, N. (1987). Stress, competence, and development: Continuities in the study of schizophrenic adults, children vulnerable to psychopathology, and the search for stress-resistant children. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 57, 157-174.
- Garnezy, N. (1989). The role of competence in the study of children and adolescents under stress. In B. H. Schneider, G. Attili, J. Nadel,

- & R. P. Weissberg (Eds.), Social competence in developmental perspective (pp. 25-40). The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic.
- Garnezy, N., Masten, A., Nordstrom, L., & Ferrarese, M. (1979). The nature of competence in normal and deviant children. In M. W. Kent & J. E. Rolf (Eds.), Primary prevention of psychopathology: Vol. 3. Social competence in children (pp. 23-44). Hanover: University Press of New England.
- Gesten, E. L., Flores de Apodaca, R., Rains, M., Weissberg, R. P., & Cowen, E. L. (1979). Promoting peer-related social competence in schools. In M. W. Kent & J. E. Rolf (Eds.), Primary prevention of psychopathology: Vol. 3. Social competence in children (pp. 150-170). Hanover: University Press of New England.
- Gesten, E. L., Rains, M. H., Rapkin, B. D., Weissberg, R. P., Flores de Apodaca, R., Cowen, E. L., & Bowen, R. (1982). Training children in social problem-solving competencies: A first and second look. American Journal of Community Psychology, 10(1), 95-115.
- Gesten, E. L., Weissberg, R. P., Amish, P. L., & Smith, J. K. (1987). Social problem-solving training: A skills-based approach to prevention and treatment. In C. A. Maher & J. E. Zins (Eds.), Psychoeducational interventions in the schools (pp. 26-45). New York: Pergamon.
- Goldfried, M. R., & D'Zurilla, T. J. (1969). A behavioral-analytic model for assessing competence. In C. D. Spielberger (Ed.), Current topics in clinical and community psychology: Vol. 1. (pp. 151-198). New York: Academic.
- Goldston, S. E. (1977a). An overview of primary prevention programming. In D. C. Klein & S. E. Goldston (Eds.), Primary prevention: An idea whose time has come (pp. 23-40). (DHEW Publication No. ADM 77-447). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Goldston, S. E. (1977b). Defining primary prevention. In G. W. Albee & J. M. Joffe (Eds.), The issues: An overview of primary prevention

- (pp. 18-23). Hanover, New Hampshire: University Press of New England.
- Goleman, D. (1995). Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ. New York: Bantam Books.
- Gottman, J. M. (1983). How children become friends. Monographs of the Society of Research in Child Development, 48(3, Serial No. 201).
- Gresham, F. M. (1986). Conceptual issues in the assessment of social competence in children. In P. S. Strain, M. J. Guralnick, & H. M. Walker (Eds.), Children's social behavior (pp. 143-180). Orlando: Academic.
- Groot, M., & Prins, P. (1989). Children's social behavior: reliability and concurrent validity of two self-report measures. Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment, 11(3), 195-207.
- Hartup, W. W. (1979). Peer relations and the growth of social competence. In M. W. Kent & J. E. Rolf (Eds.), Primary prevention of psychopathology: Vol. 3. Social competence in children (pp. 150-170). Hanover: University Press of New England.
- Hartup, W. W., & Laursen, B. (1993). Conflict and context in peer relations. In C. H. Hart (Ed.), Children on playgrounds (pp. 44-84). Albany: State University of New York.
- Hartup, W. W., Brady, J. E., & Newcomb, A. F. (1983). Social cognition and social interaction in childhood. In E. T. Higgins, D. N. Ruble & W. W. Hartup (Eds.), Social cognition and social development (pp. 82-109). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Herman, J. L., Morris, L. L., & Fitz-Gibbon, C. T. (1987). Evaluator's Handbook. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications.
- Hops, H. (1982). Social-skills training for socially withdrawn/isolate children. In P. Karoly & J. J. Steffen (Eds.), Improving children's competence: Vol. 1. Advances in child behavioral analysis and therapy (pp. 39-97). Lexington: Lexington Books.
- Hops, H., & Finch, M. (1985). Social competence and skill: A

- reassessment. In B. H. Schneider, K. R. Rubin, & J. E. Ledingham (Eds.), Children's peer relations: Issues in assessment and intervention (pp. 23-39). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Hord, S. M., Rutherford, W. L., Huling-Austin, L., & Hall, G. E. (1987). Taking charge of change. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Howell, D. C. (1987). Statistical methods of psychology (2nd ed.). Boston, Massachusetts: PWS Publishers.
- Hyde, J. S. (1985). Half the human experience: The psychology of women (3rd ed.). Toronto: D. C. Heath and Company.
- Jahoda, M. (1958). Current concepts of positive mental health. New York: Basic Books.
- Jason, L. A., Durlak, J. A., & Holton-Walker, E. (1984). Prevention of child problems in the schools. In M. C. Roberts & L. Peterson (Eds.), Prevention of problems in childhood (pp. 311-341). Toronto: John Wiley & Sons.
- Jason, L. A., Thompson, D., & Rose, T. (1986). Methodological issues in prevention. In B. A. Edelstein & L. Michelson (Eds.), Handbook of prevention (pp. 1-19). New York: Plenum Press.
- Jenkins, J., & Smith, M. (1987). Mediation in the schools program evaluation report: 1986-87. Unpublished manuscript, University of New Mexico, New Mexico Center for Dispute Resolution, New Mexico.
- Jones, R. A. (1985). Research methods in social and behavioral sciences. Sunderland, Mass: Sinauer Associates.
- Kagan, J., Hans, S., Markowitz, A., Lopez, D., & Sigel, H. (1982). Validity of children's self-reports of psychological qualities. Progress in experimental personality research (Vol. II). New York: Academic Press.
- Kelly, J. G. (1971). The quest for valid preventive interventions. In G. Rosenblum (Ed.), Issues in community psychology and preventive mental health (pp. 109-139). New York: Behavioral Publications.

- Kelly, J. G. (1977). The search for ideas and deeds that work. In G. W. Albee & J. M. Joffe (Eds.), The issues: An overview of primary prevention (pp. 7-17). Hanover, New Hampshire: University Press of New England.
- Kendall, P. C. (1981). Assessment and cognitive-behavioral interventions: Purposes, proposals, and problems. In P. C. Kendall & S. D. Hollon (Eds.), Assessment strategies for cognitive-behavioral interventions (pp. 1-12). New York: Academic Press.
- Kendall, P. C., Pellegrini, D. S., & Urbain, E. S. (1981). Approaches to assessment for cognitive-behavioral interventions with children. In P. C. Kendall & S. D. Hollon (Eds.), Assessment strategies for cognitive-behavioral interventions (pp. 227-285). New York: Academic Press.
- Kent, M. W., & Rolf, J. E. (1979). Primary prevention of psychopathology: Vol. 3. Social competence in children. Hanover: University Press of New England.
- Kessler, M., & Albee, G. W. (1975). Primary prevention. Annual Review of Psychology, 26, 557-591.
- Kessler, M., & Albee, G. W. (1977). Bibliographical essay: An overview of the literature of primary prevention. In G. W. Albee & J. M. Joffe (Eds.), The issues: An overview of primary prevention (pp. 321-346). Hanover, New Hampshire: University Press of New England.
- Kirk, R. E. (1982). Experimental design: Procedures for the behavioral sciences (2nd ed.). Belmont, California: Wadsworth, Inc.
- Klein, D. C., & Goldston, S. E. (Eds.). (1977[a]). Primary prevention: An idea whose time has come. (DHEW Publication No. ADM 77-447). Washington, Dc: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Klein, D. C., & Goldston, S.E. (1977[b]). Preface. In D. C. Klein & S. E. Goldston (Eds.), Primary prevention: An idea whose time has come (pp. v-viii). (DHEW Publication No. ADM 77-447). Washington, Dc: U.S. Government Printing Office.

- Krasnor, L. R. (1983). An observational case study of failure in social problem-solving. Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 4, 81-98.
- Krasnor, L. R. (1985). Observational assessment of social problem solving. In B. H. Schneider, K. H. Rubin, & J. E. Ledingham (Eds.), Children's peer relations: Issues in assessment and intervention (pp. 57-74). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- La Greca, A. M. (1990). Issues and perspectives on the child assessment process. In A. M. La Greca (Ed.), Through the eyes of the child: Obtaining self-reports from children and adolescents (pp. 3-17). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Ladd, G. W. (1985). Documenting the effects of social skill training with children: Process and outcome assessment. In B. H. Schneider, K. H. Rubin, & J. Ledingham (eds.), Children's peer relations: Assessment and Intervention (pp. 243-269). New York: Springer Verlag.
- Lam, J. A. (1989[a]). School mediation program evaluation kit. Unpublished manuscript, University of Massachusetts, National Association for Mediation in Education, Massachusetts.
- Lam, J. A. (1989[b]). The impact of conflict resolution programs on schools: A review and synthesis of the evidence (2nd ed.). Amherst, Massachusetts: National Association of Mediation in Education.
- Linney, J. A. (1989). Optimizing Research strategies in the schools. In L. A. Bond & B. E. Compas (Eds.), Primary prevention and promotion in the schools (pp. 50-76). Newbury Park, Sage.
- Long, B. B. (1986). The federal scene: Ten years later. In M. Kessler & S. E. Goldston (Eds.), A decade of progress in primary prevention (pp. 346-362). Hanover: University Press of New England.
- Lorion, R. P. (1983). Evaluating preventive interventions: Guidelines for the serious social change agent. In R. D. Felner, L. A. Jason,

- J. N. Moritsugu, & S. S. Farber (Eds.), Preventive psychology: Theory, research and practice (pp. 251-272). New York: Pergamon.
- Lorion, R. P. (1987). Methodological challenges in prevention research. In J. A. Steinberg & M. M. Silverman (Eds.), Preventing mental disorders: A research perspective (pp. 28-47). (DHH Publication No. ADM 87-1492). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Lorion, R. P., Work, W. C., & Hightower, A. D. (1984). A school-based multilevel preventive intervention: Issues in program development and evaluation. The Personnel and Guidance Journal, April 1984, 479-484.
- Maccoby, E. E. (1990). Gender and relationships: A developmental account. American Psychologist, 50, 513-520.
- Maccoby, E., E., & Jacklin, C. N. (1974). The psychology of sex differences. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Mark, M. M., & Cook, T. D. (1984). Design of randomized experiments and quasi-experiments. In L. Rutman (ed.), Evaluation research methods: A basic guide (2nd ed.), (pp. 65-120). Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Masterpasqua, F. (1981). Toward a synergism of developmental and community psychology. American Psychologist, 36, (7), 782-786.
- McClure, L. F., Chinsky, J. M., & Larcen, S. W. (1978). Enhancing social problem-solving performance in an elementary school setting. Journal of Educational Psychology, 70(4), 504-513.
- McFall, R. M. (1982). A review and reformulation of the concept of social skills. 1 Behavioral Assessment, 4, 1-33.
- McKim, B. J., Weissberg, R. P., Cowen, E. L., Gesten, E. L., & Rapkin, B. D. (1982). A comparison of the problem-solving ability and adjustment of suburban and urban third-grade children. American Journal of Community Psychology, 10(2), 155-169.
- Michelson, L., & Mannarino, A. (1986). Social skills training with children: Research and clinical application. In P. S. Strain, M.

- J. Guralnick, & H. M. Walker (Eds.), Children's social behavior: Development, assessment, and modification (pp. 373-406). Orlando: Academic Press.
- Michelson, L., & Wood, R. (1980). A group assertive training program for elementary school children. Child Behavior Therapy, 2, 1-9.
- Michelson, L., & Wood, R. (1982). Development and psychometric properties of the children's assertive behavior scale. Journal of Behavioral Assessment, 4(1), 3-13.
- Miller, P. M., Danaher, D. L., & Forbes, D. (1986). Sex-related strategies for coping with interpersonal conflict in children aged five and seven. Developmental Psychology, 22(4), 543-548.
- Ollendick, T. H., & Hersen, M. (1984). An overview of child behavioral assessment. In T. H. Ollendick & M. Hersen (Eds.), Child behavioral assessment: Principles and procedures (pp. 3-19). New York: Pergamon.
- Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services (1989). Better beginnings, better futures: An integrated model of primary prevention of emotional and behavioural problems. Toronto: Queen's Printer for Ontario.
- Oppenheimer, L. (1989). The nature of social action: Social competence versus social conformism. In B. H. Schneider, G. Attili, J. Nadel, & R. P. Weissberg (Eds.) Social competence in developmental perspective (pp. 41-70). The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic.
- Pancer, S. M., & Weinstein, S. M. (1987). The development of affective skills in school-aged children. Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 8, 165-181.
- Pellegrini, A. D. (1987). Applied child study: A developmental approach. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Pellegrini, D. S., & Urbain, E. S. (1985). An evaluation of interpersonal cognitive problem solving training with children. Journal of Child Psychology, 26(1), 17-41.

- Piaget, J. (1928). Judgment and reasoning in the child. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.
- Piaget, J. (1932). The moral judgment of the child. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd.
- President's Commission on Mental Health (1978). Report to the President from The President's Commission on Mental Health (Vol. 1.) (Stock No. 040-000-00390-8). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office .
- Price, R. H. (1986). Education for prevention. In M. Kessler & S. E. Goldston (Eds.), A decade of progress in primary prevention (pp. 289-306). Hanover: University Press of New England.
- Price, R. H., & Smith, S. (1985). A guide to evaluating prevention programs in mental health. (DHHS Publication No. ADM 85-1365). Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.
- Price, R. H., Cowen, E. L., Lorion, R. P., & Ramos-McKay, J. (1989). The search for effective prevention programs: What we learned along the way. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 59(1), 49-58.
- Price, R. H., Cowen, E. L., Lorion, R. P., & Ramos-McKay, J. (Eds.). (1988). 14 cunces of prevention: A casebook for practioners. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- Putallaz, M., & Gottman, J. M. (1982). Conceptualizing social competence in children. In P. Karoly & J. J. Steffen (Eds.), Improving children's competence: Vol. 1. Advances in child behavioral analysis and therapy (pp. 1-33). Lexington: Lexington Books.
- Putallaz, M., & Gottman, J. M. (1983). Social relationship problems in children. In B. B. Lahey & A. E. Kazdin (Eds.), Advances in clinical child psychology: Vol. 4. (pp. 1-43). New York: Plenum.
- Putallaz, M., & Sheppard, B. H. (1992). Conflict management and social competence. In C. U. Shantz & W. W. Hartup (Eds.), Conflict in child and adolescent development, (pp. 330-355). Cambridge:

Cambridge University.

- Quinn Patton, M. (1984). Data collection: Options, strategies, and cautions. In L. Rutman (Ed.), Evaluation research methods: A basic guide (2nd ed.) (pp. 39-64). Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications.
- Reber, A. S. (1985). Dictionary of psychology. Markham: Penguin.
- Resnick, G. (1985). The interaction between evaluator and program: Lessons from an evaluation of a parent resource centre. Canadian Journal of Community Mental Health, 4(2), 45-56.
- Richard, B. A., & Dodge, K. A. (1982). Social maladjustment and problem solving in school-aged children. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 50, 226-233.
- Roberts, M. C., & Peterson, L. (1984). Prevention models: Theoretical and practical implications. In M. C. Roberts & L. Peterson (Eds.), Prevention of problems in childhood (pp. 1-39). Toronto: John Wiley & Sons.
- Rubin, K. H., & Krasnor, L. R. (1992). Interpersonal problem solving and social competence in children. In V. B. Van Hasselt & M. Hersen (Eds.), Handbook of social development (pp. 283-324). New York: Plenum.
- Rutman, L. (1984). Introduction. In L. Rutman (Ed.), Evaluation research methods: A basic guide (pp. 9-25). London: Sage Publishing.
- Rutter, M. (1979). Protective factors in children's responses to stress and disadvantage. In M. W. Kent & J. E. Rolf (Eds.), Primary prevention of psychopathology: Vol. 3. Social competence in children (pp. 49-74). Hanover: University Press of New England.
- Rutter, M. (1983). Stress, coping, and development: Some issues and some questions. In N. Garmezy & M. Rutter (Eds.), Stress, coping, and development in children (pp. 1-41). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Rutter, M. (1987). Psychosocial resilience and protective mechanisms.

American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 52(3), 316-331.

Sarason, B. R. (1981). The dimensions of social competence:

Contributions from a variety of research areas. In J. D. Wine & M. D. Smye (Eds.), Social competence (pp. 100-172). New York: Guilford Press.

Sarason, S.B. (1982). The culture of the school and the problem of change (2nd ed.). Toronto: Allyn and Bacon Inc.

Schneider, B. H. (1989). Between developmental wisdom and children's social-skills training. In B. H. Schneider, G. Attili, J. Nadel, & R. P. Weissberg (Eds.), Social competence in developmental perspective (pp. 339-353). The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic.

Schneider, B. H. (1992). Didactic methods for enhancing children's peer relations: A quantitative review. Clinical Psychology Review, 12, 363-382.

Schneider, B. H. (1993). Children's social competence in context: The contributions of family, school and culture. Oxford: Pergamon.

Schneider, B. H., Attili, G., Nadel, J., & Weissberg, R. P. (1989). Social competence in developmental perspective. The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic.

Schneider, B. H., & Byrne, B. M. (1985). Children's social skills training: A meta-analysis. In B. H. Schneider, K. H. Rubin, & J. Ledingham (eds.), Children's peer relations: Assessment and intervention (pp. 175-192). New York: Springer Verlag.

Seidman, E. (1987). Toward a framework for primary prevention research. In J. A. Steinberg & M. M. Silverman (Eds.), Preventing mental disorders: A research perspective (pp. 2-19). (DHH Publication No. ADM 87-1492). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Selman, R. L. (1980). The growth of interpersonal understanding. New York: Academic Press.

Shaffer, D. R. (1985). Developmental psychology: Theory, research, and application. Monterey: Brooks/Cole

- Shantz, C. U. (1987). Conflicts between children. Child Development, 158, 283-305.
- Shantz, C. U., & Shantz, D. W. (1985). Conflict between children: Social-cognitive and sociometric correlates. In M. W. Berkowitz (ed.), Peer conflict and psychological growth (pp. 3-22). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Sharp, K. C. (1981). Impact of interpersonal problem-solving training on preschoolers' social competency. Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 2, 129-143.
- Shaw, M. C., & Goodyear, R. K. (1984). Introduction to the special issues on primary prevention. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 62, 444-445.
- Shure, M. B. (1981). Social competence as a problem solving skill. In J. D. Wine & M. D. Smye (Eds.), Social competence (pp. 158-185). New York: Guilford Press.
- Shure, M. B., & Spivack, G. (1982). Interpersonal problem-solving in young children: A cognitive approach to prevention. American Journal of Community Psychology, 10(3), 341-356.
- Shure, M. B., & Spivack, G. (1987). Competence-building as an approach to prevention of dysfunction: The ICPS model. In J. A. Steinberg & M. M. Silverman (Eds.), Preventing mental disorders: A research perspective (pp. 124-139). (DHH Publication No. ADM 87-1492). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Shure, M., & Spivack, G. (1988). Interpersonal cognitive problem solving. In R. H. Price, E. L. Cowen, R. P. Lorion, & J. Ramos-McKay (Eds.), Fourteen ounces of prevention (pp. 69-82). Washington: American Psychological Association.
- Silverman, S. (1993). A Problem-solving approach to conflict management for elementary students: A staff training manual, unpublished manuscript, Ottawa Board of Education.
- Smith, M. L., & Glass, G. V. (1987). Research and evaluation in

- education and the social sciences. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Solomon, D., Watson, M., Battistich, V., Schaps, E., Tuck, P. Solomon, J., Cooper, C., & Ritchey, W. (1985). A program to promote interpersonal consideration and cooperation in children. In R. Slavin, S. Sharan, S. Kagan, R. Hertz-Lazarowitz, C. Webb, & R. Schmuck (eds.), Learning to cooperate, cooperating to learn (pp. 371-402). New York: Plenum Press.
- Spivack, G., & Shure, M. B. (1974). Social adjustment of young children. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Spivack, G., & Shure, M. B. (1982). The cognition of social adjustment: Interpersonal cognitive problem-solving thinking. In B. B. Lahey & A. E. Kazdin (Eds.), Advances in clinical child psychology Vol. 5. (pp. 323-372). New York: Plenum.
- Spivack, G., & Shure, M. B. (1985). ICPS and beyond: Centripetal and centrifugal forces. American Journal of Community Psychology, 13(3), 226-240.
- Spivack, G., Platt, J. J. & Shure, M. B. (1976). The problem-solving approach to adjustment. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Sterling, S., Cowen, E. L., Weissberg, R. P., Lotyczewski, B. S., & Boike, M. (1985). Recent stressful life events and young children's school adjustment. American Journal of Community Psychology, 13(1), 87-98.
- Sullivan, H. S. (1953). The interpersonal theory of psychiatry. New York: W. W. Norton & Company Inc.
- Swift, M. S., & Healey, K. N. (1986). Translating research into practice. In M. Kessler & S. E. Goldston (Eds.), A decade of progress in primary prevention (pp. 205-234). Hanover: University Press of New England.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (1989). Using multivariate statistics (2nd ed.). New York: Harper Collins.

- Urbain, E. S., & Kendall, P. C. (1980). Review of social-cognitive problem-solving interventions with children. Psychological Bulletin, 88(1), 109-143.
- Urbain, E. S., & Savage, F. (1989). Interpersonal cognitive problem-solving training with children in the schools. In J. N. Hughes & R. J. Hall (Eds.), Cognitive-behavioral psychology in the schools (pp. 466-500). New York: Guilford.
- Vitaro, F., & Pelletier, D. (1991). Assessment of children's social problem-solving skills in hypothetical and actual conflict situations. Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 19(5), 505-518.
- Waters, E., & Sroufe, L. A. (1983). Social competence as a developmental construct. Developmental Review, 3, 79-97.
- Weiss, C. H. (1972). Evaluation research: Methods for assessing program effectiveness. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Weissberg, R. P. (1985). Designing effective social problem-solving programs for the classroom. In B. H. Schneider, K. H. Rubin, & J. E. Ledingham (Eds.), Children's peer relations: Issues in assessment and intervention (pp. 225-242). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Weissberg, R. P. (1989). Challenges inherent in translating theory and basic research into effective social competence promotion programs. In B. H. Schneider, G. Attili, J. Nadel, & R. P. Weissberg (Eds.), Social competence in developmental perspective (pp. 335-338). The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic.
- Weissberg, R. P., & Allen, J. P. (1986). Promoting children's social skills and adaptive interpersonal behavior. In B. A. Edelstein & L. Michelson (Eds.), Handbook of prevention (pp. 153-175). New York: Plenum Press.
- Weissberg, R. P., & Gesten, E. L. (1982). Considerations for developing effective school-based social problem-solving (SPS) training

- programs. School Psychology Review, 11(1), 56-63.
- Weissberg, R. P., Caplan, M. Z., & Sivo, P. J. (1989). A new conceptual framework for establishing school-based social competence promotion programs. In L. A. Bond & B. E. Compas (Eds.), Primary prevention and promotion in the schools (pp. 255- 298). Newbury Park: Sage.
- Weissberg, R. P., Gesten, E. L., Carnrike, C. L., Toro, P. A., Rapkin, B. D., Davidson, E., & Cowen, E. L. (1981). Social problem-solving skills training: A competence-building intervention with second- to fourth-grade children. American Journal of Community Psychology, 9(4), 411-423.
- Weissberg, R. P., Gesten, E. L., Rapkin, B. S., Cowen, E. L., Davidson, E., Flores de Apodaca, R., & McKim, B. J. (1981). Evaluation of a social-problem-solving training program for suburban and inner-city third-grade children. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 49(2), 251-261.
- White, R. W. (1959). Motivation reconsidered: The concept of competence. Psychological Review, 66, 297-333.
- Wodarski, J. S. (1989). Requisites for the establishment, implementation and evaluation of social work prevention programs for adolescents. In J. S. Wodarski (Ed.), Preventative Health Services for Adolescents. Springfield, Illinois: Thomas.
- Wrubel, J., Benner, P., & Lazarus, R. S. (1981). Social competence from the perspective of stress and coping. In J. D. Wine & M. D. Smye (Eds.), Social competence (pp. 61-99). New York: Guilford.
- Zigler, E., & Trickett, P. K. (1978). IQ, social competence, and evaluation of early childhood intervention programs. American Psychologist, 33(9), 789-798.
- Zigler, E., Kagan, S. L., & Muenchow, S. (1982). Preventative intervention in the schools. In C. R. Reynolds & T. B. Gutkin (Eds.), The handbook of school psychology (pp. 774-795). Toronto: John Wiley & Sons.

Zins, J. E., & Forman, S. G. (1988[a]). Guest editors' comments:

Primary prevention in the schools: What are we waiting for? School Psychology Review, 17(4), 539-541.

Zins, J. E., & Forman, S. G. (Eds.). (1988[b]). Guest editors'

comments: Primary prevention in the schools: What are we waiting for? [Special Issue]. School Psychology Review, 17 (4).

Zolik, E. S. (1983). Training for preventive psychology in community and academic settings. In R. D. Felner, L. A. Jason, J. N. Moritsugu, & S. S. Farber (eds.), Preventive psychology: Theory, research and practice (pp. 273-289). Toronto: Pergamon Press.

Appendix A
Criteria for Comparison School Selection

MATCHING FOR CONTROL SCHOOLS

FOCUS ON FUTURE SCHOOLS ANALYSIS:
FINAL RANKING AMONG 53 OTTAWA AREA SCHOOLS

SCHOOL RANKINGS BY SELECTED TOPIC

SCHOOL	FIRST LANGUAGE SPOKEN	ESL/ESD	STAFF TURNOVERS	SINGLE PARENT FAMILIES	CITIZENSHIP "OTHER THAN CANADIAN"
COMPARISON #1	25	17	19	46	24
PROGRAM #2	21	32	19	13	44

(continuation from above)

SCHOOL RANKINGS BY SELECTED TOPIC

SCHOOL	HOUSEHOLD INCOME	% POP LESS THAN GRADE 9 EDUCATION	% SCHOOL POP. IN PUBLIC HOUSING	FINAL SCORE CALCULATION	FINAL RANKING
COMPARISON #1	6	2	28	19.6	16
PROGRAM #2	44	12	14	21.2	18

SCHOOL RANKINGS BY SELECTED TOPIC

SCHOOL	FIRST LANGUAGE SPOKEN	ESL/ESD	STAFF TURNOVERS	SINGLE PARENT FAMILIES	CITIZENSHIP "OTHER THAN CANADIAN"
PROGRAM #1	26	23	42	2	33
COMPARISON #2	28	20	31	37	26

(continuation from above)

SCHOOL RANKINGS BY SELECTED TOPIC

SCHOOL	HOUSEHOLD INCOME	% POP LESS THAN GRADE 9 EDUCATION	% SCHOOL POP. IN PUBLIC HOUSING	FINAL SCORE CALCULATION	FINAL RANKING
PROGRAM #1	28	16	25	25.2	23
COMPARISON #2	36	27	21	28.2	28

Note: Comparison #1 and Program #2 are "Focus on Future" schools

Appendix B**Consent Letter to Program Parents/Guardians**

November, 1994
Dear Parent or Guardian:

Many of you are probably aware that a mental health promotion program called 'Children Learning for Living' is operating in the Ottawa Board of Education. One of the aims of this program is give children a set of words and skills to help them deal with their everyday problems peacefully. This program has been introduced into several schools and will be introduced into your child's school. What is currently needed is an ongoing method of evaluating the effectiveness of this program.

We would like to evaluate the impact this curriculum has on the children who take part. To do this we are examining four schools, two schools receiving the program and two other schools being used for comparison.

We would like to administer several confidential questionnaires to grade 4-6 students during the Fall Term and then again in the Spring Term. Each student will fill out his or her own set of questionnaires while in class and it will take approximately one hour. The questionnaires will ask about their school environment, their attitudes towards social problems, their assertive behaviour, their feelings of confidence in dealing with problems and their motivation to handle their problems peacefully. The scheduling of the questionnaires will be completed at convenience of your child's teacher to minimize interference with the daily routine.

Also, we will test the children's knowledge of the words and the skills taught by the program. This test will be 10 multiple choice questions. Finally, some children will be randomly selected to complete two 5 minute interviews after recess (one in the Fall and one in the Spring). The children will be asked if anything happened at recess between them and another student which caused a problem and then they will be asked how they handled the problem. This will help us determine if the children are using the skills outside of the classroom. A tape recorder will be used to help recall what the child answers and these tapes will be erased after they have been listened to.

Your child's answers will be kept confidential and will not appear in any school records. The information gathered from your child will be kept for one year and then destroyed.

The collection of this information has been approved by the Ottawa-Research Advisory Committee and by the principal of your child's school. However, please note that the participation of your child in this study is voluntary and your son/daughter may withdraw at any time. Only students with written permission from their parent/guardian may participate.

Please take a moment to fill in the forms on the following pages and return them as soon as possible to your child's teacher regardless of your decision. Returning of these forms ensures that all parents have received our request.

Please feel free to contact Dr. T. Daniels or Dr. L. Paquet (Chair of the Ethics Committee) with any concerns you might have at Carleton University, 613-788-2644.

Thank you for taking the time to consider this project.

Sincerely,

Kelly Astin
Conflict Management Program
Supervising Researcher - Carleton University

C O N S E N T   F O R M

This information is confidential and is protected under the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, 1989.

I have read and understood the request for my son/daughter to participate in the study evaluating the problem solving program in the school. I have discussed it with my son/daughter and ...

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

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

Date: _____

Name of Student: _____
(please print)

Name of Parent/Guardian: _____
(please print)

Signature of
Parent/Guardian: _____

C O N S E N T   F O R M

This information is confidential and is protected under the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, 1989.

I have read and understood the request for my son/daughter to participate in the individual interviews asking the students if they had a problem with another student at recess and how they handled the problem. I have discussed it with my son/daughter and ...

I give permission to my son/daughter to participate.

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

Date: _____

Name of Student: _____
(please print)

Name of Parent/Guardian: _____
(please print)

Signature of
Parent/Guardian: _____

Consent Letter to Comparison Parents/Guardians

November, 1994
Dear Parent or Guardian:

Many of you are probably aware that a mental health promotion program called "Children Learning for Living" is operating in the Ottawa Board of Education. One of the aims of this program is give children a set of words and skills to help them deal with their everyday problems peacefully. This year the program is not in your child's school but it has already been introduced into several other schools. What is currently needed is an evaluation of the effectiveness of this program. The evaluation will help make improvements to this program so that all future program schools will benefit.

We would like to evaluate the impact this curriculum has on the children who take part. To do this we are examining four schools, two schools receiving the program and two other schools being used for comparison. Your child's school will act as a comparison to see how a child would change without the program.

We would like to administer several confidential questionnaires to grade 4-6 students during the Fall Term and then again in the Spring Term. Each student will fill out his or her own set of questionnaires while in class and it will take approximately one hour. The questionnaires will ask about their school environment, their attitudes towards social problems, their assertive behaviour, their feelings of confidence in dealing with problems and their motivation handle their problems peacefully. The scheduling of the questionnaires will be completed at convenience of your child's teacher to minimize interference with the daily routine.

Also, we will test the children's knowledge of problem solving words and skills. This test will be 10 multiple choice questions. Finally, some children will be randomly selected to complete two 5 minute interviews after recess (one in the Fall and one in the Spring). The children will be asked if anything happened at recess between them and another student which caused a problem and then they will be asked how they handled the problem. This will help us determine if the children are using the specific program skills outside of the classroom. A tape recorder will be used to help recall what the child answers and these tapes will be erased after they have been listened to.

Your child's answers will be kept confidential and will not appear in any school records. The information gathered from your child will be kept for one year and then destroyed.

The collection of this information has been approved by the Ottawa-Research Advisory Committee and by the principal of your child's school. However, please note that the participation of your child in this study is voluntary and your son/daughter may withdraw at any time. Only students with written permission from their parent/guardian may participate.

Please take a moment to fill in the forms on the following pages and return them as soon as possible to your child's teacher regardless of your decision. Returning of these forms ensures that all parents have received our request.

Please feel free to contact Dr. T. Daniels or Dr. L. Paquet (Chair of the Ethics Committee) with any concerns you might have at Carleton University, 613-788-2644.

Thank you for taking the time to consider this project.

Sincerely,

Kelly Astra
Conflict Management Program
Supervising Researcher - Carleton University

C O N S E N T   F O R M

This information is confidential and is protected under the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, 1989.

I have read and understood the request for my son/daughter to participate in the study evaluating a problem solving program. I have discussed it with my son/daughter and ...

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

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

Date: _____

Name of Student: _____
(please print)

Name of Parent/Guardian: _____
(please print)

Signature of
Parent/Guardian: _____

C O N S E N T   F O R M

This information is confidential and is protected under the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, 1989.

I have read and understood the request for my son/daughter to participate in the individual interviews asking the students if they had a problem with another student at recess and how they handled the problem. I have discussed it with my son/daughter and ...

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

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

Date: _____

Name of Student: _____
(please print)

Name of Parent/Guardian: _____
(please print)

Signature of
Parent/Guardian: _____

Appendix C
Instructions to Students

Instructions to Students

To be read verbatim by the person administering the student questionnaires.

Introduction

"Today we are going to do something that you have never done before. There is a researcher in Ottawa whose name is Kelly. She wants to know more about children in Grades 4 to 6. She would like to find out what children your age think about things at school. She has sent some questions that she would like answers to and she has asked us to help her by filling out some forms that ask about you, your school, how you get along with other people and what you do if certain things happen at school.

One thing you should know is that this is not a test. You won't be graded. In fact, these forms are very different from most things you do at school. There are no right or wrong answers to any of the things you will be asked. It's all about what you think and feel."

Non-participation

"Before we start there are some things I want to talk to you about. The forms we will be filling out are easy to do and I will be helping you by reading each question out loud, then you will circle your answer. We will work for about an hour today. I think you will like doing this but if there is anyone who does not want to fill out the forms he/she may take out some quiet desk work."

Confidentiality

"Okay. Let's talk about your answers for a minute before we start. Remember I said that there are not any right or wrong answers; it's what you think and feel that is important. Kelly is interested in your opinion -- that's what she wants to know about -- WHAT YOU THINK. So it's very important that you are VERY HONEST when you fill out these forms and tell her what you think. Your answers are "confidential". Do you know what that means? (Enlist answers from students like "private" or "secret"). That's right! Your answers are PRIVATE. Your answers today will be private. You won't have to worry about what you mark down because no one will see your answers except Kelly. Please try not to talk to your neighbour about your answers while you are filling out your answers or afterwards. To help make you feel sure that no one can see your paper, take out a BOOK and stand it up in front of your paper so no one can see your answers.

Are there any questions? If you don't understand something or you need help, RAISE your HAND and the other helper I will answer you. I will read each question and then you will answer. Try not to work ahead. Remember to stop when you see the BLUE sheet. Okay, then let's begin. You will need a pencil or pen."

Appendix D**Children's Assertive Behavior Scale****(Michelson & Wood, 1981)****I Want to Know What You Would Usually Do**

Children's Assertive Behavior Scale
(Michelson & Wood, 1981)
(I Want to Know What You Would Usually Do)

(PLEASE write the answers to the second example on the chalk board before going over these instructions).

You are going to answer some questions about what you do in many situations. There are not any "right" or "wrong" answers. You are just to answer what YOU would really do.
 For example, a question might be:

"What do you do if someone does not listen to you when you are talking to them?"

Try to THINK about what you would do if someone does not listen to you when you are talking to them.

Would anyone like to share what they would usually do (get some examples)

(If there are not any negative answers then provide examples from the choices below (e) or (a)).

Now that you have some ideas of how you would usually act, look over the answers that you can choose.

You have to choose the answer that is like what you usually do.

"What do you do if someone does not listen to you when you are talking to them?"

You would usually:

- (a) Tell them to listen.
- (b) Keep on talking.
- (c) Stop talking and ask them to listen.
- (d) Stop talking and walk away.
- (e) Talk louder.

From these 5 answers, you decide which one is MOST like the one you would do. If you don't find the answer that you thought of in the list, try to pick an answer that is like your answer. Now circle the letter that is most like you.

If you cannot understand a word, question, or answer, then raise your hand and you will be helped. Remember to answer honestly about how you would act. Also there are not any "right" or "wrong" answers so choose the answer that is MOST like you.

PLEASE TRY TO WORK QUICKLY.

Now, we will answer the questions. (Read each question and PAUSE so the students can think of their answer; then read the answers)

I Want to Know More About Who You Are.

Please print your answers to the following questions.

Name _____

Grade _____

School _____

Are you a boy or a girl? _____

How old are you? _____

I Want to Know What You Would Usually Do

EXAMPLE:

"What do you do if someone does not listen to you when you are talking to them?"

(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
Tell them to listen	Keep on talking.	Stop talking and ask them to listen.	Stop talking and walk away.	Talk louder.

1. Someone says to you, "I think you are a very nice person." You would usually:

(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
Say "No. I'm not that nice."	Say "Yes, I think I am the best."	Say "Thank you."	Say nothing and blush	Say "Thanks, I am really great."

2. Someone does something that you think is really great. You would usually:

(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
Act like it wasn't that great and say, "That was all right."	Say "That was all right, but I've seen better."	Say nothing.	Say "I can do much better than that."	Say "That was really great!"

3. You are working on something you like and think is very good. Someone says, "I don't like it." You would usually:

(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
Say "You're a dummy."	Say "I think it's good."	Say "You are right," although you don't really agree.	Say "I think this is great, besides, what do you know?"	Feel hurt and say nothing.

4. You forget something you were supposed to bring and someone says, "You're so dumb." You would usually:

(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
Say "I'm smarter than you any day; besides what do you know?"	Say "Yes, you're right, sometimes I do act dumb."	Say "If anybody is dumb, it's you!"	Say "Nobody's perfect. I'm not dumb just because I forgot something."	Say nothing or ignore it.

5. Someone you were supposed to meet arrives 30 minutes late, which makes you upset. The person who was late says nothing about why they were late. You would usually:

(A) Say I'm upset that you kept me waiting like this.	(B) Say "I was wondering when you'd get here."	(C) Say "This is the last time I'll wait for you."	(D) Say nothing to the person.	(E) Say "You're a jerk. You're late."

6. You need someone to do something for you. You would usually:

(A) Not ask for anything at all.	(B) Say "You gotta do this for me."	(C) Say "Would you please do something for me," and then explain what you want.	(D) Give a small hint that you need something done.	(E) Say "I want you to do this for me."

7. Someone asks you to do something that would keep you from doing what you really want to do. You would usually:

(A) Say "I did have other plans, but I'll do what you want."	(B) Say "No way. Find someone else."	(C) Say "OK, I'll do what you want."	(D) Say "Forget it, shove off."	(E) Say "I've already made other plans, maybe next time."

8. You see someone you don't like and they ask you to meet. You would usually:

(A) Say "I'm not meeting anyone at the moment."	(B) Walk over to the person, introduce yourself, and start talking.	(C) Walk over near the person and wait for them to talk to you.	(D) Walk over to the person and start talking about great things you have done.	(E) Say nothing to the person.

9. Another student you haven't met before stops and says "hello" to you. You would usually:

(A) Say "What do you want?"	(B) Not say anything.	(C) Say "Don't bother me. Get lost."	(D) Say "hello," introduce yourself, and ask who they are.	(E) Nod your head, say "hi," and walk away.

10 You know that someone is feeling upset. You would usually:				
(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
Say "You seem upset"; ask if help?	Be with them and not talk about their being upset.	Say "What's wrong with you?"	Not say anything and leave them alone.	Laugh and say "You're just a big baby."
11 You are feeling upset, and someone says, "You seem upset." You would usually:				
(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
Turn your head away or say nothing	Say "It's none of your business."	Say "Yes, I am upset, thank you for asking."	Say "It's nothing."	Say "I'm upset, leave me alone."
12 Someone else makes a mistake and someone blames it on you. You would usually:				
(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
Say "You're crazy!"	Say "That wasn't my fault, someone else made the mistake."	Say "I don't think it was my fault."	Say "Wasn't ~~me~~ , you don't know what you're talking about!"	Take the blame or say nothing.
13 Someone asks you to do something, but you don't know WHY it has to be done. You would usually:				
(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
Say "This doesn't any sense, I don't want to do it."	Do what they ask and say nothing.	Say "This is dumb, I'm not going to do it."	Before doing it, say "I don't understand why you want this done."	"If that's what you make want" and then do it
14 Someone says to YOU, they think that something you did was terrific. You would usually:				
(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
Say "Yes, I usually do better than most."	Say "No, that wasn't so hot."	Say "That's right, because I'm the best."	Say "Thank you."	Ignore it and say nothing.

15. Someone has been very nice to you. You would usually:

(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
Say "You have been really nice to me, thanks."	Act like they weren't that nice and say "Yea, thanks."	Say "You have treated me all right, but I deserve even better."	Ignore it and say nothing.	"You don't treat me good enough!"

If you are talking very loudly with a friend and someone says, "Excuse me, but you are being too noisy." You would usually:

(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
Stop talking immediately.	Say "If you don't like it, get lost," and keep on talking loudly.	Say "I'm sorry, I'll talk quietly," and then talk in a quiet voice.	Say "I'm sorry" and stop talking.	Say "All right" and continue to talk loudly.

If you are waiting in line and someone steps in front of you. You would usually:

(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
Make quiet comments such as, "Some people have a lot of nerve," or "I'm actually in line."	Say "Get to the end of the line."	Say nothing to the person.	Say loudly, "Get out of this line you creep!"	Say "I was here first, please go to the end of the line."

If someone has something to say to you that you don't like and it makes you angry. You would usually:

(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
Say "I'm sorry."	Say "I am angry. I don't like what you said."	Act hurt about it but not say anything to the person.	Say "I'm mad. I don't like you."	Ignore it and not say anything to the person.

If someone says something that you want to use. You would usually:

(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
Tell them to give it to you.	Not ask to use it.	Take it from them.	Tell the person you would like to use it, and then ask to use it.	Make a comment about it, but not ask to use it.

2. Someone says, "I can borrow something of yours, but it is new and you don't want to let them use it. You would like it."

(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
Say, "No, I can't give it to you. I want to keep it."	Say, "I really don't want to, but you can use it."	Say, "No, go get your own."	Give it to them even though you don't want to.	Say, "You're crazy!"

3. Someone says, "I'm talking about a hobby you really like, and you want to join in and say something. You would usually..."

(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
Not say anything.	Interrupt the people and immediately start telling them how good you are at this hobby.	Move closer to the people and enter into the conversation when you have a chance.	Move closer to the people and wait for them to notice you.	Interrupt the people and immediately start talking about how much you like the hobby.

4. You are working on a hobby and someone asks, "What are you doing?" You would usually:

(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
Say, "Oh, just something or other, nothing."	Say, "Don't bother me. I can't see I'm working."	Keep on working and say nothing.	Say, "It's none of your business!"	Stop working and explain what you were doing.

5. You see someone trip and fall down. You would usually:

(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
Laugh and say, "Why don't you watch where you're going?"	Say, "Are you all right? Is there anything I can do?"	Ask, "What happened?"	Say, "That's what happens!"	Do nothing and ignore it.

6. You bumped your head on a shelf and it hurts. Someone says, "Are you all right?" You would usually:

(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
Say, "I'm fine. Leave me alone!"	Say nothing and ignore them.	Say, "Why don't you mind your own business?"	Say, "No, I hurt my head, thanks for asking."	Say, "It's nothing. I'm OK."

26. YOU made a mistake and someone else is blamed for it. You would usually: (A) Say nothing	(B) Say "It's their mistake."	(C) Say "I made the mistake."	(D) Say "I don't think that person did it." (E) Say "That's their tough luck."
27. You feel upset by something someone said to you. You would usually: (A) Walk away from them, without telling them you feel upset	(B) Tell them not to do it again.	(C) Say nothing to the person, although you feel upset.	(D) Insult them back and call them a name. (E) Tell them you don't like what they said and tell them not to do it again.
28. Someone often interrupts you when you're speaking. You would usually: (A) Is it me? I could have so much to say. I was saying	(B) Say "This is it, that's all. I got to talk."	(C) Interrupt the other person by starting to talk again.	(D) Say nothing and let the person continue to talk. (E) Say "Shut up. I was talking."

Appendix E**Conflict Management Motivation (Astin, unpublished)****(I Want To Know More About Your Feelings)**

Conflict Management Motivation (Act 1) (unpublished)
 (I want to know more about your feelings.)

Now I would like to know how you feel and what you think about your feelings. There are only 4 questions. For the first three questions, you will just need to answer "yes", "sometimes", or "no" (not at all).

(Now go through each question)

(read a question and then place the question in the positive or negative form to help the student realize what they are circling.)

For example, Do you sometimes feel angry, jealous, hurt or worried?

Yes, I sometimes feel angry, jealous, hurt or worried
 or

No I never feel angry, jealous, hurt or worried.)

The last question is a little different. I want you to tell me how important or how not important this sentence is to you.

Let's try the question.

How important is it to you that you handle your upset feelings peacefully.

Very Important	Important	Not Important	Not at all
Important			

THINK of when you get upset, what do you do (just think about it, no talking). What are some ways that you can handle your upset feelings PEACEFULLY (list some ideas)

If you think it is IMPORTANT to handle your upset feelings peacefully then look at this side of the page (point). This is the left side. This is the side to look at if you think that it is IMPORTANT to handle your upset feelings peacefully.

Now do you think that it is REALLY VERY IMPORTANT to handle your upset feelings peacefully? If you think it is really very important, then you would circle the words "Very Important".

If you think that it is important to handle them peacefully, but not REALLY IMPORTANT, then you would circle the word "Important".

Now, not everyone thinks that it is important to handle their upset feelings peacefully. For some people it doesn't really matter. It is NOT important to them to handle their upset feelings peacefully.

If you think that it is NOT IMPORTANT to handle your upset feelings peacefully, then look at this side of the page (point), the right side. This is the side to look at if you do not think it is IMPORTANT to handle your upset feelings peacefully.

Now, do you think that it is REALLY NOT IMPORTANT to handle them peacefully?

If you do, then you would circle the words "NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT".

If you think that it is NOT important to handle them peacefully, but you do not think it is REALLY NOT IMPORTANT, then you would circle the words "NOT IMPORTANT".

Has everyone circled ONE answer? Circle only one. (the most important)

Are there any questions? Does everyone understand?

3

PM-1 3 1/2" x 4" PHOTOGRAPHIC MICROCOPY TARGET
NBS 1010a ANSI/ISO #2 EQUIVALENT

PRECISION^{SM} RESOLUTION TARGETS

I Want to Know More About Your Feelings.

For each sentence, circle the words that best describes how you feel. Remember there are not any "right" or "wrong" answers, only how you feel.

YES SOMETIMES	1. Do you sometimes feel angry, jealous, hurt or worried?	NO, NOT AT ALL

YES SOMETIMES	2. Do you think that these feelings can be uncomfortable?	NO, NOT AT ALL

YES SOMETIMES	3. Do you think that these feelings can cause problems?	NO, NOT AT ALL

YES IMPORTANT	4. How important is it to you that you handle your upset feelings peacefully?	NOT IMPORTANT NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT

Appendix F
School Climate Questionnaire (Lam, 1989)
I want To Know More About Your School

School Climate Questionnaire (Rev. 1989)
(I Want to Know More About Your School)

To start I would like to know about your school. I am going to read you some sentences about your school and I want you to tell me if you agree with the sentence or you don't.

For example: I like ice-cream.

How do you feel about that sentence?

How many people here like ice-cream? (get a show of hands)

Everyone who put their hand up likes ice-cream so they AGREE with the sentence "I like ice-cream".

Everyone who likes ice-cream will look at this side of the page. The left side (point). This is the side to look at if you AGREE with the sentence

Now do you REALLY agree with the sentence I like ice-cream. Do you REALLY REALLY like ice-cream? If you do then you would circle the words "Strongly Agree".

But what if you don't really like ice-cream a lot but you like it a little? Then you would circle the words "Somewhat Agree"

Now, not everyone likes ice-cream. Who does NOT like ice-cream?

(get a show of hands).

Everyone who put their hand up does NOT like ice-cream so they DISAGREE with the sentence "I like ice-cream".

Everyone who does NOT like ice-cream will look at this side of the page (point), the right side. This is the side to look at if you DISAGREE with the sentence.

Now do you REALLY disagree with the sentence I like ice-cream. DO you REALLY NOT like ice-cream? If you REALLY, REALLY do NOT like ice-cream then you would circle the words "Strongly DISAGREE".

If you don't like ice-cream but you don't think it is really bad then you would circle the words "Somewhat DISAGREE".

Has everyone circled the words that best describe how they feel? Circle only one.

How many strongly agree with the sentence I like ice-cream?

(get show of hands)

How many somewhat agree with the sentence I like ice-cream?

(get show of hands)

How many somewhat disagree with the sentence I like ice-cream?

(get show of hands)

How many strongly disagree with the sentence I like ice-cream?

(get show of hands)

Are there any questions? Does everyone understand?

Lets go on and try each question. Remember for each question FIRST decide if you agree or disagree. Then go to the left side of the paper (point) or the right side (point). Then decide if you STRONGLY OR somewhat agree or disagree. Each question will be different.

Remember to think about each one.

(continue with the same instructions for the first two or three sentences but do not ask children to give a show of hands. The instructions can then be shortened as appropriate.)

I Want to Know More About Your School

For each sentence, circle the answer that best describes how you feel about your school. Remember there are no right or wrong answers, only how you feel.

Example: I like ice-cream			
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree

Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	7. Teachers spend too much time disciplining students. Disciplining means making sure children follow the school rules.	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	8. Students are generally happy with how teachers make sure children follow the rules.	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	9. Students know how to solve problems without getting into fights.	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	10. Students in our school really like the school.	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	11. Teachers listen to both sides of the story when children have a problem.	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	12. Students can't really solve their own problems at school; they need help from an adult.	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	13. Students at our school argue and fight a lot.	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree

Appendix G**Student Attitudes About Conflict Scale****(Jenkins and Smith, 1989)****I Want to Know More About How You****Get Along With Other People**

Students' Attitudes About School
(Jenkins & Smith, 1987)

(I Want To Know More About How You Get Along With Other People)

I would like to know some more about you and how you get along with other people. This time I am going to read you some sentences and I want you to tell me if you agree with the sentence or you don't agree. Let's just review what you are to do.

EXAMPLE: I like pineapple on my pizza.
How do you feel about that sentence?

Well, who likes pineapple on their pizza? (get a few responses out loud)

How many people here like pineapple on their pizza? (get a show of hands)

Everyone who put their hand up likes pineapple on their pizza so they AGREE with the sentence. I like pineapple on my pizza.

Everyone who likes pineapple on their pizza will look at this side of the page (point). This is the left side. This is the side to look at if you AGREE with the sentence.

Now do you REALLY REALLY agree with the sentence. I like pineapple on my pizza. If you do then you would circle the words "Strongly Agree".

If you don't like pineapple on your pizza a lot but you like it a little then you would circle the words "Somewhat Agree".

Now, not everyone likes pineapple on my pizza. Who does NOT like pineapple on their pizza? (get a show of hands).

Everyone who put their hand up does NOT like pineapple on their pizza so they DISAGREE with the sentence. I like pineapple on my pizza.

Everyone who does NOT like pineapple on their pizza will look at this side of the page (point), the right side. This is the side to look at if you DISAGREE with the sentence.

Now do you REALLY REALLY disagree with the sentence. I like pineapple on my pizza. DO you really NOT like pineapple on your pizza? If you REALLY, REALLY do NOT like pineapple on your pizza then you would circle the words "Strongly DISAGREE".

If you kind of don't like pineapple on your pizza but you don't think it is really bad then you would circle the words "Somewhat DISAGREE". Has everyone circled ONE? Circle only one, the one most like you.

How many strongly agree with the sentence. I like pineapple on my pizza? (get show of hands)

How many somewhat agree with the sentence. I like pineapple on my pizza? (get show of hands)

How many somewhat disagree with the sentence. I like pineapple on my pizza? (get show of hands)

How many strongly disagree with the sentence. I like pineapple on my pizza? (get show of hands)

Are there any questions? Does everyone understand?

Let's go on and try each question. Remember for each question FIRST decide if you agree or disagree. Then go to the left side of the paper (point) or the right side (point). Then decide if you strongly or somewhat agree or disagree. Each question will be different. Remember to think about each one.

Continue with the same instructions for the first two or three sentences but do not ask children to give a show of hands. The instructions can then be shortened as appropriate.

I Want to Know How You Get Along With Other People

For each sentence, circle the words that best describes how you get along with other people. Remember there are *not* any right or *strong* answers only how you feel.

Example:			
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	I like pineapple on my pizza.	Somewhat Disagree
			Strongly Disagree
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	1. Most of the time I feel good about myself	Somewhat Disagree
			Strongly Disagree
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	2. Other children think I'm someone they can talk to	Somewhat Disagree
			Strongly Disagree
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	3. I like school and look forward to coming most days	Somewhat Disagree
			Strongly Disagree
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	4. Asking someone questions helps to find out how they feel.	Somewhat Disagree
			Strongly Disagree
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	5. Most children would like to have me as a friend	Somewhat Disagree
			Strongly Disagree
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	6. I have a hard time resolving problems with other people.	Somewhat Disagree
			Strongly Disagree

Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	7 I like to see teachers get mad in class.	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	8 If I saw my friends fighting, I would try to get them to talk out the problem instead.	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	9 I get along really well with other people.	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	10 When people talk I have a hard time paying attention.	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	11 I have a hard time getting work done.	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	12 Sometimes a person doesn't have any idea what he's doing.	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	13 To help someone with a problem, you have to ask them how they feel about it.	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	14 I want to do well in school.	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree

Strongly Agree	15	When children I'm with want to do something bad, I can usually talk them out of it.	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Strongly Agree	16	I think most people at school really like me.	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Strongly Agree	17	It's hard to talk to a teacher about my feelings.	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Strongly Agree	18	There is at least one thing I'm really good at.	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Strongly Agree	19	Other children will think I'm afraid if I don't fight when someone makes me mad.	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Strongly Agree	20	My teachers really care about me.	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Strongly Agree	21	If someone hits me I usually hit them back to get even.	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Strongly Agree	22	It's easy for me to explain things to other children my age.	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree

Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	23. Fighting with someone can be a good way to solve a problem	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	24. I like to get involved with school activities	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	25. I'm good at helping people solve their problems.	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	26. Other children would think I'm strange if I tried to stop a fight	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	27. I like to help my teachers	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	28. I work well with others	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	29. Most people don't know what I'm really like	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	30. I try to talk out a problem instead of fighting	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree

Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	11 Teachers think I cause a lot of trouble.	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	12 I treat other people well.	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree

Appendix B

Peaceful Problem-Solving Abilities Scale

(Daniels & Astri, unpublished)

Peaceful Problem-Solving Abilities Scale
 (Daniels & Astri, unpublished)
 (I Want To Know What You Feel You Can Do)

I would like to know some more about you and how you handle problems. This time I am going to read you some sentences and I want you to tell me if you think you can do something peaceful about these situations or if you think you cannot do anything peaceful about these situations.

Lets review what you are to do.

Here is a situation: "Someone keeps bugging you when you are trying to do your work".

Try to imagine this happening to you. (pause)

There are many ways to handle this situation (elicit a few responses - give a negative response if the students do not e.g., Punch them in the stomach or yell at them saying, "Leave me alone!").

Think of what you Feel you Could do if you were in this situation.

Some ways of handling this situation are peaceful and some ways of handling this situation are not peaceful.

If you yelled at the person to get them to stop bugging you, this would Not be a peaceful way of handling this situation.

If you asked the person nicely to please stop bugging you, this would Be a peaceful way of handling this situation.

Again, think about what you Could do if you were in this situation.

Remember that there are not any "right" or "wrong" answers; I only want to know how you would Honestly handle these situations.

Now, do you think you Can do something peaceful about this situation? If you think you can, put an X beside the answer "I Can do something Peaceful about that."

OR

Do you think that you Can't do anything peaceful about this situation. If you can't, put an X beside the answer "I Can't do Anything Peaceful about that."

I will be reading the rest of the sentences to you. I would like you to think of what you could do if you were in these situations. Then I would like you to mark down if you think you could do something peaceful or if you think you could not do anything peaceful about each situations.

Remember to put an X beside only one choice. Remember to answer HONESTLY about what you can do. Also remember that there are not any "RIGHT" or "WRONG" answers. It is what YOU FEEL YOU CAN DO.

I Want to Know What You Feel You Can Do

For each sentence, place an X beside the words that best describes what you feel you can do. Remember there are no right or wrong answers, only how you feel.

	Example:		
☐ I Can Do Something Peaceful About That.	If someone keeps bugging me when I'm trying to work	☐ I Can't Do Anything Peaceful About that	☐
☐ I Can Do Something Peaceful About That.	1. If someone calls me a name	☐ I Can't Do Anything Peaceful About that	☐
☐ I Can Do Something Peaceful About That.	2. If someone pushes in front of me in a lineup	☐ I Can't Do Anything Peaceful About that	☐
☐ I Can Do Something Peaceful About That.	3. If someone takes my eraser without asking	☐ I Can't Do Anything Peaceful About that	☐
☐ I Can Do Something Peaceful About That.	4. If someone blames me for something I didn't do	☐ I Can't Do Anything Peaceful About that	☐
☐ I Can Do Something Peaceful About That.	5. If someone asks me to do something I don't want to do	☐ I Can't Do Anything Peaceful About that	☐
☐ I Can Do Something Peaceful About That.	6. If someone tells lies about me behind my back	☐ I Can't Do Anything Peaceful About that	☐
☐ I Can Do Something Peaceful About That.	7. If someone will not let me play with them	☐ I Can't Do Anything Peaceful About that	☐
☐ I Can Do Something Peaceful About That.	8. If someone has a party and doesn't invite me	☐ I Can't Do Anything Peaceful About that	☐
☐ I Can Do Something Peaceful About That.	9. If someone will not share with me	☐ I Can't Do Anything Peaceful About that	☐
☐ I Can Do Something Peaceful About That.	10. If someone will not help me with my homework	☐ I Can't Do Anything Peaceful About that	☐

Appendix I
Test of Specific Knowledge

General Questions

1. When you get angry, what's the first thing you should do?

_____

2. Is it OK to feel angry? Put an "X" beside either Yes _____ No _____

Is it OK to feel jealous? Put an "X" beside either Yes _____ No _____

3. What is the best way to find out how another person is feeling?

_____

4. What is an example of a good (constructive) way of handling anger?

_____

5. Are you familiar with "I" Talk? Yes _____ No _____

If you answered "Yes", then explain how you would use "I" talk to tell someone that you are upset because they won't let you play a game with them.

_____

6. What would you SAY to someone who just called you "stupid"?

_____

7. List the steps for managing a problem with another student (hint "traffic-light").

_____

_____

_____

8. If you were having trouble thinking up ways to solve a problem, what would help you?

---

9. What is brainstorming?

---

10. Why is it important to calm down when you are very angry?

Appendix J

Post-test Questions, Program School Children Only

Supplemental questions derived from the questionnaire asking, "I Want To Know More About Your School" (School Climate Questionnaire, Lam, 1989) were added at post-test time. These questions ask specifically about school climate changes since the implementation of the Conflict Management Outreach Program. They were added to the end of the Program Students' questionnaire package.

---

14. Since the Conflict Management Program started, students at this school seem to enjoy going to school

- A) A Lot More   B) More   C) The Same   D) Less   E) Not At All
-

15. Since the Conflict Management Program started, students and teachers get along with each other

- A) A Lot Better   B) Better   C) The Same   D) Worse   E) Not At All.
-

16. Since the Conflict Management Program started, students get along with each other

- A) A Lot Better   B) Better   C) The Same   D) Worse   E) Not At All.
-

17. When you had a problem, how often did you use the Conflict Management skills?
(For example: "I" Talk, Constructive Ways of Handling Conflicts, Brainstorming, Calming Down Ideas, Stopping and Thinking, Agreeing to Talk it Over, and Making a Deal)

- A) Always   B) Most of the Time   C) Sometimes   D) Rarely   E) Never
-

Appendix K
Open-Ended Interviewing After Recess

Open-ended Interviewing

(Astri, unpublished)

A random sample of students were assessed after recess for conflict management behaviours. A 4th year psychology student (who was blind to the experimental condition) collected the data. The elementary students were told prior to the assessment that they were going to be asked some questions by a researcher after recess. Teachers were informed prior to recess about which student would be participating. The questioning lasted approximately 5-10 minutes and was held in a private area. A tape recorder was utilized to record the responses of the child as they discuss their conflict episode. Blind ratings of the content of the child's conflict incident were conducted, as well as inter-rater reliability.

Interview:

- 1) Pre-test - I want you to think back to the last time you had a problem with another student on the playground. It might be a big problem or it might be a little problem. Think about recess today. Did anything happen that caused a problem for you? What about yesterday? Think about all the things you did outside on the playground yesterday. Did anything happen that was a problem for you? (continue going back in time until the child recalls an incident - try to record how long ago it occurred).

Post-test - Remember back in November when we talked about a problem you had with another student. It was. . . Okay, has anything like that happened recently? (establish the same frame of reference by looking back).

- 2) What happened?
- 3) What did you do?
- 4) What did the other person do?
- 5) What did you say?
- 6) What did the other person say?
- 7) What were you feeling?
- 8) What do you think the other person was feeling?
- 9) What were you thinking?
- 10) What do you think the other person was thinking?
- 11) How did the problem turn out?
- 12) How do you feel about how the problem turned out?
- 13) Was there anything else that you thought about doing?
- 14) Looking back on that is there anything else?
- 15) How do you think that would be better?

Problem Identification Questions

#1, #2, #3, #4, #5 and #6

Affective - Feelings Identification

#7, #8

Cognitive - Problem-Solving Skill - Alternatives

#9, #10, #13, #14, #15

Behaviour - Resolution of Problem

#11, #12

Appendix 1.**Teacher Pre and Post-test Measures**

School Climate Questionnaire (Lam, 1989)

I Want To Know More About Your School

(for teachers)

I Want to Know About Who You Are.

Please Print Your answers to the following questions.

Name _____

School _____

Gender _____

Grade that You Teach _____

I Want to Know More About Your School

For each sentence, circle the answer that best describes how you feel about your school. Remember there are no right or wrong answers, only how you feel.

Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Example: I like ice-cream	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	1. Students are proud to go to our school.	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	2. Students at this school participate in many school activities.	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	3. Teachers pay attention when students have problems.	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	4. At this school, when students have a problem teachers encourage them or help them to solve it themselves.	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	5. Students get along with one another at school.	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	6. At this school people can be different and still get along with each other.	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree

Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	7. Teachers spend too much time disciplining students.	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	8. Students are generally happy with how teachers make sure children follow the rules.	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	9. Students know how to solve problems without getting into fights.	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	10. Students in our school really like the school.	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	11. Teachers listen to both sides of the story when children have a problem.	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	12. Students can't really solve their own problems at school; they need help from an adult.	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	13. Students at our school argue and fight a lot.	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree

Causes, Locations and Outcome Measure (CLO)**(Araki, 1990; Jenkins & Smith, 1987)****(For Teachers)**

1. Rate each of the following causes of conflicts in your school by circling the most appropriate answer.

a. Rumours/Gossip	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
b. Arguments - telling another child off	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
c. Dirty looks	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
d. Difficulties in class - cheating, copying	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
e. Harassment - name calling, teasing, hugging	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
f. Jealousy	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
g. Physical fighting - punching, hitting, pushing	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
h. Invasion of privacy - touching or taking other children's things	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
i. Group inclusion/exclusion - won't let others play/join group or have a turn	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
j. Tattling - telling on other children	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever

k. Other _____

Mostly Sometimes Hardly Ever

2. Rate each of the following places where conflicts occur at your school by circling the most appropriate answer.

a. bathroom	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
b. classroom	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
c. hallway	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
d. playground	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
e. other _____	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever

3. Rate each of the following ways in which student conflicts may be resolved at your school by circling the most appropriate answer.

a. teacher intervenes	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
b. students resolve problem themselves	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
f. other student intervenes	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
c. parent conference	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
d. referred to principal	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
e. referred to counsellor	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever

Teacher Posttest

Supplemental questions derived from the questionnaire that asked, "I Want To Know More About Your School (School Climate Questionnaire, Lam, 1989) were used at post-test. These questions ask specifically about school climate changes since the implementation of the Conflict Management Outreach Program. They also ask the Teachers to rate how often their children used the problem-solving skills and whether they modelled the skills.

---

14. Since the Conflict Management Program started, students at this school seem to enjoy going to school

- A) A Lot More   B) More   C) The Same   D) Less   E) Not At All
-

15. Since the Conflict Management Program started, students and teachers get along with each other

- A) A Lot Better   B) Better   C) The Same   D) Worse   E) Not At All.
-

16. Since the Conflict Management Program started, students get along with each other

- A) A Lot Better   B) Better   C) The Same   D) Worse   E) Not At All.
-

17. When your students had a problem, did they use the Conflict Management skills ?
(For example: "I" Talk, Constructive Ways of Handling Conflicts, Brainstorming, Calming Down Ideas, Stopping and Thinking, Agreeing to Talk it Over, and Making a Deal)

- A) Always   B) Most of the Time   C) Sometimes   D) Rarely   E) Never
-

18. How often were you able to use the skills to help a child solve a problem?

- A) Always   B) Most of the Time   C) Sometimes   D) Rarely   E) Never
-

Frequency Data on Program Utilization

These measures were only given to the Program group

Questions:

- 1) Number of times per week that the Problem Solving Area was used.

Assessed by placing a sign-up sheet at the area and asking the students to sign-in when they are using the area. The children were told that they must sign-in so that the teacher knows where they are during the day. By using this as the reason, then the child would not feel they were being graded or assessed based on the number of times they visit the Problem Solving Area.

Name (please print)

Date

Time

Questions for the Program Teachers - Numbers assessed at the post test

- 1) Number of Booster Activities employed within the Class
(approximately) _____
- 2) Please place a check beside the lessons that were taught.

Primary	Junior
Lesson 1. Identifying Feelings	Calming Down Ideas _____
Lesson 2. Calming Down Ideas	Feelings/"I" Talk _____
Lesson 3. "I" Talk	Constructive Ways _____
Lesson 4. Conflict Strategies	Further Con. Ways _____
Lesson 5. Brainstorming	Brainstorming _____
Lesson 6. Stop Light	Stop Light _____

- 3) Do you have any comments about the lessons that would help make the program better?

Appendix M
Monthly Report Form For Principals
October, 1994 to May, 1995

Comparison School Principals Forms

I Want to Know About Who You Are.

Please Print Your answers to the following questions.

Name _____

School _____

Gender _____

Monthly Report Form
for (insert MONTH), 199(?)

School _____

Please indicate:

The number of conflicts that were brought to your attention
that you felt could have been solved by the students themselves?

_____

i. Rate each of the following causes of conflicts that were brought to your attention this month, by circling the most appropriate answer.

a. Rumours/Gossip	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
b. Arguments - telling another child off	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
c. Dirty looks	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
d. Difficulties in class - cheating, copying	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
e. Harassment - name calling, teasing, bugging	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
f. Jealousy	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
g. Physical fighting - punching, hitting, pushing	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
h. Invasion of privacy - touching or taking other children's things	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
i. Group inclusion/exclusion - won't let others play/join group or have a turn	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
j. Tattling - telling on other children	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever

k. Other _____

Mostly

Sometimes

Hardly Ever

2. Rate each of the following places where conflicts occur at your school by circling the most appropriate answer.

a. bathroom	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
b. classroom	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
c. hallway	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
d. playground	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
e. other _____	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever

3. Rate each of the following ways in which student conflicts may be resolved at your school by circling the most appropriate answer.

a. teacher intervenes	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
b. students resolve problem themselves	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
c. other student intervenes	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
d. parent conference	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
e. referred to principal	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
f. referred to counselor	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever

Program School Principals' Forms

I Want to Know About Who You Are.

Please Print Your answers to the following questions.

Name _____

School _____

Gender _____

Monthly Report Form
for (insert MONTH), 199(?)

School _____

Please indicate:

The number of conflicts that were brought to your attention
that you felt the students could have solved by themselves?

_____

Please indicate:

The number of conflicts with which you were able to use the
conflict management charts to help resolve the problem?

_____

1. Rate each of the following causes of conflicts that were brought to your attention this month, by circling the most appropriate answer.

a. Rumours/Gossip	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
b. Arguments - telling another child off	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
c. Dirty looks	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
d. Difficulties in class - cheating, copying	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
e. Harassment - name calling, teasing, bugging	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
f. Jealousy	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
g. Physical fighting - punching, hitting, pushing	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
h. Invasion of privacy - touching or taking other children's things	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
i. Group inclusion/exclusion - won't let others play/join group or have a turn	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
j. Tattling - telling on other children	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever

k. Other _____

Mostly

Sometimes

Hardly Ever

2. Rate each of the following places where conflicts occur at your school by circling the most appropriate answer.

- a. bathroom   Mostly   Sometimes   Hardly Ever
- b. classroom   Mostly   Sometimes   Hardly Ever
- c. hallway   Mostly   Sometimes   Hardly Ever
- d. playground   Mostly   Sometimes   Hardly Ever
- e. other _____   Mostly   Sometimes   Hardly Ever

3. Rate each of the following ways in which student conflicts may be resolved at your school by circling the most appropriate answer.

- a. teacher intervenes   Mostly   Sometimes   Hardly Ever
- b. student's resolve problem themselves   Mostly   Sometimes   Hardly Ever
- c. other student intervenes   Mostly   Sometimes   Hardly Ever
- d. parent conference   Mostly   Sometimes   Hardly Ever
- e. referred to principal   Mostly   Sometimes   Hardly Ever
- f. referred to counselor   Mostly   Sometimes   Hardly Ever

Program School Principals' Forms
when Booster Activities Start

Monthly Report Form
for (insert MONTH), 199(?)

School _____

Please indicate:

The number of conflicts that were brought to your attention
that you felt the students could have solved by themselves?

_____

Please indicate:

The number of conflicts with which you were able to use the
conflict management charts to help resolve the problem?

_____

Please indicate:

The number of School-wide Booster Activities?

_____

1. Rate each of the following causes of conflicts that were brought to your attention this month, by circling the most appropriate answer.

a. Rumours/Gossip	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
b. Arguments - telling another child off	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
c. Dirty looks	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
d. Difficulties in class - cheating, copying	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
e. Harassment - name calling, teasing, bugging	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
f. Jealousy	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
g. Physical fighting - punching, hitting, pushing	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
h. Invasion of privacy - touching or taking other children's things	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
i. Group inclusion/exclusion - won't let others play/join group or have a turn	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
j. Tattling - telling on other children	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever

k. Other _____ Mostly _____ Sometimes _____ Hardly Ever _____

2. Rate each of the following places where conflicts occur at your school by circling the most appropriate answer.

a. bathroom	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
b. classroom	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
c. hallway	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
d. playground	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
e. other _____	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever

3. Rate each of the following ways in which student conflicts may be resolved at your school by circling the most appropriate answer.

a. teacher intervenes	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
b. students resolve problem themselves	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
f. other student intervenes	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
c. parent conference	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
d. referred to principal	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
e. referred to counsellor	Mostly	Sometimes	Hardly Ever

Program School Principals
Post Test Questions

I Want to Know About Who You Are.

Please Print Your answers to the following questions.

Name _____

School _____

Gender _____

Grade that You Teach _____

14. Since the Conflict Management Program started, students at this school seem to enjoy going to school

- A) A Lot More   B) More   C) The Same   D) Less   E) Not At All

15. Since the Conflict Management Program started, students and teachers get along with each other

- A) A Lot Better   B) Better   C) The Same   D) Worse   E) Not At All.

16. Since the Conflict Management Program started, students get along with each other

- A) A Lot Better   B) Better   C) The Same   D) Worse   E) Not At All.

17. When your students had a conflict, did they use the Conflict Management skills ?
(For example: Talk, Constructive Ways of Handling Conflicts, Brainstorming, Calming Down Ideas, Stopping and Thinking, Agreeing to Talk it Over, and Making a Deal)

- A) Always   B) Most of the Time   C) Sometimes   D) Rarely   E) Never

18. How often were you able to use the skills to help a child solve a problem?

- A) Always   B) Most of the Time   C) Sometimes   D) Rarely   E) Never

Appendix N
Oral Debriefing
(for students)

Oral Debriefing
(for students)

Thank you for helping us by telling us about yourself and your school. Your answers are very important to us. We will be going to many different schools and asking many children the same questions we asked you. When we put everyone's answers together we will know a lot more about children your age and how they get along at school. This will help us figure out the kinds of problems children have and the best way to help them. You have been a big help to us.

Does anyone have any questions?

Thank you again for your help.

Appendix O
Threats to Internal and External Validity

Controls Implemented

Every effort was made to control for erroneous events and variables. The list presented here demonstrates the areas perceived to threaten the validity of the research findings. The specific efforts to control the effects of each factor are given.

Threats to Internal \ External Validity

(From Amabile, 1982; Cook and Campbell, 1979; Jones, 1985)

INTERNAL VALIDITY refers to whether an intervention does indeed make a difference.

History:

Events were noted during the administration of the questionnaires, the interviews or during the intervention. Similar events affected both the program and comparison groups (e.g., class changes, school schedule changes, global historical events).

Maturation:

The comparison group was used to establish the effect of maturation. It is possible that the different schools have differently maturing students and this is the cause of any measurement differences.

Testing:

Both the program schools and the comparison schools received a second exposure to the tests. Therefore, if there was an effect due to the second exposure, it effected both the program and comparison schools.

Instru' ation change:

A one-day training session was given to each questionnaire administrator to ensure common presentation. Also, the questionnaire

package remained the same from pre to post testing. The only addition to the questionnaire package consisted of four post-test questions that were given to the program children only.

Statistical Regression:

Extreme scores were not selected at the pre-test.

Selection:

From the pre-test scores, it was determined whether the children in the two conditions differ significantly from each other. Gain scores or change scores were then used to reduce the effect of the pre-test differences.

Mortality:

Only a small amount of students did not complete the post-test. To ensure that as many students were evaluated, another administration was conducted for the absent students soon after the first post-testing time.

Administration:

Almost every child was administered the questionnaire in their classroom with their teacher present. At one school, the children completed the questionnaire in the library with a teacher present. The events that occurred during the administration were noted and nothing unusual occurred during the testing times. Please refer to the other controls presented below.

ESL students:

To control for language difficulties, teachers assessed whether or not the consenting students were able to complete the forms.

If the questionnaires were deemed to be too hard, then the student was used as a research participant.

Reading Ability:

Each question was read out loud by a graduate student to control for reading ability.

Writing Ability:

Help was provided by a second graduate student if the children could not spell a word.

Speed:

Blue sheets were added after every questionnaire so the children could draw once they had finished a section of the questionnaire package. This ensued that the students did not proceed to the next questionnaire without receiving the instructions and assured that the students were completing the same questionnaire. To make sure the children were on the same question, periodically the administrator would ask for the children to point to a question. This ensured that the children were following instructions.

Privacy:

Confidentiality was explained and each child used a book to shield their answers from the other students. Also, talking was not allowed during the administration.

Social Desirability:

Children were told that there were not any right or wrong answers and that it was okay to pick an answer that they felt was bad, if they honestly would react that way. As well, each administrator was taught the appropriate tone to use when reading the questionnaires so they would not indicate to the children the socially desirable answer.

Understanding:

Detailed instructions and definitions of the terms were given and the students were asked if they understood. Further the students' understanding was assessed by the second graduate student. The graduate student would observe (unobtrusively) the students' responses for answer sets (e.g., marking only the left side). They also asked the students periodically a few questions to test understanding. They were available to answer questions, and gave more detailed explanations of the questionnaires to individual children. The graduate students were reminded to talk to the children using words that the children would understand.

Fatigue:

The questionnaires were administered 1/2 hour before and after recess. Therefore, the children received a break during the testing.

Evaluation Apprehension:

Children were told that this was not a test and that there were not any right or wrong answers.

Hawthorne Effect:

The administrators of the questionnaires varied from pre-test to post-test, thus lessening the effect of a particular experimenter. Also the questionnaires were completed in a professional manner, hopefully eliminating the effect of increased personal attention.

Experimenter Bias: Experimenters were kept blind to the condition.

Experimenter Effect: The readers of the questionnaires were all women and everyone was dressed in formal attire.

EXTERNAL VALIDITY refers to the generalizability of results.

The two program schools were similar at pre-test and the intervention had a similar effect on both of these schools, then it is possible that the program would have a similar effect in other schools. This hypothesis can only be confirmed by implementing the program in other schools and seeing its effect.

Appendix P**Pre-Test Student Questionnaire Analyses**

Program Impact

Students' Questionnaire Data -Pre-Test

Pre-test Results for CABS, SAAC and SCLIM - Analytical Strategy.

Internal consistency of the three measures was tested first. The measures were the Children's Assertive Behaviour Scale (CABS), the Students' Attitudes About Conflict (SAAC), and the School Climate (SCLIM). Cronbach's alpha was used as the reliability coefficient. Table 31 lists the Alpha values for each test. The Alpha values indicated that the scales were reliable. These numbers are comparable to those reported in the original studies (see Table 31, Jenkins & Smith, 1987; Michelson & Wood, 1982).

Scores on the CABS, SAAC and the SCLIM then were examined to determine the "schools" and "program/comparison" effects. A nested design MANOVA was utilized, with "schools" nested under "program/comparison" (Kirk, 1982)¹. A significant nested school effect was found on the three DVs, $F(6, 356) = 2.18, p = .045$. Two analytical strategies were developed to deal with the significant effect due to schools (refer to Footnote 2).

The first analytical strategy involved the issue of the number of DVs for a nested design. After a significant nested school effect was found, program/comparison differences could not be examined due to a singularity issue. Elimination of one DV would insure that the number of DVs did not exceed cases (cases = schools, therefore, 2 schools within program and comparison, 2 DVs). This would effectively deal with the singularity issue. Consequently, the univariate Fs and the discriminant function for the "school" effect were examined to decide which DV could be eliminated. Because the SAAC's univariate F had a low significance level ($p = .877$) and contributed a small amount of variance to the discriminant function for the "school" effect ($PV = .002$), it was decided that a follow-up nested MANOVA using only SCLIM and CABS was justified.

Table 31

Alpha Values for The CABS, SAAC and SCLIM

Measure		Alpha Values		
	N of Cases	N of Items	Alpha	Original
			Alpha	
CABS'	184	27	.8771	.80
SAAC"	184	32	.8477	.83
SCLIM'	184	13	.7738	Not reported

'Children's Assertive Behavior Scale

"Students' Attitudes About Conflict

'School Climate

The second analytical strategy to deal with a significant nested school effect was also employed. This involved determining which of the schools was contributing to the nested school effect. A completely new set of analyses were computed with this strategy. Because the second comparison school seemed to contribute the most to the school effect, it was decided that elimination of this school was justified (please refer to the next section for this finding). The program schools could then be tested for school differences using a nested design. If differences between the program schools were nonsignificant, the error due to these schools could be pooled. A MANOVA comparing the pooled-program schools and one comparison school could then be performed. With this strategy, all three DVs would remain in the analysis.

Both analytical strategies will be reported.

Pre-Test Analytical Strategy #1 -CABS, SCLIM

The first analytical strategy was implemented (i.e., elimination of the one DV = SAAC). With the use of Pillai's criterion, the combined DVs revealed that at pre-test there was a significant nested school effect in the students' scores on the CABS and the SCLIM, $F(4, 158) = 2.70$, $p = .031$, $\eta^2 = .029$, Power = .93. Cell means and standard deviations of the CABS and the SCLIM (SAAC means as well) are presented in Table 32¹. The pooled within-group correlation matrix is provided in Table 33. This matrix shows that the DVs are correlated which necessitates interpretive adjustments (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1989). With correlated DVs, the univariate F's are not independent. Therefore, when trying to determine which DV contributed to the significant multivariate effect, correlations between the DVs must be considered because of their effect on univariate ANOVAs.

Review of the univariate F-tests showed that none of the DVs reached significance (See Table 34). A Discriminant Functions Analysis (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1989) was then computed. The Dimension Reduction Analysis indicated that the first discriminant function was significant

Table 32

PRE-TEST -Cell Means and Standard Deviations of CABS, SCLIM and SAAC

<u>Group</u>		<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>n</u>
CABS'	overall -	15.17	9.00	184
	Program School #1	14.04	9.46	53
	Program School #2	14.31	7.40	36
	Comparison School #1	14.84	8.66	67
	Comparison School #2	19.21	10.08	28
SCLIM"	overall -	37.45	5.66	184
	Program School #1	36.49	5.13	53
	Program School #2	35.33	6.42	36
	Comparison School #1	38.33	5.77	67
	Comparison School #2	39.89	3.98	28
SAAC'	overall -	96.63	11.32	184
	Program School #1	94.42	12.23	53
	Program School #2	95.56	11.98	36
	Comparison School #1	98.12	10.87	67
	Comparison School #2	98.64	9.22	28

'Children's Assertive Behavior Scale - Score Range = 0-54 - 50%=27

- Lower Scores = More Assertive.

"School Climate - Score Range = 13-52 - 50%= a score of 32.5.

'Students' Attitudes About Conflict - Score Range = 32-128 - 50%=80

Table 33

PRE-TEST -CABS, SCLIM (SAAC)-Pooled Within-Cell Correlations with
Standard Deviations on Diagonal

	<u>CABS</u>	<u>SCLIM</u>	<u>(SAAC)</u>
CABS	1.151		
SCLIM	-.396	5.498	
(SAAC)	-.484	.634	11.278

Note: SAAC is not included in Analytical Strategy #1, but it is present in Analytical Strategy #2.

Table 34

**PRE-TEST -Univariate F Tests for SCLIM and CABS by School within
Program/Comparison**

Univariate					
IV	DV	F	df	p	α

Nested					
School					
	SCLIM	1.27	2/180	.282	.016
	CABS	2.43	2/180	.091	.016
-----					

using Pillai's criterion, $F(4, 358) = 2.69$, $p = .031$. Figure 2 shows that the comparison schools' group centroids appeared to be the most disparate. Examination of the Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficients and the Structure Coefficients revealed that the discriminant function was determined by both the SCLIM and CABS variables (refer to Table 35). Table 35 also displays the proportion of variance that each variable shares with the discriminant function and the mean proportion of variance. Thus, the two comparison schools were significantly different on the SCLIM and CABS measures (at pre-test).

Next, the nested MANOVA examined the "program/comparison" effects on the two DVs. This analysis did not reveal significant differences between the program and comparison students, $F(2, 1) = 2.73$, $p = .394$, $\eta^2 = .845$, Power = .05. Because the power to reject the null hypothesis was low, confidence in the decision to fail to reject the null hypothesis is tenuous (Cohen, 1988; Kirk, 1982). The power is low due to the small Degrees of Freedom for the nested design. When a nested design is used, the within-group error is partialled by the error due to schools. The small number of degrees of freedom associated with the error due to Schools increases the Mean Square for Schools. Thus, with the larger error term, an effect due to program/comparison is difficult to obtain. The SCLIM's program mean was 36.02 (SD = 5.68, $n = 89$) and the comparison mean was 38.79 (SD = 5.33, $n = 95$). The CABS program mean was 14.15 (SD = 8.64, $n = 89$) and the comparison mean was 16.13 (SD = 9.27, $n = 95$). Both comparison schools received higher mean pre-test scores on the CABS (indicating less assertiveness) and the SCLIM (indicating higher perceived school climate); but these differences were not significant.

A Manova examining the gender and grade effects on the CABS and the SCLIM revealed significant gender and grade main effects, $F(2, 177) = 4.20$, $p = .016$, $\eta^2 = .045$, Power = .63, and $F(4, 353) = 4.47$, $p = .002$, $\eta^2 = .048$, Power = .90, respectively. An interaction was not

Figure 2

Table 35

PRE-TEST -Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficients and Structure Coefficients for the Nested School Effects -Without SAAC

IV	Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficients	Structure Coefficients	Proportion of Variance
-----			
SCLIM	.819	.430	.18
CABS	.983	.659	.43

Mean Proportion of Variance		.31	

Note: Any Structure Coefficients above .3 are considered significant because they account for more than 9% of the variance (Comrey, 1973).
 -----

evidenced by the present analysis, $F(4, 354) = 2.20$, $p > .025$, $\eta^2 = .024$, Power = .54.

The effect due to gender on the CABS and the SCLIM was further examined. The univariate Fs were both significant at the $p < .025$ level. The Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficients (CABS = .637; SCLIM = -.593) and the Structure Coefficients (CABS = .828; SCLIM = -.798) indicated that the first discriminant function was due to a combined influence of the CABS and the SCLIM. Examination of the gender means for the CABS revealed that the male students ($M = 17.08$, $n = 88$) were obtaining higher scores, on average, than the female students ($M = 13.42$, $n = 96$). Thus, the males were less assertive than the females. Gender means for the SCLIM indicated that the female students ($M = 38.32$) were obtaining higher scores, on average, than the male students ($M = 36.50$). The female students perceived their school climate to be better than the boys.

The grade differences on the CABS and the SCLIM were then explored. The univariate F for SCLIM was significant, $F(2, 178) = 9.10$, $p = .000$; however, the univariate F for the CABS was not, $F(2, 178) = .68$, $p = .508$. The Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficients (CABS = .07; SCLIM = 1.02) and the Structure Coefficients (CABS = -.259; SCLIM = .998) indicated that the first discriminant function was due to differences in the students' SCLIM scores. For the CABS, the means for Grade 4 ($n = 63$), 5 ($n = 58$), and 6 ($n = 63$) students were 13.87, 15.53 and 16.13, respectively. For the SCLIM, the means for Grade 4, 5 and 6 students were 39.82, 36.00 and 36.41, respectively. These results show that Grade fours were obtaining higher SCLIM scores, on average, than the two other grades. Thus, the grade fours perceived that the school climate was better than their higher grade confederates.

Therefore, for the first analytical strategy, an effect due to "school" was found in the nested MANOVA analysis. "School" effects were primarily due to the combined influence of the SCLIM and CABS.

Examination of the group centroids for the discriminant function analysis indicated that the two comparison schools had disparate group means. Disparate means were not found between the two program schools on the pre-test measures. The means for the SCLIM and the CABS indicated that the second comparison school was dissimilar from the first comparison schools. Also, the comparison schools (especially the second school) received higher mean scores on both the CABS (indicating less assertive) and the SCLIM (indicating better perceived school climate) than the two program schools. This effect was non-significant though (mainly due to the nested design and its effect on the degrees of freedom).

Gender and grade effects were also demonstrated for the pre-test CABS and SCLIM measures. Males received, on average, higher scores than the females on the CABS (i.e., less assertive males); however, female students received, on average, higher scores on the SCLIM (i.e., better perceived school climate). Also, Grade 4 students obtained higher scores on the SCLIM than the other two grades (on average). Thus, females and grade fours perceived their school climate as better than their counterparts.

Pre-Test Analytical Strategy #2 - CABS, SCLIM, SAAC

Because the nested effect of schools seemed primarily due to one school (the second comparison school), the second analytical strategy was initiated. The nested MANOVA was re-computed using the three DVs, however, the second comparison school was eliminated from the analyses ($N = 156$). Schools nested under program were tested to see if they differed on the CABS, the SCLIM and the SAAC. A non-significant program-school effect was found, $F(3, 151) = 1.02$, $p = .386$, $\eta^2 = .020$, Power = .60; thus, the variability due to the program schools could be pooled. Please refer back to Table 32 for the means and standard deviations.

Next, the "program/comparison" effects were examined. A

significant effect was found between the program and comparison students, $F(3, 152) = 3.26$, $p = .023$, $\eta^2 = .061$, Power = .74. Only the SCLIM was found to be significant in the univariate analyses. The univariate F for the SCLIM was 6.21 (1, 154) $p = .014$, for the CABS it was .26 (1, 154) $p = .608$ and for the SAAC it was 3.00 (1, 154) $p = .085$. The Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficients and the Structure Coefficients revealed the significant "program/comparison" effect was due to differences in the SCLIM and SAAC scores, but not the CABS. Table 36 presents these values. Means were then examined to determine the location of the "program/comparison" differences. Table 37 shows that for both the SCLIM and the SAAC, the first comparison school was performing better than the program schools, at the pre-test.

Gender and grade effects were then examined. As with the other analytical strategy, gender and grade main effects were found. Univariate findings for gender were, $F(3, 148) = 5.45$, $p = .001$, $\eta^2 = .099$, Power = .89 and for grade, $F(6, 296) = 3.78$, $p = .001$, $\eta^2 = .071$, Power = .93. An interaction between the two IVs was not found, $F(6, 296) = .59$, $p = .737$, $\eta^2 = .012$, Power = .16.

The univariate F s for the gender main effect revealed that all three DVs were significant at $p < .016$. The Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficients for the SAAC, the SCLIM and the CABS were $-.842$, $-.083$ and $.192$ respectively. The Structure Coefficients revealed that the discriminant function was due to a combination of the three DVs (SAAC = $-.981$; SCLIM = $-.674$; CABS = $.614$). Table 37 shows the gender means. The means indicated that on the SAAC and the SCLIM, girls obtained the higher scores (indicating better conflict attitudes and better perceived school climate); whereas, on the CABS, the boys obtained the higher scores (on average) (indicating less assertiveness than the females).

Table 36

PRE-TEST -Without Comparison School #2 -Standardized Discriminant
Function Coefficients and Structure Coefficients -Program/Comparison

IV	Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficients	Structure Coefficients	Proportion of Variance
SCLIM	-.874	-.791	.62
SAAC	-.349	-.550	.30
CABS	-.715	-.163	.03
Mean Proportion of Variance		.32	

Note: Any Structure Coefficients above .3 are considered significant because they account for more than 9% of the variance (Comrey, 1973).

Table 37

PRE-TEST -Without Comparison School #2 -Cell Means and Standard Deviations of CABS, SCLIM and SAAC

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>n</u>
SCLIM^a			
Program	36.02	5.68	89
Comparison	38.33	5.77	67
Boys	35.75	5.46	73
Girls	38.12	5.92	83
Grade 4	39.83	5.04	54
Grade 5	35.26	5.44	50
Grade 6	35.77	5.91	52
SAAC^c			
Program	94.86	12.07	89
Comparison	98.12	10.87	67
Boys	92.51	11.17	73
Girls	99.58	11.10	83
Grade 4	99.50	11.44	54
Grade 5	94.70	10.53	50
Grade 6	94.35	12.36	52
CABS^d			
Program	14.15	8.64	89
Comparison	14.84	8.66	67
Boys	16.56	9.84	73
Girls	12.58	6.95	83
Grade 4	13.26	7.88	54
Grade 5	14.28	7.81	50
Grade 6	15.83	9.98	52

^aChildren's Assertive Behavior Scale- Score Range = 0-54 -50%=27
- Lower Scores = More Assertive.

^bSchool Climate - Score Range 13-52 -50% = a score of 32.5

^cStudents' Attitudes About Conflict - Score Range 32-128 -50%=80.

For the grade effects on the three DVs, only the SCLIM was found to be significant on the univariate tests, $F(2, 150) = 11.06$, $p = .000$. The univariate F for the SAAC was 3.21 ($2, 150$) $p > .016$, and the univariate F for the CABS was $.64$ ($2, 150$) $p > .016$ (Please refer to footnote 2 for a discussion on adjusted significance level with multiple analyses). The Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficients for the SCLIM, the SAAC and the CABS (-1.097 , $.058$, $-.216$, respectively) and the Structure Coefficients ($-.976$, $-.514$, $.191$, respectively) revealed that the grade effect was due to differences in the SCLIM and SAAC scores. The means (presented in Table 37) indicate that the grade 4 students were obtaining, on average, higher scores on the SCLIM and the SAAC than the grade 5 or grade 6 students.

In summary, the second analytical strategy lead to somewhat similar results as the first analytical strategy. First, no significant differences were found between the two program schools, on the three DVs. The error due to "schools" was then pooled with the "within subjects" error. Because a nested design was not used, a MANOVA revealed significant "program/comparison" differences in the students' SCLIM and SAAC scores. The means suggested that the first comparison school received higher scores than the program schools. Again, this result indicates that the first comparison schools had higher conflict attitudes and perceived school climate than the program schools at pre-test.

As with the first analytical strategy, gender and grade effects were found. Girls obtained a higher mean score on the SCLIM and the SAAC (indicating better conflict attitudes and perceived school climate); however, the boys obtained higher mean scores on the CABS at pre-test (indicating less assertiveness). Grade effects also were found. Grade 4 students acquired higher mean scores on both the SCLIM and the SAAC than the grade 5 and 6 students. Thus, the grade fours perceived their school climate as better and obtained better conflict

attitudes than the higher grade students.

For the next section, factor analysis and subscale tests were performed on the three DVs.

Factor Analysis and Subscale Testing -CABS, SAAC, SCLIM.

For confirmation and/or exploration of the original research findings, each of the three DVs was then tested for underlying factor structure using Factor Analysis with varimax rotation. It should be noted that these analyses are limited by the small sample size of the present study.

CABS. The absolute values of the students's scores on the CABS indicated a two factor solution (see Appendix Q). This was contrary to the initial analyses completed by Michelson and Wood (1982). They demonstrated a homogeneous one factor structure. Sample size limitations necessitated omitting CABS' subscale analyses. A sample size of 184 was rated by Comrey (1973) as between "poor" and "fair" when estimating correlation coefficients. Thus, our sample size is not sufficient. However, the CABS also generated two scores other than the total (or assertive) score. These were an "aggressive" score and a "passive" score.

CABS - Subscale Analysis. After testing the two scores to discern if the Multivariate assumptions were retained (see footnote 2), it was decided that the "aggressive" scores should be analyzed using non-parametric statistics. The mean "aggressive" score for the program schools was $M = 4.81$ ($SD = 6.14$). A mean of 5.65 ($SD = 8.47$) was obtained by the comparison schools. The "aggressive" scores ranged from 0-54. Therefore, the majority of students were receiving low aggressive scores at pre-test. The Mann-Whitney U test of the program vs. comparison effects on the "aggressive" scores was nonsignificant, $U(n_1 = 89, n_2 = 95) = 4185.0, p > .016$. An effect due to gender was found, $U(n_1 = 88, n_2 = 96) = 3020.5, p = .000$. However, grade level differences were not found using the Kruskal-Wallis test, $\chi^2(2, N = 184) = 2.54, p > .016$.

As well, an interaction between gender and grade was not found. The means for the CABS' "aggressive" scores revealed that male students received higher "aggressive" scores ($M = 6.91$, $SD = 8.91$) than the female students ($M = 3.72$, $SD = 5.35$) at pre-test. In general, the students were obtaining low aggressive scores.

The CABS' "passive" scores were analyzed using an ANOVA with a nested design. An effect due to "school" was not evidenced by the pre-test "passive" scores, $F(2, 180) = .15$, $p > .25$, $\eta^2 = .002$, Power = .30. Thus, there were not any significant differences found between the two program schools or the two comparison schools. The error due to schools was then pooled with the within subjects error. The analysis of variance indicated a nonsignificant effect due to the variable "program/comparison" on the CABS "passive" scores, $F(1, 182) = 1.63$, $p = .204$, $\eta^2 = .009$, Power = .63. As well, nonsignificant gender and grade effects were found on the CABS "passive" scores, $F(1, 178) = .01$, $p > .025$, $\eta^2 = .002$, Power = .05 and $F(2, 178) = .46$, $p > .025$, $\eta^2 = .005$, Power = .08, respectively. An interaction between gender and grade was also nonsignificant, $F(2, 178) = 1.15$, $p > .025$, $\eta^2 = .012$, Power = .16. Means and standard deviations are presented in Table 38. Therefore, at the pre-test, the students' CABS "passive" scores were not significantly different on all the IVs.

SAAC. The SAAC was also examined for factor structure to confirm the subscales in the original study. The present results contradicted the findings of the Jenkins and Smith (1987). Jenkins and Smith found a four factor solution, whereas, the present analysis found a ten factor solution. Another Factor Analysis was run setting the number of factors to be extracted as four. In this instance, the factors were comprised of the appropriate SAAC items (only 3 items did not converge) (see Appendix Q). Thus, the forced 4 factor solution was utilized subsequently.

Table 38

PRE-TEST -Cell Means and Standard Deviations for CABS "Passive" Scores

---

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>n</u>
CABS' Passive Score			
Program School #1	9.30	5.51	53
Program School #2	9.34	5.13	36
Comparison School #1	10.15	5.29	67
Comparison School #2	11.25	6.16	28
 Program	 9.34	 5.33	 89
Comparison	10.47	5.55	95
 Boys	 10.17	 6.05	 88
Girls	9.70	4.87	96
 Grade 4	 9.51	 5.14	 63
Grade 5	10.41	5.29	58
Grade 6	9.89	5.94	63

'Children's Assertive Behaviour Scale - "Passive" Score

- Score Range = 0-54 -50% = a score of 27.
- higher scores= more passive.

Jenkins and Smith labelled these four subscales as "Students' Self-Concept and Peer Relations", "Students' Attachment and Commitment", "Conflict Resolution/Problem-solving" and "Perceptions of Social Skills". In order to test the internal consistency of the original four factors, Cronbach's Alpha was computed for each of the subscales, using the present data. The alpha values generated by the present data were .75, .75, .75 and .47 respectively. These values are comparable to the original study (.75, .72, .71 and .50 respectively). Because the last factor ("Perception of Social Skills") received a low Alpha value, it was eliminated from further analyses of the SAAC subscales. Thus, the three original subscales of the SAAC were used in the following analyses.

Multivariate assumptions were retained when the SAAC Factors were evaluated (see footnote 2). A nested MANOVA revealed that the schools were not significantly different on their three SAAC Factor scores, $F(6, 356) = .8753$, $p < .25$, $\eta^2 = .015$, Power = .69. The subsequent MANOVA revealed that program and comparison differences also were nonsignificant, $F(3, 180) = 1.58$, $p > .025$, $\eta^2 = .026$, Power = .41. A main effect for gender and grade was indicated by a MANOVA for the gender and grade variables, $F(3, 176) = 5.94$, $p = .001$, $\eta^2 = .092$, Power = .92, and $F(6, 352) = 2.60$, $p = .018$, $\eta^2 = .042$, Power = .78, respectively. Cell means and standard deviations are presented in Table 39. A gender by grade interaction was not found, $F(6, 352) = .76$, $p = .602$, $\eta^2 = .013$, Power = .21.

The pooled within-group correlation matrix is provided in Table 40. With correlated DVs, interpretive adjustments are necessary (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1989).

For the main effect due to gender, significant univariate Fs were found for SAAC Factor 2, $F(1, 178) = 10.48$, $p = .001$, and for SAAC Factor 3, $F(1, 178) = 16.38$, $p = .000$. This was followed by a Discriminant Function Analysis to determine the linear combination of the factors

Table 39

PRE-TEST -Cell Means and Standard Deviations for SAAC Subscales

---

<u>SAAC Factors</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>n</u>
Self Concept/Peer Relations-Range 10-40			
Program School #1	30.55	4.06	53
Program School #2	31.03	4.37	36
Comparison School #1	31.18	3.99	67
Comparison School #2	32.04	3.53	28
Program	30.74	4.17	89
Comparison	31.43	3.86	95
Boys	30.65	3.78	88
Girls	31.51	4.20	96
Grade 4	32.05	4.19	63
Grade 5	30.20	3.81	58
Grade 6	30.97	3.88	63
School Attachment/Commitment-Range 9-36			
Program School #1	26.16	5.07	53
Program School #2	27.56	4.78	36
Comparison School #1	28.44	4.05	67
Comparison School #2	28.46	3.68	28
Program	26.73	4.97	89
Comparison	28.48	3.93	95
Boys	26.51	8.85	88
Girls	28.67	3.98	96
Grade 4	28.63	4.38	63
Grade 5	27.40	4.58	58
Grade 6	26.86	4.54	63
Conflict Resolution/Problem Solving-Range 7-28			
Program School #1	20.92	4.34	53
Program School #2	20.72	3.70	36
Comparison School #1	21.92	3.46	67
Comparison School #2	21.68	4.37	28
Program	20.84	4.07	89
Comparison	21.85	3.73	95
Boys	20.22	3.98	88
Girls	22.42	3.57	96
Grade 4	22.33	3.68	63
Grade 5	21.45	3.83	58
Grade 6	20.32	4.04	63

Table 40

PRE-TEST -SAAC Factors-Pooled Within-Cell Correlations with Standard
Deviations on Diagonal

	<u>SAAC F3</u>	<u>SAAC F2</u>	<u>SAAC F1</u>
SAAC F3	.703		
SAAC F2	.560	.752	
SAAC F1	-.406	-.424	1.981

---

which lead to a significant gender effect. Examination of the Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficients and the Structure Coefficients revealed that the first discriminant function was comprised of the three factors (see Table 41). These analyses indicate that at pre-test, girls scored higher than boys on the three SAAC factors tested (SAAC Factor 1 - Self-Concept/Peer Relations; SAAC Factor 2 - School Attachment/ Commitment; SAAC Factor 3 - Conflict Resolution/Problem-Solving).

Grade effects for the SAAC Factors were then addressed. A significant univariate F was found for SAAC Factor 3, $F(2, 178) = 5.06$, $p = .007$. A subsequent discriminant function analysis demonstrated that the discriminant function was comprised of all three factors (see Table 42). On average, Grade 4s scored higher than both Grade 5s and Grade 6s on all three SAAC Factors, at pre-test.

SCLIM. The original study of the SCLIM did not complete a Factor Analysis. Therefore, a Factor Analysis was performed for exploratory reasons only. The four factor solution generated by the present research is shown in Appendix Q. The first factor was labelled "Teacher/Student Relations". The next was labelled "Getting Along at School". The last two factors were called, "Feelings About School" and "Teacher Intervening in Conflicts". Subscales for the SCLIM were not analyzed further because a large enough sample size was not accomplished by the present study (Comrey, 1973).

Table 41

PRE-TEST -Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficients and Structure Coefficients -Gender by SAAC Factors

IV	Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficients	Structure Coefficients	Proportion of Variance
SAAC F3	-.801	-.954	.91
SAAC F2	-.372	-.763	.58
SAAC F1	-.137	-.346	.12
Mean Proportion of Variance		.54	

Note: Any Structure Coefficients above .3 are considered significant because they account for more than 9% of the variance (Comrey, 1973).

Table 42

PRE-TEST -Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficients and Structure
Coefficients -Grade by SAAC Factors

IV	Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficients	Structure Coefficients	Proportion of Variance
SAAC F3	.854	.980	.96
SAAC F2	.250	.713	.51
SAAC F1	.036	-.417	.17
Mean Proportion of Variance		.55	

Note: Any Structure Coefficients above .3 are considered significant because they account for more than 9% of the variance (Comrey, 1973).

Pre-test Results for PPSAS.

The internal consistency of the Peaceful Problem Solving Abilities Scale (PPSAS) was tested. Cronbach's alpha was used as the reliability coefficient. The Alpha value for the PPSAS was .6452 ($n = 10$ questions). Due to the low internal consistency of the PPSAS and the non-normal distribution, it was decided to perform non-parametric test on this measure. The scores ranged from 0-10 on this measure. The mean for the program schools was $M = 7.92$ ($SD = 1.63$) and the mean for comparison schools was $M = 7.78$ ($SD = 2.04$). The Mann-Whitney U test of the program vs. comparison effects on the PPSAS was nonsignificant, $U(n_1 = 89, n_2 = 95) = 4185.0, p > .016$. Gender effects also were found to be nonsignificant, $U(n_1 = 86, n_2 = 95) = 4185.0, p > .016$ (Male $M = 7.98$; Female $M = 7.70$). As well, grade level differences were not found using the Kruskal-Wallis test, $\chi^2(2, N = 184) = .2338, p > .016$ (Grade 4 $M = 7.89$; Grade 5 $M = 7.78$; Grade 6 $M = 7.87$). An interaction between gender and grade was not evidenced by the present data. Therefore, the students in both the program and comparison schools were receiving high scores on the PPSAS at pre-test. Differences in the IVs were not present.

Pre-test Results for CMM Question 4.

For the fourth question in the Conflict Management Motivation measure, non-parametric tests were used. This question asked, "How important is it to you that you handle your upset feelings peacefully?"

The Mann-Whitney U test of the program vs. comparison effects on the CMM Question 4 did not reach significance, $U(n_1 = 89, n_2 = 95) = 3901.0, p > .016$. For the CMM Question 4, the scores ranged from 1-4. The mean for the program schools was 3.03 ($SD = .61$) and the mean for the comparison schools was 3.09 ($SD = .72$). A further analysis examining the effect of gender on the CMM Question 4 also did not exhibit a significant difference, $U(n_1 = 88, n_2 = 96) = 3597.5, p > .016$, (Male $M = 2.94$; Female $M = 3.18$). Using the Kruskal-Wallis test,

significant differences between the grades were not evident, $\chi^2(2, N = 184) = .3445, p > .016$. The mean for Grade 4, 5 and 6 students was 3.14 ($SD = .64$), 3.10 ($SD = .61$) and 2.95 ($SD = .73$), respectively. As well, an interaction between gender and grade was not found. Therefore, on average, the students in both the program and comparison schools indicated that it was important (score = 3) to handle their conflicts peacefully. Gender or grade effects were not demonstrated by these analyses.

Pre-Test Percentages -CMM Questions 1-3.

Please refer to Table 43 for the response percentages for the program and comparison schools on the CMM Questions 1-3. For all of the Questions, a high percentage of students in all the schools responded with "Yes, sometimes".

Pre-Test Results of Consistency in Answering-Program Students.

The fourth question in the CABS and the sixth question in the Test of Knowledge were used to test the program students' consistency in answering.⁴ The two questions were similar in wording; however, question 4 of the CABS was a forced choice and question 6 in the Test of Knowledge was open-ended. Also, the CABS question appeared at the beginning of the questionnaire package and the Test of Knowledge question appeared at the end of the program student's questionnaire. Both questions were scored on a 5 point likert scale. Scores ranged from +2 (very aggressive response) to -2 (very passive response).

Spearman's r and Kendall's τ correlation coefficients were calculated for the pre-test data. The results of the two tests were similar. Kendalls $\tau(n = 89) = .2619, p = .004$ and Spearman's $r(n = 89) = .3057, p = .004$. Thus, at the pre-test, the students answered question 4 on the CABS ($M = -.02; SD = 1.01$) and question 6 on the Test of Knowledge ($M = .62; SD = 1.15$) similarly.

Table 43

PRE-TEST -Percentages for CMM Questions 1-3 - Program vs. Comparison

Answer	Program	Comparison
Do you sometimes feel angry, jealous, hurt or worried?		
No, Not At All	3.4%	4.2%
Yes, Sometimes	96.6%	95.8%
Do you think that these feelings can sometimes be uncomfortable?		
No, Not At All	15.7%	1.4%
Yes, Sometimes	84.3%	92.6%
Do you think that these feelings can sometimes cause problems?		
No, Not At All	11.2%	12.6%
Yes, Sometimes	88.8%	87.4%

Note: Program n = 89, Comparison n = 95

Pre-Test Students' Questionnaire Summary of Results.

CABS, SCLIM and SAAC Summary - (Children's Assertive Behaviour Scale, School Climate Measure and Students' Attitudes About Conflict Scale).

Multivariate examination of the nested school effect (see footnote 1 and 2) on the students' CABS, SCLIM and SAAC scores lead to two analytical strategies. In the first, the SAAC was eliminated from the analysis (to prevent a singularity problem). The subsequent nested MANOVA revealed a significant school effect due to the combined influence of the CABS and SCLIM. Inspection of the results indicated that the students in the two comparison schools were obtaining significantly different scores on the CABS and the SCLIM. The second comparison school received significantly higher scores on the CABS (indicating that these students were less assertive) and higher scores on the SCLIM (indicating that these students perceived a better school climate) than the first comparison school. The two program schools were not significantly different at pre-test on the three measures.

Next, nested program vs. comparison effects were not found (please note that the degrees of freedom were small and the observed power for this test was .05).

Overall (regardless of school) gender and grade main effects were found. Mean scores on the CABS indicated that the boys were receiving higher scores (less assertive), and mean scores on the SCLIM indicated that girls were receiving higher scores. As well, the grade 4 students' SCLIM mean was higher than the grade 5 and 6 students. Therefore, females and grade 4 students had better perceived school climates.

For the second analytical strategy, the second comparison school was eliminated from the analyses to deal with the singularity problem. Differences between the two program schools were not found, so the error due to two program schools was pooled. Next, the differences between the program schools and first comparison school was examined. A

significant program vs. comparison effect was found. The comparison students from the first comparison school performed better on the SCLIM and the SAAC than the program students.

Thus, incorporating the results from the first analytical strategy (the second comparison school being different from the first) and then the second analytical strategy (the finding that the first comparison school was significantly different from the two program schools), resulted in a conclusion that both the comparison schools were different from the program schools at pre-test (on all of the measures). Observance of the means indicated that the comparison schools received higher scores on the CABS (indicating less assertive), the SCLIM (higher perceived school climate) and on the SAAC (indicating better conflict attitudes) than the program schools.

As with the first strategy, overall analysis of gender and grade effects were significant. Males received higher CABS mean scores (less assertive), but the females received higher SCLIM and SAAC mean scores. Grade 4 students on the SCLIM and the SAAC performed better than the Grade 5 and 6 students. Thus, female students and grade 4's felt their schools had a better school climate and they possessed better attitudes towards conflicts.

CABS Subscale Summary

Subscale analysis of the CABS was then addressed. The CABS generated two scores other than the total or assertiveness score. These two scores were an "aggressive" score and a "passive" score. Non parametric tests on the "aggressive" scores indicated significant gender effects. Male students received higher mean "aggressive" scores than the female students. Program and comparison and grade effects were not found. The students were obtaining, on average, low "aggressive" scores at pre-test.

The CABS "passive" score yielded non-significant school, program/comparison, gender and grade effects. Therefore, the students

CABS "passive" scores were not significantly different at pre-test.

Therefore, the significant difference found between the males and females on the CABS total score (or assertive score) is due to the higher aggressive scores obtained by the males. Stated differently, the males were found to be less assertive because they obtained more aggressive scores on the CABS than the female students.

SAAC Factors Summary

For the three SAAC factors, non-significant school and program/comparison effects were found. However, the SAAC factors exhibited significant main effects due to gender and grade variables. These analyses indicated that the girls in this study (regardless of school) scored higher than the boys on all three SAAC factors. As well, Grade 4 students received higher scores than both Grade 5 and 6 students on the SAAC factors. Thus, females and grade 4 s obtained higher scores than their counterparts on the SAAC factors of Self Concept/Peer Relations, School Attachment/ Commitment and Conflict Resolution/Problem-Solving.

PPSAS and CMM Summary - (Peaceful Problem Solving Abilities Scale and Conflict Management Motivation).

For the PPSAS and the CMM, similar results were found. Significant differences between the groups were not found at pre-test. On both measures, the students were receiving high scores. The students felt that they could peacefully handle their problems and they felt motivated to handle their upset feelings peacefully.

Consistency in Answering

Finally, the students' scores on Question 4 of the CABS and Question 6 of the Test of Knowledge indicated that the students were answering similarly, when similar questions were given at the beginning and the end of the questionnaire package.

Appendix Q
Factor Analysis Loading and Scree Plots
for CABS, SAAC and SCLIM

Table 44 Factor Analysis of the CABS

	Loadings	

	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2
	-----	-----
CABS 17	.64	
CABS 26	.62	
CABS 24	.60	
CABS 27	.58	
CABS 16	.54	
CABS 10	.52	
CABS 25	.51	
CABS 4	.51	
CABS 3	.50	
CABS 11	.46	
CABS 23	.43	
CABS 18	.41	
CABS 12	.35	
CABS 6	.31	
CABS 19		.60
CABS 1		.50
CABS 21		.45
CABS 14	.30	.44
CABS 22	.32	.44
CABS 9	.38	.42
CABS 2		.35
CABS 20		.35
CABS 15	.32	
CABS 13		.32
CABS 8		
CABS 5		
CABS 7		

EIGENVALUES	6.24	.89
PCT. OF VARIANCE	23.1	3.3

Note: Only the loadings that are greater than .30 are included in this table (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1989; Comrey, 1973).

N = 184; varimax rotation, 3 iterations.

Table 45 Factor Analysis of the SAAC - Four Factor Limit

		Loadings			
		FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	FACTOR 3	FACTOR 4
		-----	-----	-----	-----
SAAC	9	.69			
SAAC	5	.59			
SAAC	25	.58			
SAAC	28	.54			
SAAC	16	.53			
SAAC	32	.51			
SAAC	15	.49		.31	
SAAC	2	.48			
SAAC	1	.45			
SAAC	22	.39			
SAAC	4	.32			
SAAC	13				
SAAC	14				
SAAC	18				
SAAC	3	.66			
SAAC	11	.62			
SAAC	27	.59			
SAAC	7	.55			
SAAC	20	.54			
SAAC	8	.46	.36		
SAAC	17	.31			
SAAC	24				
SAAC	30		.70		
SAAC	23	.32	.70		
SAAC	21	.35	.63		
SAAC	12		.59		
SAAC	26			.50	
SAAC	29			.49	
SAAC	31	.31		.42	
SAAC	19			.35	
SAAC	6			.33	
SAAC	10			.31	

EIGENVALUES	5.86	2.20	1.25	.97	
PCT. OF VAR.	18.3	6.9	3.9	3.0	

Note: Only the loadings that are greater than .30 are included in this table (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1989; Comrey 1973).

N = 184; varimax rotation, 7 iterations

4

PM-1 3 1/2" x 4" PHOTOGRAPHIC MICROCOPY TARGET
NBS 1010a ANSI/ISO #2 EQUIVALENT

PRECISION^{SM} RESOLUTION TARGETS

Table 46 Factor Analysis of the SCLIM

		Loadings			
		FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	FACTOR 3	FACTOR 4
		-----	-----	-----	-----
SCLIM 3	.71				
SCLIM 4	.64				
SCLIM 11	.55				
SCLIM 6	.49		.34		
SCLIM 8	.46			.33	
SCLIM 9		.74			
SCLIM 5		.68			
SCLIM 13		.50			
SCLIM 10		.33		.61	
SCLIM 1		.33		.60	
SCLIM 2					
SCLIM 12					.87
SCLIM 7					
EIGENVALUES	3.57	.99	.61	.56	
PCT. OF VAR.	27.4	7.6	6.3	4.5	

Note: Only the loadings that are greater than .30 are included in this table (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1989; Comrey, 1973).

N = 184; varimax rotation, 7 iterations.

Appendix R
Test of Knowledge Scoring Key

Test of Knowledge Scoring Key

1. When you get angry, what's the first thing you should do?

2 pts = Calm Down

Stop and/or Think- Control what you say/do -Keep Quiet

Calming Down Ideas:

Listen to Music

Read a Book

Watch T.V.

Write in your Diary

Talk it out

Draw a Picture

Run/Walk Away

Ride a Bike

Throw a Ball

Go to your Room

Lie Down

Take a Walk

Take a deep breath

Count to 10

Let it go

Blow up a Balloon

Pray

1 pt = Punch a pillow - Squeeze Something -

Take it out on something

Ignore - Do nothing

0 pt = No Answer Given or Wrong Answer

Don't Show Anger

'I' Talk - First you need to calm down

2. Is it OK to feel angry. Is it OK to feel jealous?

2 pts = Yes / Yes

1 pt = Yes / No combination

0 pt = No / No

3. What is the best way to find out how another person is feeling?

1 pt = Ask them or talk to them

0 pt = wrong answer, no answer

4. What is an example of a good (constructive) way of handling anger?

2 pts = "I" Talk - Talk it over

Calm Down

Calming Down Ideas: See Question #1

Problem Solving Skills

Constructive Wheel Ideas:

Compromise

Walk Away

Distract

Use Chance

Share

Get Help

Postpone

Apologize

Take Turns

Talk it out

1 pt = Punch a pillow - Squeeze Something -

Take it out on something

Ignore - Do nothing

0 pt = No Answer Given or wrong answer

5. Explain how you would use "I" talk to tell someone that you are upset because they won't let you play a game with them.

3 pts = 1 pt I Feel _____

1 pt When or because you _____

1 pt I want you to _____

0 pt = Blank lines or the wrong answer

6. Omitted - Used to assess consistency in answering.

7. List the steps for managing a problem with another student (hint "traffic light").

3 pts = 1 pt Red = Stop and Think

1 pt Yellow = Agree to talk it over - or "I" Talk

1 pt Green = Try out the solution or make a deal

0 pt = Blanks left or the wrong answer

8. If you were having trouble thinking up ways to solve a problem, what would help you?

2 pts = 1 Talk

Calming Down Ideas: (See Question #1) then Thinking
Conflict Charts or Posters

Examining Self

Brainstorming

Imagination

Working it out on Paper or on a Computer

1 pt = Ignore it

Distraction

Punching a Pillow

0 pt = Blank, left or the wrong answer

9. What is brainstorming?

2 pts = Thinking up, Writing Down or Sharing Many Possible
Solutions

Thinking up Ideas/Things (key to this answer is the
plural form i.e., ideas or things)

1 pt = Thinking about a problem

0 pt = Blanks left or the wrong answer

Just the words "thinking not enough"

10. Why is it important to calm down when you are very angry?

- 3 pts =   You can't think when you are very angry
                 You can't make a good decision when you are angry
- 2 pts =   Helps to solve problems
                 Helps to be able to talk it out better
- 1 pt =   You will stop yourself from hurting someone
                 It will stop you from doing something bad
                 It will stop you from getting into trouble
                 You are more in control - Don't over react
                 Won't regret what happens
                 Feel Better
- 0 pt =   Blanks left or the wrong answer

Appendix S**Conflict Management Outreach Program Manual**

**Ottawa Board of
Education** **Conseil
scolaire
d'Ottawa**

161

April 29, 1996

Kelly Astri
Supervising Researcher
Conflict Management Program
c/o Severn P.S.
2553 Severn Avenue
Ottawa, ON
K2B 7V8

Dear Kelly:

The Ottawa Board of Education is happy to give you permission to use six copies of "A Problem-Solving Approach to Conflict Management Part 2 - A Teacher's Manual" as an appendice in your thesis for Carleton University, as long as complete copies of the document are used, including the copyright notice.

Copies of the document are available from Jane Legg (239-2668) or Sheela Silverman (239-5929).

If you have any further questions, please feel free to contact me at 239-5911.

Sincerely

Michael Bergin
Curriculum Administrator

330 Gilmour, Ottawa, Ontario K2P 6P9

TEL: (613) 239-2211
FAX: (613) 230-6408

Ottawa
Board of
Education

Conseil
scolaire
d'Ottawa

GENERAL

**A PROBLEM-SOLVING APPROACH TO
CONFLICT MANAGEMENT
PART 2**

A TEACHER'S MANUAL

CD 56-95-E

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thanks to the following individual(s) who assisted in the preparation of this document.

Sheela Silverman

Supervisory Officer(s) responsible for this document

M. Ann Jones - Assistant Director of Education

COPYRIGHT WARNING

Care has been taken to obtain permission to reproduce all third party materials in this document for use within the Ottawa Board of Education. The Board would be pleased to receive any information that will enable it to rectify any reference or credit in subsequent editions. All or part of the materials in this package are subject to copyright; copying of the materials in this package is not permitted without permission from the copyright owner.

© Copyright: The Ottawa Board of Education 1995

No part of this document may be published, reproduced, translated, modified, rented, loaned, or otherwise provided to, or used for the benefit of a third party, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without the expressed written consent of the

Ottawa Board of Education
330 Gilmour St
Ottawa, Ontario
Canada K2P 0P9

CD 56-95-E

A PROBLEM-SOLVING APPROACH TO CONFLICT
MANAGEMENT - PART 2

Ottawa Board of Education

CD 56-95-E

A Problem Solving Approach to Conflict Management: Part 2: A Teacher's Manual

Ottawa Board of Education

The following people are acknowledged for their assistance and co-operation in supporting the aims of this project:

Sheela Silverman—Author

Jane Legg—Supervisor

Stephan Grambart and Marjorie Silverman—Artists

Children Learning for Living Staff

Focus on Future Teachers and Principals

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE	PAGE
Introduction	1
Program Objectives	3
How to Introduce the Program to Primary Students	5
Primary Lessons	
Lesson 1: Calming Down Ideas	7
Lesson 2: Identifying Feelings	9
Lesson 3: "I Talk"	13
Lesson 4: Conflict Strategies	15
Lesson 5: Brainstorming	17
Lesson 6: Learning the Steps to Handle a Conflict	19
How to Introduce the Program to Junior Students	21
Junior Lessons	
Lesson 1: Calming Down Ideas	23
Lesson 2: Identifying Feelings	27
Lesson 3: What is Conflict?	31
Lesson 4: Further Constructive Ways to Handle Conflict	33
Lesson 5: Brainstorming	35
Lesson 6: Learning the Steps to Handle a Conflict	37
Sheets to be Photocopied for Lessons	39
Reinforcement Work Sheets	
"Calming Down" (Anger)	51
"Feelings", "I Talk"	65
"Conflict", "Brainstorming"	83
Manual - How to Use Posters	
Introduction to Manual	103
"Calming Down Ideas" Poster	105
"Feelings" Checkerboard Poster	109
"I Talk" Poster	113
"Constructive Ways to Handle Conflict" Poster	117
"Steps to Problem Solving" Poster	121
"Steps for Managing Conflict" Poster	125
Sample Situations of How to Use Posters	129
Booster Activities	133
Bibliography - Recommended Resources	155

INTRODUCTION

In our society today, with ever increasing stresses and pressures, the need to equip children with problem-solving skills is crucial. Children can learn to make good choices about how to handle their problems and conflicts.

This program teaches children that there are constructive strategies they can learn to handle problems and conflicts other than the quick reactions that often result in aggression.

The children learn these problem-solving steps in the six lessons and reinforcing activities. With role playing, practice, reinforcement, and seeing staff model the process, they will develop the confidence to use these skills themselves.

The lessons and posters follow a logical sequence to establishing problem-solving/conflict-management skills. We recommend that you follow that sequence. All the information in the lessons is necessary, but all teachers, of course, will handle the material differently, according to their style and the needs of their class.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

This program requires that a Mental Health Worker or other trained professional do the training and co-ordinate the implementation.

The aim of the program is to establish within the school a common language and an approach to problem-solving and conflict-management skills that all children and adults can use. The centrepiece of the program is a set of six posters.

The trainer will use the following process to achieve this aim:

- giving inservice training in the use of these posters to teaching staff, administration and auxiliary staff such as teacher aides, volunteers, custodians, lunch room monitors, secretaries, etc.
- giving inservice training on the primary and junior lessons and posters to grades one to six homeroom teachers
- having grades one to six homeroom teachers give six primary lessons or six junior lessons to their class on the prerequisites to problem solving; the first and sixth lessons with the help of the Mental Health Worker. Each lesson will give students problem-solving skills and introduce one of the posters.
- developing and making staff aware of "booster" activities for use in the whole school or in the classroom to reinforce the problem-solving/conflict-management program. These activities can also be integrated into Math, Drama, Language Arts, Social Studies and Art curricula.
- working with the "Booster Committee" of the school to maintain the program for three years.

HOW TO INTRODUCE THE PROGRAM TO PRIMARY STUDENTS

TEACHERS' INTRODUCTION

The program for primary students consists of six lessons. Only Lessons 1-3 are recommended for students beginning Grade 1. By the end of the year your students may be ready for Lessons 4, 5 and 6.

Teacher: *"In the next few weeks, we are going to have some lessons and activities on problem solving. Who knows what a problem is and can give us an example?"*

elicit – something that makes us feel bad - a fight
something that hurts us - an accident, someone hitting or
calling us names
getting into trouble at school, etc.

"Why do you think it's important to learn here at school how to handle problems?"

elicit – so that we get along better
we can learn to work out our problems for ourselves

"We're going to talk a lot about our own and other peoples' feelings, and what we can do to calm down when we're upset. This will help us handle our problems."

"In this program we're also going to use a few posters to help us learn and remember the steps to solving problems."

PRIMARY LESSON 1

CALMING DOWN IDEAS

Introduce Calming Down Ideas posters

Grades 1, 2, 3

OBJECTIVES

- to teach children that anger, jealousy, worry or hurt feelings can be uncomfortable, but **everyone** has them at times
- to teach students that we have to learn "calming down" methods that work for us, so that we can think clearly about how to handle the problem appropriately, without hurting others

PROCEDURE

Explain that anger, jealousy, worry, etc., are all feelings that don't feel good, but everyone, children and adults, has them at times as a normal part of life

- 1 Arrange class in partners or do with whole class. Write feeling starters on poster or board:
 I feel worried . . . . I feel angry . . . . I feel upset . . . I feel jealous . . . . I feel hurt . . . .
 I feel nervous . . . .

Have partners or members of the class choose two of the above and tell each other or class when they have those feelings (or ask for volunteers to tell the class).

2. Then have them tell each other or class what happens to their body when they have that feeling - do they get hot, shaky, feel sick, etc.?

3. Make a list of their body signals or symptoms on a chart. Discuss.

Ask: *"When you feel all these signals, but you keep on getting even more angry or nervous or upset, what can happen?"*

- elicit — you explode, hurt someone, get sick to your stomach, get a headache, yell, etc.

Step 2

5 min.

Draw on chart an 'upset' hill.

Tell class that this can be an anger, upset or nervous hill.

Ask them: *"Can you make a good choice when you're upset? Can your brain work well?"*

- elicit — no

"As our anger or upset goes up . . . what goes down?"

- elicit — our thinking skills (you will have to help them with this)

Then label the arrows on the hill.

Ask: "What do you have to do if you want your brain to think properly again so you can handle the problem?"

- elicit – cool off, calm down, get anger or upset to go down the hill and thinking skills to go up

Change the arrows on a second hill

Step 3

5 min.

Now put the class back into partners or ask class.

"Ask each other - What do you do to calm down or cool off or what do other people in your family do?"

Then make list on chart from students' answers.

Take out poster of "Calming Down Ideas" and compare the class's list with the ideas on the chart. See how many are the same.

Discuss idea of hot air balloons flying into the air carrying away our uncomfortable feelings as we calm down.

Talk about ideas that are inactive and appropriate for indoors at school or home, and those that are active and appropriate for outdoors

Conclusion

If there is time in this lesson, practise breathing and relaxation exercises (next page). If not, take 15-20 minutes at another time to practise

- It's very important to keep practising relaxation skills

Put up poster for students to refer to when they need to calm down

Soft relaxing music is helpful after recesses, gym, etc. The Solitudes, Exploring Nature with Music Series is excellent. These tapes can be found in any music or nature store

Materials

Chart paper
Two drawings of upset hill
Poster entitled "Calming Down Ideas"

Reinforcement Sheets

Appropriate for this lesson – pages 53, 55, 61 and 63

PRIMARY LESSON 2

IDENTIFYING FEELINGS

Introduce Feelings Checkerboard posters
Grades 1, 2, 3

(20 min.)

OBJECTIVES

- to have children learn to identify feelings of self and others
- to have children learn that everyone can have different feelings about the same thing and this can sometimes lead to problems
- to have students learn that listening carefully to another person's feelings can help to prevent problems

PROCEDURE

Step 1

10 min.

Call up volunteers to demonstrate a 'feeling' using their face and body. Then list it on a chart paper as class members identify the feeling. You will probably have to help them out by giving a feeling idea to the volunteer. Act out five feelings.

Teacher: *"We can see that our faces and bodies help us to know how someone is feeling. This is called Body Talk".* Discuss. Demonstrate how voice can show feelings also.

Step 2

5 min.

Put up the Feelings Checkerboard poster.

Arrange class into pairs, or do this exercise with three volunteers stating feelings and the rest of the students agreeing or not by a show of hands.

Tell them you're going to mention several situations and they are each to tell their partner what their 'feeling' would be if this happened. They may want to refer to the poster to name feelings.

A. Your best friend says, "I hate you!"

B. Your Dad or Mom says "Let's go to a movie!"

C. Your sister or brother wants to watch football on TV.

D. You get chicken and peas for supper.

E. You get a present you don't like for your birthday.

F. You spell a word wrong and the whole class laughs.

G. You don't know anyone at the party.

Step 3

5 min.

You then have them raise one hand if each partner always had the same feelings as the other about the same situation -- Raise two hands if they sometimes had different feelings.

"We can see that not everybody always has the same feeling about the same thing. What can happen if people feel differently and think they're always right?" Discuss how each person is different and therefore has different brains and ideas and this is OK - "We have to accept others' feelings."

- elicit – fights, problems
- discuss

"Now we know that 'telling' someone what your feelings are is important. Is 'listening' to the other person tell you their feelings - important?"

- elicit – yes
- discuss – accepting the feelings of the other person can prevent problems from becoming worse

Example: If you've listened to the other person saying that they hate rough games and you really want to play with them, you'll think of something else to play

- Have students think of at least two other examples.

Conclusion

Discuss the rules for listening and ensure they include not interrupting and looking directly at the person.

Show them where you've put up the Feelings Checkerboard poster, and remind them to refer to it when they're trying to identify their feelings

Materials

Use "Common Feelings Sheet, page 39" for a supplementary lesson on feelings

Checkerboard poster entitled "Feelings"

Reinforcement Sheets

Appropriate for this lesson – pages 67, 69, 71, 73 and 75

RELAXATION SCRIPT

*(Read **very slowly**.)* Pretend you're a turtle. You can escape inside your nice, warm shell. It's cozy and safe inside here. You curl up and get very comfortable and hide away. You are starting to feel very calm and peaceful. Your mind feels soothed; all of your muscles are relaxed. You're ready to face the world once again.

BREATHING EXERCISE

1. Breathe deeply from your nose; expand diaphragm for a count to 4.
2. Hold your breath for a count of 1 and say . . . "calm down".
3. Breathe out slowly through your mouth for a count of 8 --- say . . . "good".
4. Repeat --- a few times.

PRIMARY LESSON 3

"I TALK"

Introduce "I Talk" Poster
Grades 1, 2, 3

(20 min.)

OBJECTIVES

- to have students learn the benefits of using "I Talk"
- to have students practise "I Talk"

PROCEDURE

Step 1

10 min.

Ask for volunteers or **choose** students to role play the following situations or ones that are suitable to your class or have recently occurred

- One child grabs the other's pencil crayons. Have the second child react in an angry way.**
- One child calls the other 'stupid' for getting a math mistake. Have the second child react in an angry way.**
- One child teases the other about his/her new 'short' haircut. Have the second child react in an angry way.**
- One child constantly 'bugs' the other in line - pokes, pushes, etc. Have the second child react in an angry way.**

Teacher: *"Now what we've seen is children becoming upset with each other and making the anger and problem worse. What did they do?"*

- elicit – insulting, blaming, teasing, hurting language, criticizing

"But there is a 'better' way of talking about our feelings using what we call 'I Talk'. We're going to practise it using this chart. We say 'I feel... when... I want...' or 'It makes me feel...'; 'I would like...'"

Give many examples. Then go over the following rules

- 1 First of all calm down. Use a Calming idea
- 2 Use a neutral voice and body language
- 3 Make sure the other person is calm enough to talk, listen and think or else postpone it, or use another strategy

Step 2

10 min.

*"Let's have some other volunteers to do the **very same** situations - but now using 'I Talk'."*

(Caution – some children of certain ethnic backgrounds might be reluctant to use "I Talk" and should not be required to do so.)

Go through each situation - have second child practise "I Talk" in each situation. (Remember to calm down first.) For example

- A. I feel really angry when you take my pencil crayons without asking. I want you to ask me next time.**
- B. I feel very mad/hurt when you call me a name/insult me. I want you to think about my feelings and stop.**

C. I feel upset/bad when you tease me about my hair. I want you to stop.

D. I feel very frustrated/angry/bad when you "bug" me all the time. I want you to stop right now.

Ask class: *"Why is this a better way to express your feelings than the first way?"*

- elicit – person doesn't get blamed or called names or hit or yelled at

* Discuss: The other person doesn't get angry and you have a chance to talk and perhaps resolve the problem.

Contrast "I Talk" with examples of "you" messages that make the other person very angry, and therefore closes the door to communication.

This concept is very important.

Point out also that with "I Talk" the person takes responsibility for his own feelings - it's why we start with "I".

Conclusion

5 min.

If there is time, practise a few more sentence starters: "I feel happy when _____" "I feel sad when _____" or write the starters in journals.

Refer children to where the "I Talk" Poster will be put up, so they can remember to use it.

Material

"I Talk" Poster
Problem situations for role playing

Reinforcement Sheets

Appropriate for this lesson – pages 75, 79 and 81

PRIMARY LESSON 4

CONFLICT STRATEGIES

*Introduce Constructive Ways to
Handle Conflict poster
Grades 2, 3*

(20-30 min.)

OBJECTIVES

- to teach children the meaning of conflict
- to teach children that there are positive or constructive ways to handle conflict
- to have children learn and practise conflict management strategies such as take turns, walk away, chance, apology, share

PROCEDURE

Step 1

3 min.

Teacher: *"In our last lesson, we learned that if people don't calm down when they get angry or upset . . . what can happen?"*

- elicit - fights, arguing, explosions

"Another word that means all kinds of disagreements or 'fights' - starts with the letter C . . . O . . . N F L I C T" - (see if anyone comes up with the word)

"There are small conflicts like (elicit example of two kids pushing in line) and medium ones like (elicit example of two people hitting each other) and there are very, very big ones like two countries . . . . . ? (elicit 'wars')

"It would be a good idea if people learned and practised some ways of handling these conflicts, so that people and their feelings wouldn't get hurt."

Step 2

15-20 min.

Pass out comics one page at a time (Taking Turns, Chance, Apology & Explanation, Walk Away, Compromise & Sharing)

"We're going to look at some methods that can be used to handle conflicts " (You might have to explain comics to ESL students)

After each is read (or looked at) silently, or read by the teacher, ask

"What was the problem?"

"How did people feel?"

"What was done to handle it?"

"Have you ever used this method? Give us an example."

Conclusion

Show students "Constructive Ways to Handle Conflict" poster. Point out the strategies they discussed.

Post poster and comics for them to refer to

Materials

Comic strips for "Taking Turns", "Chance", "Apology & Explanation", "Walk Away", "Compromise & Sharing" (see pages 43-49 for pages to photocopy)
"Constructive Ways to Handle Conflict" poster

Reinforcement Sheets

Appropriate for this lesson - pages 85, 89 and 93

PRIMARY LESSON 5

BRAINSTORMING

Introduce Steps to Problem Solving poster
Grades 2, 3

(20-30 min.)

OBJECTIVES

- to teach students that there are steps to follow in order to find good ideas for handling problems
- to teach students the meaning of brainstorming and how to test ideas

PROCEDURE

Step 1

5 min.

Teacher: "Today we're going to see how many ideas for 'calming down' we can list in 2 minutes -- starting now!"

"OK - time is up. Count."

"Wow - that was a storm of ideas! Where did they all come from?"

- elicit -- us, our heads, our brains

"So that was a 'brainstorm' -- ideas pelting out of your brains just like a big _____ or _____."

- elicit -- brainstorm or snowstorm

Discuss: Your brain is capable of producing many options.

Step 2

15 min.

"Today I'm going to read you a short story that has a problem or conflict in it. We're going to have to 'brainstorm' ideas to get a good ending that is fair. We're going to follow all these steps on our next poster."

Show the "Steps to Problem Solving" chart
Read "The Lost Kitten Problem".

Ask: "What was the problem?"
"What were people's feelings?"
"What do they each want?"

"OK. We've done 'Talking Time'. Now we'll start brainstorming. Let's try to get about six ideas on how to handle the problem. In brainstorming all ideas are accepted."

After all ideas are given, say: "We now have to test each idea by asking 'What would happen if . . . ?'."

After this, tell the children that they now have one vote for what they think is the best idea. Show that this is the next step on the chart. Take a vote. Explain that the next step would be to try the best idea, then if it doesn't work, to try another and another.

Conclusion

"We can solve a lot of everyday problems at home and at school using these steps." Ask for examples. Go over the steps. "I'll put up the poster so that you can refer to it when you need it."

Materials

Steps to Problem Solving poster
 "The Lost Kitten Problem" (this page)

THE LOST KITTEN PROBLEM

Two friends, Nadia and Mohammed, were just leaving the park on a bright summer afternoon when they noticed a tiny furry grey kitten perched on the park bench.

They walked over to the bench and approached the kitten very slowly. They saw the kitten was not wearing a collar.

As Nadia softly patted the kitten's back, it quickly cuddled up to her and then jumped onto her lap.

Mohammed started speaking to the kitten and touching its furry head. It then jumped into his lap and promptly fell asleep.

Nadia whispered to Mohammed, "Do you think it's lost? What should we do?"

Mohammed answered, "Well I know that people go to the Humane Society if they find a lost animal because they get calls from the owners who lost them. Maybe we should go home and ask one of our parents to take us there."

Nadia thought about this for a minute and then said to Mohammed, "Why don't we ask all the people in the park first to see if they know anything?"

"Good idea", replied Mohammed, "let's go!"

They carried the kitten around and showed it to all the people they could find. No one recognized the adorable kitten.

As they hurried to Nadia's house to ask her Mom to drive them to the Humane Society, they began to hope that they could keep the kitten.

The man at the Humane Society said that he would keep the kitten for five days to see if the owner claimed it. If not, one of them could return and take the kitten.

The five days passed very slowly. Finally the man at the Humane Society called to tell them they could now claim the kitten as theirs.

Mohammed and Nadia started to argue about who was going to have the kitten.

PRIMARY LESSON 6

LEARNING THE STEPS TO HANDLE A CONFLICT

*Introduce Steps for Managing
Conflict (Stop Light) poster
Grades 2, 3*

(20-30 min.)

OBJECTIVES

- to teach students the three steps to use if there is a conflict between two or more people
- to demonstrate, by using these steps, how conflicts can be 'managed', using positive means rather than aggression and violence

PROCEDURE

Step 1

5 min.

Draw a coloured traffic light on chart paper.

Tell the class to pretend that the safety officer is coming in next week to see if they remember all the rules for crossing the street at a traffic light.

Ask: *"When the light is red - what do you have to do?"*

- elicit – Stop - Don't go off the sidewalk - It's dangerous.

"When the light is yellow - what does this mean?"

- elicit – Wait - Caution - There's no time to cross because the light is going to turn red very soon.

"When it is green - what does this mean?"

- elicit – Go - You now have the right of way - Still look both ways first in case someone is not following the rules on the other side.

"Good! You know these steps very well!"

Step 2

10 min.

"Now, when we want to follow steps for managing conflict between two or more people, we use similar rules. Let's see how they work."

Ask two volunteers to do the following role play (you might want to rehearse them before):

Two children are yelling and starting to fight over the use of the new swing at the play structure. Ann gets there first and hogs it according to Sally.

Teacher: "Sally, Ann - Stop, separate, go away and use a calming down method. Then you'll be able to think and talk. Right now you're both too upset. Come back to me in 5 minutes."

(Girls go to opposite corners.)

Teacher: "Now Sally, the next step after Stop and Think, is 'Agree to Talk It Over'. Are you ready for that?"

Girls: "Yes!"

Teacher: "When you agree to talk it over, it means you each have to give your side and feelings using 'I Talk', and listen very carefully to the other? OK?" (You will probably have to help them out here.)

Sally: "Yes, well, I feel very angry when Ann thinks she can use the new swing all the time and I want equal time. She always gets there first and so thinks it's her right."

Ann: "Well, I feel angry too when Sally hogs all the class magic markers and I want them sometimes. I wanted to pay her back."

Teacher: "OK, girls, we've heard your side and feelings. Now do you want to try and settle this, and go to our next step which is to 'Make a Deal'?"

Girls: "Yes."

Teacher: "OK - Now why don't you take some paper and a pencil and write down a few ideas of ways you can manage this so that it's 'fair'. If you need some ideas look at our 'Constructive Ways to Handle Conflict' and the comic strips."

Step 3

5 min.

Put the 'Stoplight' poster next to the drawing of the traffic light. Ask the class to point out similarities using the steps they just have seen in the role play.

• elicit –

Red (Stop)	Stop , calm down and think
Yellow (Wait)	Wait until you're calm - then you can Agree to Talk It Over . Use "I Talk".
Green (Go)	Now you can go 'Make a Deal'

Conclusion

If there is time (or on another day), do a second and third role play using the three steps, of two students fighting over the Nintendo or any other situation that suits your class.

Tell the class you're going to put up the poster and the drawing of the light together so that they can easily remember the three steps when they have a conflict with someone.

Materials

Drawing of traffic light (coloured)
Steps for Managing Conflict poster

HOW TO INTRODUCE THE PROGRAM TO JUNIOR STUDENTS

children learning for living

TEACHERS' INTRODUCTION

Teacher. *"In the next few weeks, we are going to have some lessons and activities on **problem solving**. All of us have problems at times and, sometimes we react 'impulsively', without thinking or taking the proper steps. This sometimes creates worse problems because we might get angry and behave in a way that hurts others."*

"What do you think problem solving is?"

elicit – it is doing something to make an upsetting or stressful situation **better**

"Why do you think it's important to take time in school to learn problem-solving skills?"

elicit – to do better in our lives
to learn how to work out our everyday problems ourselves
so that we get along better

"In this program we're going to talk about our own feelings, understanding others' feelings, ways to calm down when we're upset, and steps we can take if we're having a problem."

"We're also going to learn how to use six charts which will help us remember the important steps to problem solving."

JUNIOR LESSON 1

CALMING DOWN IDEAS

Introduce Calming Down Ideas poster

(30-40 min.)

OBJECTIVES

To teach children that:

- all people get upset at times and need to find ways of calming down that work for them
- you need to take time to calm down before you act, so that your thinking skills are effective and you can handle the problem
- you can learn your own symptoms or signals that tell you when you are getting upset, so that you can prevent yourself from exploding or making the wrong decisions when dealing with a problem
- anger can be channelled into positives

PROCEDURE

Step 1

2 min.

Teacher: *"We are going to find out today what makes people angry or upset."*

- get five volunteers to say "I feel very angry when . . ."
- teacher is the sixth

Step 2

3 min.

Ask each of the volunteers what they sometimes do when they are this upset or angry.

- elicit – hit, fight, yell, leave, insult, tease

Step 3

5 min.

"We can see that everyone has times when something really upsets them. When we're upset, our bodies sometimes give us signals that this is happening. What are some of those signals that your body gives you? Let's make a list!" (You may want to post this list in the Problem-Solving Corner.)

- elicit – sweaty hands, upset stomach, butterflies, pounding heart, fast breathing, heavy breathing, red face, shaky hands, tense muscles, headache

"So, if our bodies are sending us these signals, what can we use them for?"

- elicit – to warn us to cool down, or else we might get into a serious problem - we might hurt someone, make a bad choice, etc

Discuss: If we become aware of these signals, we can channel our energy into something positive.

Ask for examples.

Step 4**5 min.**

"When our bodies start giving us these signals, something else is also happening in our brains - how are our minds feeling?"

- elicit - muddled, frazzled, mixed up, crazy

"Let's look at this picture of a hill on our chart paper --- This is an 'upset' hill. As our upset or anger goes up (point arrow up hill) --- what is going down (point arrow down)?"

- elicit - thinking skills, brain power, etc.

"So if our thinking skills are going downhill as our anger goes up, what do we have to do to start thinking clearly again?"

- elicit - get our anger down
How? by calming down

Step 5**5 min.**

"Here is a poster that gives us many ideas for calming down - some are active and are good for outdoors and some are inactive and suitable for home or school. I bet some of you use these already - let's find out! (Go to Poster) When you want to calm down, how many of you -
read a book
jog
walk
talk to a friend
go lie down
punch a pillow?

What are some other ways of calming down that work for you or your family?

So everyone, adults and children, has their favourite ways of cooling off!"

Discuss: some people need five minutes to cool down - some people need much longer.

Step 6**5 min.**

"Sometimes we need an invisible method that takes those upset 'symptoms' away easily - to do here in class, for example . . .

We can practise two methods right now (if there is no time in this lesson, take 10 - 15 minutes at another time) - they're called 'relaxation exercises'.

Everyone get in a relaxed, comfortable position - on your chairs or on the floor.

Soft music is very helpful. Relaxation tapes such as the "Solitudes, Exploring Nature with Music Series" are excellent. This series can be found at any music or native store.

Let's try this!

- 1. Breathe deeply from your nose; expand diaphragm for a count to four.**
- 2. Hold your breath for a count of one and say . . . 'calm down'.**
- 3. Breathe out slowly through your mouth for a count of eight — say . . . 'good'.**
- 4. Repeat — a few times.**

or You might prefer this method! It will take you to a quiet peaceful place where you are safe

Change scripts to suit the class. Practise very often (i.e. after recesses, gym, etc.)

Turtle: (Speak very slowly) Close your eyes. Imagine you're a turtle. You have a shell. You're going to go into your shell where no one can get at you. It feels safe and secure. You feel so good - it is quiet and peaceful . . . you're nice and calm, calm, calm!

or

You're on a warm, sandy, quiet beach walking through the soft waves. You and your friend are speaking quietly. You feel so peaceful and calm. All is right in the world. You'd like this feeling to continue forever.

Conclusion

Put up poster and refer students to it when they are feeling angry, upset, or worried.

Materials

Draw two 'upset' hills
"Calming Down Ideas" poster
Relaxation music tape (optional)

Reinforcement Sheets

Appropriate for this lesson – pages 53, 55, 57, 59 and 61

JUNIOR LESSON 2

IDENTIFYING FEELINGS

USING "I TALK" TO EXPRESS FEELINGS

Introduce Feelings Checkerboard
"I Talk" Poster

(30-40 min.)

OBJECTIVES

To teach children that:

- it's a normal part of life to experience happy feelings at times and upset feelings at times
- people have different feelings about the same thing
- recognizing and talking about feelings in ourselves and others can help us to identify and solve problems

PROCEDURE

Step 1

2 min.

Teacher: "Would everyone look at the people sitting near them - can you tell by looking at their faces and bodies - how they are feeling right now?" (If not much response, act out some feelings, using body talk.)

- get several examples from individuals
- elicit how expression and body language can show how a person is feeling

Step 2

3 min.

"What else 'tells' you how a person is feeling?"

- elicit - tone of voice

Ask for demonstrations of (or do yourself):
an angry voice
a disappointed voice
a surprised voice

Step 3

7 min.

"We're now going to list as many feelings as we can on this chart. We'll divide it into two sections."

"What are two categories that we can put feelings into?"

- elicit - happy/positive/pleasant
upset/stressed/unpleasant

(Pointing to upset category) - "We all have times when we feel unhappy or upset - this is just normal for children and adults. But if we find that too much time is spent feeling upset, then we will recognize that this means we have a problem, and then we can try to talk to someone we trust to get some help in handling it. Our feelings can tell us that problems exist!"

"Now let's start listing --- we have three minutes."

"Who has the first feeling?"

Step 4

5 min.

"I'd like to show you this 'Feelings' checkerboard poster which also lists some feelings. Let's see if you listed any of these."

"Now keep your eyes on our list and this poster. As I read a situation to you - you can tell us what your feelings would be."

Get two to four responses for each of following situations:

- A. You get broccoli for supper.
- B. You get a new hockey stick.
- C. You're home alone for the evening.
- D. Your brother wants to watch a football game on TV.

After responses to each situation ask: "How many in the class feel the same way as _____? or _____?"

After these 4 situations, say: "Many people **feel** one way and many another way about the same thing. When people have **different** feelings about the **same** situation, what can sometimes happen?"

- elicit – conflicts, arguments, fighting

Step 5

12 min.

"Now, if disagreements and fights can result from people having different feelings about the same thing, it would be very good to 'know' the other person's feelings - so that you can prevent problems from getting too serious."

"What do you think is the best way to find out?"

- elicit– ASK THEM and LISTEN CAREFULLY
- discuss the rules for listening and ensure they include not interrupting and looking directly at the person. (You can include supplementary material on active listening here)

"And what is the best way for them to find out your feelings?"

- elicit – TELL THEM

"We have a poster that will help us do that - it's called 'I Talk'. You say 'I feel _____ when _____ I want . . . .' and fill in the blanks. WHO WANTS TO PRACTISE?"

Before beginning

1. Point out the rules
  - both people calm down first (Do not try it if the other person isn't ready. It will not work. Postpone or use another strategy)
  - body language and voice must be neutral (This concept is very important to get across)
2. Explain
  - this does not solve the problem right away, but opens the door for discussion that can lead to a solution
  - there is a difference between "you" messages and "I" messages. Use role plays

Present these three situations. Two or three sets of volunteers practise. If there is time, do other situations. (Choose ones that suit your students.)

- A. Two brothers are playing Nintendo. The older brother barges in and stops the younger one's game because he wants his time on it.

Do aggressive reaction and then contrast with "I Talk" scenario.

Example:

Younger brother: "I feel angry when you butt into my game - I want you to ask me first and wait your turn."

Older brother: "I feel disappointed when you hog the Nintendo. I want my fair time."

B. One child takes another's markers!

Example:

Second child: "I feel very angry when you take my markers without asking me. I want you to ask politely."

C. Two children go off at recess and exclude the third.

Example:

Third child: "I feel left out when you go off to play without me. I want to join in next time."

"Why do you think this way of expressing feelings can work well?"

- elicit (or explain) –

It doesn't get the other person angry because it doesn't blame them or criticize them

You take responsibility for your own feelings

Materials

Flip chart - two markers
 "Feelings" checkerboard poster
 "I Talk" poster

Reinforcement Sheets

Appropriate for this lesson – pages 67, 69, 71, 75, 77, 79 and 81

Conclusion

"We've talked a lot about how we identify feelings and how we have to express them to others. We're going to put these two feelings posters up now so that we can refer to them when we have problems with our feelings. This checkerboard chart helps us identify our feelings when we're confused about them."

JUNIOR LESSON 3

WHAT IS CONFLICT?

WHAT ARE SOME CONSTRUCTIVE WAYS TO HANDLE CONFLICT?

*Introduce Constructive Ways to
Handle Conflict poster*

(30-40 min.)

OBJECTIVES

- to introduce the concept of conflict
- to have students become aware of their present methods of dealing with conflict
- to have the students learn some constructive management strategies of "taking turns, chance, apology & explanation, walk away"

Attach lines outward writing these locations. Keep getting more specific and have them name the kinds of conflicts at home, school, etc. without getting personal. Create a tree!

Example

PROCEDURE

Step 1

10 min.

1. Have two students volunteer to do a role play. Situation is: One student grabs another student's pen and ruler without asking. Allow one minute of arguing.
2. Freeze role play. Ask class: *"What just happened between the two students?"*
  - elicit – a fight, disagreement, argument
3. Ask: *"Does anyone know a word starting with 'C' that means arguments or disagreements or fights?"*
  - elicit – conflict (you might have to keep giving them the next letter)
4. On large paper write the word "Conflict" in the middle and circle it. Ask students where Conflicts take place.
  - elicit – school, home, world or others

Step 2

3 min.

Ask. *"What makes conflicts worse?"*

- elicit – insults, hitting, name calling

"What makes them better?"

- elicit – cooling off ideas, talking it over

"What do all conflicts have in common?"

- elicit – each thinks that they are right!

Step 3**5 min.**

"We're going to see how you handle your conflicts now. Here are some typical situations."

- give out conflict sheet (page 41) to each student and do written or orally with class (results are usually - "I feel mad or bad and I usually fight back or insult, etc.")

Ask: *"Do these methods make the problem better or worse?"*

- elicit - some of the methods make conflicts worse - they are destructive
- explain

Step 4**15 min.**

- 1 *"To see if there are **better** ways to handle conflict, we're going to be using this poster (Constructive Ways to Handle Conflict). There are methods here that can be used to make the problem better - that's why they're called "constructive" (Ask for explanation of word).*
- 2 Pass out comic strips one at a time - Taking Turns, Chance, Apology and Explanation, Walk Away (see pages 43, 44, 45, 46).

Have children read them silently.

For each, ask:

- "What was the problem?"*
- "What were each person's feelings?"*
- "What was done to solve the problem?"*
- "Have you ever used this method?"*

Have children act out another constructive ending for each comic strip.

Or, have the students Role Play their own idea for each strategy. You might want to take an extra half hour at another time to do this. The students love these skits and remember them.

Conclusion

Put up the poster and a set of comic strips. Remind students to refer to them.

Materials

Comic strips and conflict sheet (see pages 43-46 for pages to photocopy)
 "Constructive Ways to Handle Conflict" poster
 Large sheet of paper for the tree

JUNIOR LESSON 4

FURTHER CONSTRUCTIVE WAYS TO HANDLE CONFLICT

*Introduce Constructive Ways to
Handle Conflict poster*

(30-40 min.)

OBJECTIVES

- to have students learn five more ways to handle conflict
- to practise these methods for handling conflict in role plays

Go over the "Rules for Role Plays" first

- one minute of conflict
- stop/tell feelings
- use constructive way to handle conflict
- audience then identifies method used

PROCEDURE

Step 1

15-20 min.

1. Pass out comic strips one at a time
Compromise & Sharing
Distraction
Postponement
2. Ask questions after each is read silently.
  - "What was the problem?"
  - "What were each person's feelings?"
  - "What was done to solve the problem?"
  - "Have you ever used this method?"
3. Have children act out another constructive ending.
4. Discuss strategies of "Talk It Out" and "Get Help" from the poster with students.

Step 2

15-20 min.

Have children volunteer to act out the following role play situations using the above strategies

Role Play situations (or make up your own according to class's needs):

- A. Two sisters/brothers both want to watch a different TV show that's on at 8:00 o'clock. (Compromise)
- B. Two students are doing a Science project together. They each want to use a different display method. (Compromise)
- C. Two good friends are not getting along lately. They really like each other and want to remain friends. (Talk it over)
- D. Sally has missed breakfast; she's very grumpy. Jane wants to ask her for a favour. Sally just keeps complaining about everything. (Postponement)
- E. Pam is babysitting for two three-year-old children. They are beginning to fight over a toy they both want. (Distraction)
- F. Your good friend is acting strange lately - not eating, not socializing, getting into trouble at school. (Get help)

Conclusion

Put up the rest of the comic strips.

Remind students to refer to the comics and poster.

Materials

Comic strips (see pages 47-49 for originals to photocopy)

"Rules for Role Plays" on chart paper or board

"Constructive Ways to Handle Conflict" poster

Reinforcement Sheets

Appropriate for this lesson – pages 89, 91, 93
95, 97, 99, 101 and 102

JUNIOR LESSON 5 BRAINSTORMING

Steps to Problem Solving Chart
"Action" Time
(30-40 min.)

OBJECTIVES

- to teach children, and have them practise, the concepts of brainstorming and testing ideas
- to show children there are always "options" available to handle problems

PROCEDURE

Step 1

15-20 min.

1. Teacher: *"We're going to take 2 minutes to see if we can come up with some ideas for a class end-of-year party. We'll list them all on this chart paper - all ideas will be accepted - starting now - go!"*
List all ideas . . . "Stop!"
2. *"Now that was a huge 'storm' of ideas pouring out, just like a rainstorm or a snowstorm. - Where did they 'pour' from?"*
  - elicit — us, our brains
3. *"So what we just did was 'brainstorm' ideas. This is a great method for solving problems. When we do this - all ideas we accepted. We'll see a little later how we test them to see if they're workable. Let's keep this list for later in the year!"*

Discuss: Your brain is capable of producing tons of options.

Step 2

30 min.

1. *"We're going to have a chance now to practise brainstorming and go through all the steps in 'Action Time' on this chart today. I will read a story that has no ending. You'll get a chance to create the ending by brainstorming ideas of what could work to handle the problem in the story. We accept all ideas in brainstorming. Here it is!"*

- Read the story "The Lost Kitten Problem" (at end of lesson)
- Ask "What was the problem?"
"What were the persons' feelings?"
"What do they each want?"
"What could they do that's fair to handle the problem?"

"Remember our 'Constructive Ways to Handle Conflict' that we just learned"

2. Go to chart paper. List five to eight ideas. After you get them all, start testing. For each idea, ask: "What would happen if . . ."
3. Now ask for a vote (one vote each) for each idea. Tally. (This is Step Three in "Action Time" on the poster - choose the best idea)
4. "If this one didn't work --- the people would try another and another and then perhaps have to brainstorm again"

Conclusion

Review the steps on the poster and go back to each idea and ask which strategy was used (compromise, take turns, distract)?

Go through steps for other problems that the class comes up with

Materials

"Steps to Problem Solving" poster
 "The Lost Kitten Problem" sheet for teacher
 Chart papers

THE LOST KITTEN PROBLEM

Two friends, Nadia and Mohammed, were just leaving the park on a bright summer afternoon when they noticed a tiny furry grey kitten perched on the park bench.

They walked over to the bench and approached the kitten very slowly. They saw the kitten was not wearing a collar

As Nadia softly patted the kitten's back, it quickly cuddled up to her and then jumped onto her lap.

Mohammed started speaking to the kitten and touching its furry head. It then jumped into his lap and promptly fell asleep.

Nadia whispered to Mohammed, "Do you think it's lost? What should we do?"

Mohammed answered, "Well I know that people go to the Humane Society if they find a lost animal because they get calls from the owners who lost them. Maybe we should go home and ask one of our parents to take us there."

Nadia thought about this for a minute and then said to Mohammed, "Why don't we ask all the people in the park first to see if they know anything?"

"Good idea", replied Mohammed, "let's go!"

They carried the kitten around and showed it to all the people they could find. No one recognized the adorable kitten.

As they hurried to Nadia's house to ask her Mom to drive them to the Humane Society, they began to hope that they could keep the kitten.

The man at the Humane Society said that he would keep the kitten for five days to see if the owner claimed it. If not, one of them could return and take the kitten.

The five days passed very slowly. Finally the man at the Humane Society called to tell them they could now claim the kitten as theirs.

Mohammed and Nadia started to argue about who was going to have the kitten.

JUNIOR LESSON 6

LEARNING THE STEPS TO HANDLE A CONFLICT

Steps for Managing Conflict poster

(30-40 min.)

OBJECTIVES

- to have students understand and learn the steps of "Stop and Think", "Agree to Talk it Over", and "Make a Deal" when two or more people are involved in a conflict

PROCEDURE

Step 1

15-20 min.

You can reverse Steps 1 and 2 if desired.

Draw traffic light on chart or board.

Teacher. *"Pretend you're 16 and about to take the written test for your learner's permit to drive. You have to review what the colours on a regular traffic light mean. Let's try it!"*

"What does red indicate?"

- elicit – STOP - danger of collision - because traffic going in opposite direction has right of way

"What does yellow indicate?"

- elicit – CAUTION - because the light is going to turn red - you'll have to wait - but if you're in the middle of the intersection, check the traffic and continue

"What does green indicate?"

- elicit – GO - you now have the right of way - but look both ways first, because of cars turning left, right, and perhaps skidding in the winter

Step 2

10-15 min.

Ask for two volunteers to do a role play. Use others according to class needs.

Situation: Two students are arguing about whose group will get the use of the basketball court at recess. One group always seems to get there early and hogs it. They start yelling and pushing.

"Freeze! Class, what is the first thing they should do if they want to solve this problem?"

- elicit – stop, separate, and calm down

"What's the next step for them when they are calm? What are they now able to do?"

- elicit – think --- about what they each want

"Now that they're calm and able to think again, what should they do next?"

- elicit – talk it over - tell their feelings

*"Good, and when you talk it over and you're telling **your** side of it and **your** feelings, what does the other person have to do -- carefully?"*

- elicit – **listen!!!**

"Alright - John, can you tell us your side and feelings? Tom - you listen carefully, and then Tom will have his say. Remember to use 'I Talk' "

Sample:

John: My group and I feel very angry when you and your group get to the net first every recess. We want our fair share.

Tom: Well, we felt fine about it, but now we're angry also because you're arguing with us, and so we want to settle it.

"OK, class, what's their next step if they want to 'handle' the conflict?"

- elicit – Make a deal! or
Figure out a solution! or
Think of some ideas that could be fair to both groups

"OK, boys - do you want to 'make a deal' and start thinking of some ideas to solve the problem?"

John: Yes, OK. I know -- we can alternate recesses - write up a schedule!

Tom: Or we could do a week at a time!

"Good --- we can test those ideas later and you can choose the best one to try. If it doesn't work, you can try another."

"What did we just do?"

- elicit – We went through 3 steps necessary in handling a conflict

TRAFFIC LIGHT		OUR POSTER	
RED	STOP/DANGER	RED	Stop and think involves calming down before you can think, or talk, or listen
YELLOW	WAIT/CAUTION	YELLOW	Wait until you are calm and then you can agree to talk it over - Use "I" Talk
GREEN	GO	GREEN	Means you're in a "Go" forward position to "make a deal". Remain calm throughout

Step 3 and Conclusion 10-15 min.

1. Put "Steps for Managing Conflict" poster up next to your drawings of the traffic light.
2. Discuss with students the analogy between our chart and traffic lights and how the role play steps fitted in (see below).
"This step is extremely important so that the students discover the similarities."
3. Show students how the steps on this chart incorporate all the concepts in the previous charts.
4. Drill students in steps and meaning of each

Materials

"Steps for Managing Conflict" chart
Drawing of traffic light (colours)

SHEETS TO BE PHOTOCOPIED

FOR

LESSONS

(PRIMARY AND JUNIOR)

children learning for living

HAPPY

ANGRY

SHY

WORRIED

PROUD

LONELY

LOVE

NERVOUS

CALM

DISAPPOINTED

SAD

SCARED

CONFLICT

Your name: _____ Grade: _____ Date: _____

	CONFLICT SITUATION	WHAT I USUALLY DO	HOW I FEEL
1	When someone calls me a name ...		
2	When someone pushes in front of me in a line ...		
3	When someone keeps bugging me when I'm trying to work ...		
4	When someone takes my eraser without asking ...		
5	When someone blames me for something I didn't do ...		
6	When someone asks me to do something I don't want to do ...		
7	When someone tells lies about me behind my back ...		

taking turns

chance

apology & explanation

walk away

compromise & sharing

distraction

postponement

REINFORCEMENT WORK SHEETS

INTRODUCTION

These Reinforcement Sheets are divided into 3 categories to follow lessons on

- Calming Down (Anger)
- Feelings, "I Talk"
- Conflict and Brainstorming

They are meant to be introduced as a reinforcement after each lesson. Choose whichever sheets suit you and your class. Some can be done orally, or in groups or in an "activity" centre.

They are each marked "Primary", "Junior", or both.

REINFORCEMENT SHEETS

FOR

"CALMING DOWN"

(ANGER)

ANGER SITUATIONS

Role play or write what you would say in each of these situations.

Use "I Talk" and/or other strategies.

1. Sister/brother switches off the television as you are watching.
2. Your friend doesn't play with you as promised at recess.
3. Your friend teases you all the time.
4. Sister/brother barges in your room when your "do not disturb" sign is out.
5. Parents scream at you for getting angry at the baby when it wasn't your fault.
6. Mother won't let you go to the party until your room is clean.
7. Dad won't let you stay up to watch a movie on the weekend.
8. Your friend calls you a name.
9. Your friends won't let you play a game at recess.

HOW ANGRY DO YOU GET?

1. Your Mom blames you for something your brother or sister did.
EXTREMELY ANGRY   SOMEWHAT ANGRY   NOT ANGRY
2. Someone bumps into you in the gym by mistake and you fall.
EXTREMELY ANGRY   SOMEWHAT ANGRY   NOT ANGRY
3. Someone was teasing your good friend.
EXTREMELY ANGRY   SOMEWHAT ANGRY   NOT ANGRY
4. A good friend of yours did not invite you to a get-together.
EXTREMELY ANGRY   SOMEWHAT ANGRY   NOT ANGRY
5. A person in your class insults someone in your family.
EXTREMELY ANGRY   SOMEWHAT ANGRY   NOT ANGRY
6. Someone makes a racial remark about your friend.
EXTREMELY ANGRY   SOMEWHAT ANGRY   NOT ANGRY
7. Your brother or sister took one of your valuable belongings without asking.
EXTREMELY ANGRY   SOMEWHAT ANGRY   NOT ANGRY

DO YOU GET RID OF YOUR ANGER BY:

1. Talking it over? ____
2. Hitting or hurting someone? ____
3. Doing exercise? ____
4. Going off by yourself to calm down? ____
5. Yelling? ____

RESPONSIBLE WAYS OF DEALING WITH ANGER	IRRESPONSIBLE WAYS OF DEALING WITH ANGER

CUT OUT STRATEGIES AND PASTE THEM IN THE APPROPRIATE COLUMN.

SAYING YOU'RE SORRY AND
EXPLAINING WHY YOU'RE ANGRY

SHARING YOUR ANGRY FEELINGS
WITH ANOTHER PERSON

POUTING

SHOUTING INSULTS AT A PERSON

SWEARING

HITTING A PERSON

LETTING OUT YOUR ANGRY
FEELINGS BY HITTING
A BAG OR PILLOW

GOING TO A QUIET PLACE TO
CALM DOWN AND THINK ABOUT
WHAT MADE YOU ANGRY

SEARCH THE NEWS FOR ANGER!

Find an article or story about a person who is very angry about something that happened that is not fair. Anger sometimes gives people extra energy to try to change things that are not right.

1. Who is the angry person in the article or story that you chose?
2. What is making this person so upset and angry?
3. Is this person doing something about the anger and the problem?

What is he/she doing?

4. What do you think? How do you think the situation could be handled? What would you do if you were the person who was angry?

WHAT WOULD YOU DO TO CHASE YOUR ANGER AWAY AND SOLVE THE PROBLEM?

1. Your friend took your rollerblades without asking.
2. Your sister barges into your room when you want privacy.
3. Your parents will not allow you to go to the party on Friday and everyone else is going.
4. Your friend called you a liar and you don't know why.
5. Classmates tease you about being the teacher's pet just because you always have your homework done properly.
6. Your parents want you to do many more chores than most kids your age.
7. Your best friend wants to play with other kids on the weekend and doesn't include you.

WHAT MAKES ME MAD AND WHAT I CAN DO INSTEAD

IN THE TOP HALF OF THE PAGE DRAW A PICTURE OF WHAT MAKES YOU MAD.

IN THIS HALF OF THE PAGE DRAW WHAT YOU COULD DO INSTEAD OF GETTING MAD.

REINFORCEMENT SHEETS

FOR

"FEELINGS"

"I TALK"

DESCRIBE YOUR FEELINGS

Some examples might be:

When I feel happy, it feels like a jet plane whizzing by.

When I feel sad, it feels like a dark, huge cloud over me.

Try the following:

1. When I feel disappointed, it feels like _____
_____
2. When I feel excited, it feels like _____
_____
3. When I feel surprised, it feels like _____
_____
4. When I feel scared, it feels like _____
_____
5. When I feel angry, it feels like _____
_____
6. When I feel jealous, it feels like _____
_____
7. When I feel embarrassed, it feels like _____
_____
8. When I feel nervous, it feels like _____
_____
9. When I feel proud, it feels like _____
_____
10. When I feel left out, it feels like _____
_____

EVERYONE HAS DIFFERENT FEELINGS ABOUT THE SAME THINGS

Interview the members of your family to see how they would feel in these situations.

1. You didn't clean your room this week. It's very messy. How would each of you feel?

YOU	MOM	DAD	SISTER	BROTHER

2. Supper is roast beef, broccoli and carrots. How would each of you feel when you sit down to eat?

YOU	MOM	DAD	SISTER	BROTHER

3. Your brother/sister breaks your favorite toy. How would each of you feel?

YOU	MOM	DAD	SISTER	BROTHER

4. Sister/brother gets a new bicycle for Christmas. You get a smaller present. How would each of you feel?

YOU	MOM	DAD	SISTER	BROTHER

5. Your best friend has a new best friend. How would you feel?

YOU	MOM	DAD	SISTER	BROTHER

6. You get a failing mark on your math test. How would you feel?

YOU	MOM	DAD	SISTER	BROTHER

WHAT WOULD YOUR FEELINGS BE IF YOU WERE IN THE OTHER PERSON'S SHOES?

- 1 Sue and her friends were playing in the playroom with the "Lego" blocks and were building a beautiful castle. John, Sue's older brother came in with his friend and told Sue to get out because they had reserved the room for that afternoon to practise their play for school. **How do you think each person would have felt?**

SUE:

HER FRIEND:

JOHN:

JOHN'S FRIEND:

- 2 Lenny asked Paul to go swimming at 2 00 p.m. He asked his Mom if he could go, and Mom said not until he had cleaned his room. Paul asked Lenny if he could come a bit later, but Lenny said that he had to go out later. **How do you think each person would have felt?**

PAUL:

LENNY:

MOM:

- 3 Mary and Sara were playing skipping games, and Jill asked if she could join them. Jill didn't know all the games, so Mary told her that she couldn't play with them. **How do you think each person would have felt?**

MARY:

SARA:

JILL:

- 4 James just got a new haircut which he liked a lot. His friends, Harold and Pete, laughed and started teasing James because his hair was so short and perfect-looking. James called them names to get back at them. **How do you think each person would have felt?**

JAMES:

HAROLD:

PETE:

MY FEELINGS CHART

*Draw your own "feelings" faces
according to the situation that happened to you.*

1	3	5
2	4	6

1. I FEEL _____ WHEN _____
2. I FEEL _____ WHEN _____
3. I FEEL _____ WHEN _____
4. I FEEL _____ WHEN _____
5. I FEEL _____ WHEN _____
6. I FEEL _____ WHEN _____

CHANGE THE FOLLOWING "YOU" MESSAGES INTO "I" MESSAGES

- 1   You always make me come in early! You never let me have fun with my friends. You're so mean!
- 2   You are such a pest. You bother everyone and you never get your work done. You should concentrate on your work instead of being a nag and a pest.
- 3   You are always so late! You don't care about anyone but yourself. Why don't you let people know when you are going to be late?
- 4   You always get your own way. You're so spoiled! Can't we ever play what I want?
- 5   You're never home when I need help with my work. Other mothers are home. You don't care about me!
- 6   You're so lazy! You never clean up your room or any mess that you make. Why don't you learn to be responsible?
- 7   You're so mean--you always break everything we build. We've been working on this snow fort for days. You're cruel!
- 8   You think you're so smart just because you're older than I am! You take my toys and order me around.
- 9   You can't make me clean up after him--he's old enough to do it himself. I always get the blame. You're not being fair!
- 10   You're a troublemaker. You always try to put the blame for the fights on someone else.

SOME

HAPPY WORDS !!!

Complete the following:

1. I feel wonderful when _____
_____
2. I feel calm when _____
_____
3. I feel exuberant when _____
_____
4. I feel cheerful when _____
_____
5. I feel contented when _____
_____
6. I feel overjoyed when _____
_____
7. I feel ecstatic when _____
_____

COMMUNICATION BREAK-DOWN

Can you change the following "YOU" messages into "I" messages so that communication can be positive.

YOU	I
PARENT:	
You're a lazy slob, look at this room!	
You never listen; how many times do I have to tell you to pick up your toys?	
You are being rude again! Don't you ever talk to me like that again!	

YOU	I
CHILD:	
You're always busy and have no time for me! You don't love me!	
You broke your promise again!	
You make awful meals!	
You don't understand; all my friends are going to the dance	

PRACTISING "I TALK"

PRIMARY GRADES (GRADES SK-3)

SITUATIONS:

1. A child in your class takes a marker off your desk without asking.
2. You make a mistake in your work and a child in your class calls you "stupid"
3. You are supposed to be first in line and someone pushes in front of you
4. You want a turn on the swing and the person on the swing won't get off
5. When you go out for recess to play with your friends, they say they don't want to play with you.
6. You work hard to make a beautiful sandcastle and someone knocks it down
7. Someone in your class tells the teacher about something you did instead of talking to you about it first.
8. A child in line is hitting and poking you.

Read out the list of situations one by one to the students and after each one ask a student to give an example of how "I Talk" could be used in that situation

JUNIOR GRADES (GRADES SK-3)

Junior

SITUATIONS:

1. You are watching your favourite television program and your sister comes in and changes the channel.
2. You invite your friend over to play your new boardgame and she says it's boring.
3. A classmate teases you about the way you dress. (Or a new haircut.)
4. When you go out for recess you hear your friends whispering about you
5. You strike out in a baseball game and a classmate laughs at you.
6. You are trying to do your school work and your classmate keeps talking and interrupting you.
7. You and a friend have agreed to meet at the skating rink and your friend is half an hour late.
8. You are babysitting your little brother and he goes over to his friend's house without telling you.

REINFORCEMENT SHEETS

FOR

"CONFLICT"

"BRAINSTORMING"

PROBLEM SITUATIONS

Practise role playing (using the turn tosser) or any other game of chance to solve the following problems.

1. Your friend is over and you decide to watch T.V. You both want to watch different programs, so you start to argue.
2. Your sister/brother wants to take his/her bath first. You say it is your turn to go first tonight, so you start.
3. You and your classmate go up at the same time to offer to help the teacher. What can you do?
4. You and your two friends are deciding what to do for the afternoon. You all want to do something different. You start arguing and fighting.
5. Your mother wants you to take out the garbage. You say that it is your sister/brothers' job that week. You start arguing.
6. You and your two friends arrive at the swing at the same time. It is the only swing that is free. What should you do to keep things fair.

WHAT COULD YOU DO?

You lost your reader

You lost your key No one is at home.

Your friend lied to you

Your friend asks you to go to his house after school.

You hit my sister and everyone is angry.

Someone is going to beat you up after school.

You don't have enough money to buy your mother a birthday present.

My best friend says she doesn't want to be my friend anymore.

MY RESPONSE TO CONFLICTS

	Always	Sometimes	Never
When I am in conflict with someone, I try to:			
1. hit the other person	---		---
2. get help from a friend	---	---	---
3. ignore it	---	---	---
4. run away			
5. try to understand the other point of view			
6. walk away	---		---
7. use swear words	---	---	
8. try to calm down		---	---
9. talk it out		---	
10. make the other kid apologize	---	---	---
11. apologize myself	---	---	---
12. get help from a grown-up	---		---
13. make a joke of it	---	---	---
14. distract attention to something else	---	---	
15. tell the kid to leave me alone	---	---	---
16. listen to the other kid		---	---
17. use "I" talk		---	
18. get friends to gang up on the other kid		---	
19. ask a Peace Patrol to help mediate		---	---

CONFLICT AND VIOLENCE

When someone feels angry or sad, they might act out physically or emotionally, in ways that hurt others. They are still responsible for these actions that hurt people, no matter what the cause. We, and they, cannot excuse them for acting this way because some bad things happened to them that day, or week, or month.

1. What does it mean to "lose your temper"?
2. When you get into a conflict with someone does saying sorry erase the event?
3. Can someone make you lose your temper?
4. Who is responsible for a lost temper?
5. How do people hurt each other besides hitting them?
6. What is a bully? What does a bully really want? How can you handle a bully?
Can adults be bullies?
7. Create a poster with the theme-"people are not for hitting."

Things That
Bug Me!

VIOLENCE

In our world, there is a lot of violence. We see it on T.V., hear about it in newspapers, on radios, etc. We sometimes see violent acts done at home, and at school, such as people beating up one another. If we learn and practice other ways of channeling conflict, those non-violent strategies will be the ones that we will think of first.

1.a) Have you observed any physically violent behavior today or this week?

1.b) How could it have been resolved in a non-violent way?

2 a) Think of T.V. shows that you have watched lately. What violent acts did you see?

2.b) How could they have been handled differently?

3 What alternatives can families use to eliminate any **physical abuse** at home? Between siblings, between parents, between parent and child.

COMPROMISE

How could you compromise in the following situations?

1. Your friend wants to order pizza with double cheese, and you want only pepperoni.
2. Your sister wants to have her friends over the same night you want to have yours over.
3. Your friend wants to go biking, and you want to play baseball.
4. Your parents want you to help make supper tonight, but you promised your friend that you would help him/her with their paper route.
5. Your two younger sisters are arguing over a toy. They are grabbing it from each other, and you're the baby-sitter.

CONFLICT STRATEGY SITUATIONS

Which of the following strategies would you use to solve the problem?
Explain how you would work it out.

STRATEGIES

- compromise
- apology and explanation
- humour
- distraction
- postponement
- sharing
- taking turns
- walk away

SITUATION 1

Bob and his brother Tom are fighting over whose turn it is on the Nintendo. 15 minutes have passed by and they're still arguing. This has happened every day this week.

SITUATION 2

It is 12.30 p.m. Your parents want you to clean your room before you go to your friends' house. They're very angry. You are rushing to meet your friend at 1:00 p.m.

SITUATION 3

A person at school seems to be picking on you a lot lately. You've tried bugging him/her back, and insulting him/her, but nothing seems to be working.

SITUATION 4

Your friend thinks that you are always spreading rumours about him/her. All you really did was tell one person that him/her was changing schools. That person told you that he/she was also changing schools and going to the same one as your friend. You thought it would be helpful if they both knew. Your friend is angry at you anyway because he didn't want anyone to know yet.

children learning for living

MANUAL

HOW TO USE THE POSTERS

INTRODUCTION TO MANUAL

These posters were developed as a resource that children, teachers, administrators, lunch room monitors, teacher aides and volunteers could refer to when dealing with children and their problems or conflicts. In this way, all of the adults and children at school will be using a common language and approach regarding problem solving.

The posters offer a logical sequence of the steps to problem solving which the children easily begin to follow with practice.

In this manual, the rationale and use of each poster are explained.

There are also two sample problem situations written in "Role Play" format, so that one can understand how each step on the posters is carried out and how various posters can be used in one situation.

"CALMING DOWN IDEAS" POSTER

RATIONALE

We coach the children to realize that, because **everyone** gets upset at times, all people need some methods of cooling off. No one can think clearly about how to handle a problem or even **talk** about it or listen to the other side until they are calm. As they cool down, their thinking skills will return and they will then be able to take the necessary "steps" to handle the problem.

HOW TO USE THE POSTER

1. Show the child that there are inactive ideas for calming down, such as listening to music or looking at books, and there are active methods, such as running, playing ball or punching a pillow. Point out that some can work in a classroom setting, such as deep breathing and counting, and others are suitable for home or outdoors, such as throwing a ball or riding a bike.
2. Have the child choose one that he/she'd like to try, that might work for him/her. He/she might have a favourite one that is not on the poster.
3. Let the child use his calming down method for five minutes or so, and then return to talk about feelings and go to the next step of problem solving if necessary. (People need varying amounts of time to calm down.)

Calming Down Ideas

"FEELINGS" CHECKERBOARD POSTER

RATIONALE

Identifying feelings is a crucial skill if children are to understand their own and others' feelings. This helps them distinguish their feelings from the problem - since often the "feelings" **are**, or **become** the problem. We often do not acknowledge "negative" feelings, because we think it is not "OK" to have them. We teach the children that everyone has negative feelings and that it is OK to have the feelings of anger, jealousy etc., as long as our behaviour expressing them is appropriate, and not harmful to themselves or others. Identifying feelings can also warn us about underlying problems. Bottling up feelings can lead to physical illnesses. We can use the energy and determination from negative emotions, such as anger, to change a situation.

HOW TO USE THE POSTER

If child appears upset, sad, angry,

1. Ask child to look at the poster and show you **which** feeling(s) he/she has.
2. If they have trouble identifying which feeling it is, ask **when** they get this feeling - in what situation. You might have to help them clarify, **after** you hear the story of what happened.
3. If they still have trouble identifying their feelings, you might want to ask them to draw the face and/or situation.

Feelings

"I TALK" POSTER

RATIONALE

This poster is used to coach children to make an "assertive statement" of their feelings after they have identified them. The child says what he/she is feeling in a certain situation and what he/she therefore wants to see happen

By making this assertive statement, the child accepts responsibility for his/her **OWN** feelings. He/she does **not** accuse, criticize or blame another person, which usually makes the other person angry or upset

We explain that when he/she is expressing his/her "wants" - that it be a positive, constructive goal or aim that will help "handle" the problem

This method does not solve the problem, but allows discussion to take place that could then help to handle it

HOW TO USE THE POSTER

- 1 Ask child how he/she is feeling (refer to Feelings checkerboard if necessary)
- 2 Ask when he/she has this feeling - in what situations?
- 3 Ask what he/she wants to see happen
- 4 a) Body Language and tone of voice should be as neutral as possible indicating that the children are calm enough to express their feelings. If one child is not calm, there will have to be postponement of "I Talk", or another strategy tried
  - b) Form can be changed slightly to

It makes me feel . . .
I would like
- 5 Have the child then put (above) into the "I" statement

I feel . . . When . . . I want . . .
- 6 You might have to help child practise above by giving examples such as

I feel sad when Mom is at work so much - I want her to spend more time with me
 I feel angry when John takes my toys - I want him to ask me first
 I feel frustrated when I can't do the math - I want more help
 - I feel left out when the kids don't include me in their baseball game - I want to join in
 - I feel excited when I go to a party - I want to have my own party
 - I feel pleased when you do your work so well - I want you to keep it up

"I Talk"

I feel

when

I want

"CONSTRUCTIVE WAYS TO HANDLE CONFLICT" POSTER

RATIONALE

This poster teaches children a variety of constructive strategies to use for handling different types of conflict situations. When children realize that there are **many ways of handling problems**, and learn the steps to do it, hopefully, they will be less likely to just "react", using destructive methods.

Younger children can easily learn examples of sharing, using chance and taking turns. Older children can learn how to distract, postpone and use compromise.

We teach children that **Compromise** is the most widely used in all life situations. It involves sharing and "making a deal" where each person benefits from the deal.

We tell children that **Distraction** is used when someone needs to get their mind on to something else because they're upset or worried, and therefore cannot make good choices.

HOW TO USE THE POSTER

When children are brainstorming ideas to handle a problem involving a conflict, have them refer to the strategies on this poster. You might have to give them examples of some of the more difficult methods.

EXAMPLES:

Compromise: Two brothers want to play Nintendo. Each is butting in on the other - no one is having fun. The two boys agree to write up a schedule - each taking a **different day** to play.

Distract: If a friend is worried or upset about a problem at home (example - parents fighting), you might be able to stop them from exploding by getting them interested in another game or outing.

Postpone: If a friend or parent is in a "bad" mood, it might be a good idea for you to wait until tomorrow to talk to them about your problem, because they will not be able to think clearly right now.

Get Help: Try to ask a person whom you trust and who may be counted on for a fair decision.

Apologize: This is helpful to show the person you're sorry about the situation - not necessarily that you're wrong. Giving an explanation can really help. This can be used to set a peaceful tone.

Constructive Ways to Handle Conflict

"STEPS TO PROBLEM SOLVING" POSTER

RATIONALE

This poster involves all the necessary steps one has to take in order to "handle a problem". The **Talking Time** includes identifying the problem and the child's feelings, as well as having the child state his goal concerning the specific problem. These questions are crucial prerequisites, so that brainstorming can be focused and effective.

The **Action Time** involves brainstorming and then testing these ideas. The child looks at all the options he has thought of and then chooses the best one to try. His input empowers him to handle his own problems. Children soon learn the steps, and realize that using this method can solve many everyday chronic problems such as a messy room, privacy, curfew concerns, etc.

HOW TO USE THE POSTER

Talking Time:

- 1 Ask the child, "Exactly what is the problem?" You might have to help the child distinguish 'what happened' from 'what is the problem'.
- 2 Then ask, "How are you feeling about this?" (You might have to refer to feelings posters if unclear)
- 3 Then ask, "What do you want to see happen?"

Action Time:

- 1 Say to child, "Now we're ready for action - let's think of some ideas to handle this problem."
- 2 What's one thing you could do?
- 3 Do you have a second idea?
- 4 How about a third - no -- perhaps I can help - let's look at the Conflict Strategy poster -- could "compromise" be used here?
- 5 Ok, let's test each of these ideas -- What would happen if...
- 6 Now the next step is for you to choose what you think might be the best idea & try it - if it doesn't work, try another and another."

We want the children to realize that there are always many constructive options that they are capable of thinking of, and if they run out of ideas, they can always ask other people to brainstorm for ideas with them.

Steps to Problem Solving

1

TALKING TIME

What is the problem?

How do you feel?

What do you want?

2

ACTION TIME

Brainstorm ideas

Test ideas by asking

"What would happen if..."

Choose the best idea.

Try it.

If it doesn't work, try another,
and another...

"STEPS FOR MANAGING CONFLICT" POSTER

RATIONALE

This poster is used when two or more children get into a conflict situation. The children learn the analogy between the three steps to crossing a street safely, and the three steps in handling a conflict successfully.

A. Stop and Think

This method teaches children that **Red** indicates that trouble is brewing, therefore they must learn to recognize those signs in themselves and others (loud voices, pushing, red faces, glaring looks). They **stop** and calm down, only then can they think of what **has** happened, and what they wish to happen **now**.

B. Agree to Talk it Over

Yellow indicates a waiting position until you are calm, and therefore can talk it over using "I Talk". This step includes each telling their side and feelings without interruption from the other child and then listening to the other person's side and feelings.

C. Make a Deal

Green indicates they are now in the "Go" position where they can "make a deal" by each stating what they want. They then can move to the next step in problem solving, which is brainstorming constructive conflict strategies, agreeing on one that they would try.

HOW TO USE THE POSTER

1. If children are arguing or fighting - have them stop, separate them, refer them to a calming down poster - allow them time to cool off.
2. When they are calm, ask them if they are ready to "**agree to talk it over**".
3. Each then gives their side of story and tells about their feelings (refer to Feelings chart, if necessary). Each then listens to the other without interrupting.
4. Ask them if they want to "**make a deal**".
5. They each then say what they want to see happen that would use a constructive method to work it out.
6. They can refer to the Constructive Conflict strategies chart to get ideas for brainstorming.

Steps for Managing Conflict

**STOP
and
THINK**

**AGREE
to
TALK IT
OVER**

**MAKE
A DEAL**

- 1 Tell your side and your feelings.
- 2 Listen to the other person's side and feelings
- 3 Tell what you want.
- 4 Listen to what the other person wants

SAMPLE SITUATIONS OF HOW TO USE POSTERS – "ROLE PLAY"

SITUATION 1: Child has been teased at recess about being a poor baseball player – always striking out. He is very upset.

Step 1

Take or send the child to a quiet corner - refer him to 'Calming Down' poster and tell him to choose a calming down idea appropriate for the classroom

Step 2

You settle class, go over to the corner, ask him to talk about how he's feeling - what is trouble - look at 'Feeling Checkerboard'. He might say - **"very angry"**

Step 3

Ask him to then refer to "I Talk" poster and make his asserave statement. He might say - "I feel very angry when John and Dave tease me about striking out. I want them to stop and give me a chance. When I know they might tease me, I play worse."

- what you've just done is gone through the "talking time" steps on the Steps to Problem Solving Chart, but you have also used the "Calming Down", "Feelings" and "I Talk" posters.

5

OF/DE

5

PM-1 3 1/2 x 4 PHOTOGRAPHIC MICROCOPY TARGET
NBS 1010a ANSI/ISO #2 EQUIVALENT

PRECISION^{SM} RESOLUTION TARGETS

Step 4

Teacher: OK, now we're ready to go to "action time" on our Steps to Problem Solving poster and brainstorm to think of some ideas to handle your problem. What is one thing you can do? (or have him write down three ideas and you'll return)

Child: I could tease them back to get even!

Teacher: Do you have a second idea?

Child: I could ignore them!

Teacher: And a third idea?

Child: I could practise more with my older brother and try to improve.

Teacher: Well, all of those are interesting ideas - now let's test each one. What might happen if you chose your first idea and teased them back?

Child: They could get angry and start a fight!

Teacher: And what might happen if you chose the second idea of ignoring them?

Child: Well, I'd never get to play baseball because they'd think I didn't want to be friends with them, and I do.

Teacher: Let's test that third idea about practising and improving. What might happen if you did that?

Child: I bet I could improve in two weeks.

Teacher: OK, now it's time to go to our next step and choose the best of these three ideas. Which will it be?

Child: I think I'll try practising and see what happens. I love baseball and I bet my brother will say yes!

Teacher: Good, try it. Good luck! If it doesn't work, come back and we'll think of some other ideas.

SITUATION 2: Two boys are arguing over the use of the soccer area. They're hauled into the principal's office (or classroom) still arguing. ("Steps for Managing Conflict" poster and "Constructive Ways to Handle Conflict" poster)

Step 1

Principal: OK boys. **Stop!** - please separate. Tom, you go to this side. Don, you sit over here. Please use your favourite calming down method (poster is on wall) to cool off and think what has happened. I'll be back to talk in a few moments after I complete my work.

Step 2

Principal: Alright boys - you have had time to "**stop and think**". Do you "**agree to talk it over**"?

Boys: Yes. I guess so.

Principal: OK - you know, that talking it over means each of you gets to tell his side and his feelings, but you also have to **listen** to each other without interrupting. Tom, you start.

Tom: Well, I feel very angry because Don and his friends hog the soccer field every recess. Their teacher lets them out earlier than ours and so they get it first. It's not fair and my friends and I want to play also.

Principal: OK, Don - what's your side?

Don: Well, my friends and I feel fine because we get out early, but now these guys are arguing with us so we're getting upset at them and we want to settle this.

Principal: Alright, boys, do you want to look at our poster on Constructive Ways to Handle Conflict, and see if you can use any of these strategies to think of some ideas on how to handle this and **make a deal**? Then write down some ideas to make a deal and I'll be back in a few minutes.

- Principal:** OK, what's your first idea?
- Don:** Well, we could schedule Monday, Wednesday and Friday for us and Tuesday and Thursday for John, and then alternate each week.
- John:** Or a second idea would be to split the field in two and use two balls.
- Principal:** OK, let's test those two ideas -- what would happen if you use Don's schedule?
- John:** That would work if we kept it with us, so we'd remember not to argue.
- Principal:** And what would happen if you split the field?
- John:** Well, I think we might end up fighting because we'd be tripping over each other.
- Principal:** Do you have a third idea?
- Boys:** No, but we could try the first idea and see if it works.
- Principal:** OK, try it -- let me know how it works and you can come back and think of some more ideas if you need to.
- Boys:** Thanks!

BOOSTER ACTIVITIES

children learning for living

INTRODUCTION

These ideas, which can be integrated into almost any curriculum, are necessary to keep interest alive in the poster and program, and to keep reinforcing the concept throughout the year. To do this, a school booster committee must be formed with at least one Primary teacher, one Junior teacher and an administrator.

Some of these ideas can be done on a school-wide basis, such as the Six-Week Poster Campaign (see page 125). This helps to create spirit and excitement in the school and build enthusiasm for the program.

Ideas for boosters are listed in subject areas such as math, art, etc. for each poster. They are easy to implement and the children will find them interesting and fun.

Enjoy! (Do them with another class - Less stress - more fun!)

One of the most interesting booster ideas is creating a "Problem-Solving Unit or theme" for a week or more.

Put problem-solving/conflict-management materials into all of your centres. You might have a centre for each poster with related materials from reinforcement sheets and boosters.

Other Ideas for General Use in School

1. Have a tape recorder in the Problem Solving Corner for students to record deal making.
2. Have students read skits for each chart on the P.A. system. Principal gives awards.
3. Have teacher put names of students who used poster steps on sheets, such as "I used 'I Talk' ", "I'm a good problem solver" - names on P.A.
4. Feature a "Poster a Week" in newsletters sent home to parents giving short explanation and suggestions of how to use.
5. Have a "drama" group go around to different classes acting out their rehearsed role plays using posters.

SIX-WEEK POSTER CAMPAIGN

This Six-Week Poster Campaign is an example of a way to get the whole school involved. It was done very successfully at W.E. Gowling School in Ottawa, Ontario. You might want to spend two weeks on each chart to give classes more time to really "work" on activities. These are all just examples of what you can do. Make up your own to suit your division.

Week 1

Feelings Chart

Competition: Classes are to list as many feelings as they can think of during the week. The class with the most within each division will win a class prize. Please post a sheet of chart paper somewhere in your room for students to write feelings on. You may want to brainstorm as a class, or you may want to ask students to add to the list as they think of feelings.

Week 2

Calming Down Chart

Competition: Classes are to list as many ways to calm down as they can think of during the week. This will be run exactly as the previous competition. Please post a chart paper somewhere in your room.

Week 3

Constructive Ways to Handle Conflict Chart

Competition: A specific problem will be read over the P.A. system on Monday morning, and classes will be asked to think of as many ways of solving that problem as they can. Please post a sheet of chart paper in your room.

Week 4**"I Talk" Chart**

Competition: Teachers will be given tickets to hand out to the first five students they hear using "I Talk" that day. Students will put their name and class number on the tickets and they will be handed in for a draw on Friday. A prize will be awarded to one student from each division.

I USED "I TALK"	
NAME	
CLASS	

Week 5**Steps to Problem Solving Chart**

Competition: Primaries and Juniors will draw and decorate their own poster.

Week 6**Steps for Managing Conflict Chart**

Competition: Children will be asked to fill in a form asking them to describe a problem they have had, and the solution they used. A panel of judges will determine winners from each division.

P.A. ANNOUNCEMENTS AT THE START OF EACH DAY

Feelings

Day 1

You have all seen the Problem Solving posters around the school. For the next six weeks, we are going to be really looking for people using the charts. To get us all thinking about them again, we're going to be having a competition every week which will look at one of the posters - the Poster of the Week. This week the special poster is the Feelings poster.

There will be a prize for the class who can think of the most feelings this week. Your teacher will have a big sheet for you to write the feelings on, and they will be counted on Friday.

We will also be listening carefully to hear people talking about their feelings. Good luck, and I hope you feel happy today!

Feelings

Day 2

How are your lists of feelings going? Has anyone got "affectionate" on their lists? You know, it's very important to think about how you're feeling. Sometimes we bottle up our feelings inside, and then they come out in other ways - like headaches, or not being able to sleep. So when you have a problem, be sure to think about how it's making you feel - and then tell someone you trust about it.

Feelings

Day 3

Are your lists of feelings getting longer? Anyone got over 100 yet? Do you have "mortified" on your list? That means you're feeling extremely horrified or shocked. It's very important to tell the other person how you feel when you have a disagreement. It's also very important to listen for how that person is feeling. If you both do this it will be much easier to solve your problem.

By the way, for this competition you may include physical feelings, like hungry or tired. Think about how those kinds of feelings are different from emotions.

Feelings**Day 4**

Rumour has it that one class has over 150 feelings on their list. Isn't that incredible? Only two more days left to add to your list. Today I'd like you to think about the different ways that you can get your feelings across - for example, with your face, your body or the tone of your voice. By the way, do you have "invigorated" on your list?

Feelings**Day 5**

Well, today is your last chance to add feelings to your list. Here's a hint - how would you feel if someone was bugging you and wouldn't stop? And another hint - do you have "intimidated" on your list?

You know it's okay to have feelings, even feelings like anger and frustration. It's what you DO because of your feelings that sometimes gets you into trouble. For example, hitting someone when you're feeling angry is not okay. There are many other ways to deal with anger, and we'll be talking about those next week.

Calming Down Ideas**Day 1**

This week we are going to be focusing on ways to calm down. One of our posters, the one with all the hot air balloons, gives some ideas of how to do this. One of the balloons is empty, and that is because there are a lot more ideas of ways to calm down when you're feeling angry or tense

Our competition this week will be to think of as many ways to calm down as you can. Your teacher will post a sheet, just the same way as she did last week, and during the week, you and your class will write out all the ideas that you can think of on the sheet. To get you started - think of something that makes you feel really angry. What do you do to stop yourself from hitting out when you feel this way? Write that idea on your chart. Good luck!

Calming Down Ideas**Day 2**

I hope those lists of calming down ideas are growing! I hear some classes have over 100 ideas!

To show you the difference between how your body feels when it is relaxed, and how it feels when it is tense or angry, I want you all to try the following exercise:

Sitting with your hands in your lap, I want you to squeeze your hand into a fist as if you were squeezing a lemon. Hold it tight for a minute, squeeze the lemon as hard as you can, get every drop of juice out of it! This is how your body feels when it is tense. Now, resting your hand on your lap, just let it relax. It probably feels kind of tingly and heavy. That's how your body feels when it is completely relaxed. But it's hard to relax your body, unless your mind is relaxed too. One way to relax your mind is to talk your problems out with someone you trust.

Don't forget, tomorrow is your last day for thinking of calming down ideas. Keep up the good work!

MAKE A NECKLACE TO SHOW HOW YOUR FEELINGS CHANGE

1. Cut a piece of cardboard or bristol board to this size.
2. Draw faces and label them. You can use both sides.
3. Punch a hole at the top.
4. Pull through shoelace or fancy string big enough to go around neck.
5. Have it laminated if you wish.
6. Use a fancy coloured paper clip or hairpin on the necklace to slide up and down to indicate your feelings.

BOOSTERS FOR "I TALK" AND FEELINGS CHECKERBOARD POSTERS

Mathematics

- A Measure each "feeling" square while learning concept of "square". Make your own chart with your favourite feelings. Take it home.
- B Create a "Feelings" wheel - two circles with pin in middle - one rotates to show feelings on outside.

Art and Language Arts

- A Create your own "I Talk" Memo Pad. Write in your usual "I Talk" messages.
- B Make a feelings collage - use magazines, your own drawings, or just words.
- C Make a "Feelings" necklace (directions opposite).
- D Fingerprint to music - colours create different feelings - discuss.

Drama/Performing Arts

- A Act out feelings, using only face, body.
- B Act out feelings, using only voice.
- C Use "I Talk" in role plays. Give out situation cards or have children make up own and act them out.
- D Write a Rap Song about Feelings. Perform for class.
- E Do song "If you're happy and you know it, clap your hands".
- F Practise using "I Talk", using examples of "teasing" about clothes, hair, sports.

Language Arts

- A Journal Starters for a week: I feel excited when . . . I feel happy when . . . I feel surprised when . . . I feel nervous when . . . I felt disappointed when . . .
- B Learn Spelling words for 10 feeling words.
- C Oral "Talk and Tell": How I used "I Talk" to solve a problem
- D Use the thesaurus to find new words for feelings.

MAKE AN UPSET OR STRESS THERMOMETER

1. Cut a piece of cardboard or bristol board to this size.
2. (a) Photocopy this cover sheet with words (put numbers at different levels if desired).
(b) Glue cover sheet onto bristol board.
3. Use marker to "mark" levels.
4. Make slits at top and bottom.
5. Slip shoelace or thick string (white) through slits.
6. Paint or colour half of shoelace red.
7. Pull shoelace through - up and down - to measure
     anger
     stress
     upset
     worry
     etc.

BOOSTERS FOR CALMING DOWN IDEAS POSTERS

Art

- A. Make your own hot air balloon. Write in your favourite methods of cooling off. Take it home to use with family.
- B. Make a big hot air balloon for the class. Have class think of 50 - 100 methods of cooling off and hang out in hall. (Have a competition with another class). Students could each make a face attached with string.
- C. Make an "anger" or "stress" thermometer. Take it home to use. Make one for the classroom.
- D. Draw a picture of yourself angry and then calm.

Language Arts

- A. Journal Starters:
  - When I'm worried, I calm down by . . .
  - When I'm hurt, I calm down by . . .
  - When I'm hyper, I calm down by . . .
  - When my Mom/Dad is upset, he/she calms down by . . .
  - When my brother/sister is angry, he/she calms down by ..
- B. Oral - "Talk and Tell":
  - How I calmed down and solved my problem -
  - My brother/Mom/I was so angry, I thought he/she/I would explode. What happened ---

Environmental Studies

Some of the things we do to protect our environment are very relaxing. Some people work in the garden, some people watch birds. What other ideas are there? Draw a picture of yourself doing one of these activities.

BOOSTERS FOR CONSTRUCTIVE WAYS TO HANDLE CONFLICT POSTER

Media Literacy

- A. Do a TV survey. Put copy of poster near TV for a week. What methods are people on TV using to handle conflicts? Are these methods good for real life?

Art and Language Arts

- A. Create your own comic strip using a conflict management strategy.
- B. Create your own cartoon character, and write and draw about a 'series' of problems that he/she gets into, and out of, using good strategies

Mathematics

- A. Recreate this poster while teaching the division of circles.

Language Arts

- A. Written or Oral:
How I Used Compromise
Chance
Taking Turns, etc., to Solve a Conflict
- B. Use words on chart for spelling.
- C. Create and act out conflict skits before, then after using a strategy.

BOOSTERS FOR STEPS TO PROBLEM SOLVING POSTER

Social Studies

- A. Identify some community or national problems - bring in an expert to brainstorm ideas on how to solve.
- B. Identify home or school chronic problems. Brainstorm in groups - come together to discuss, test and compare.

Language Arts

- A. Have a problem "box" - each week class discusses one problem - write or debate solutions. (Give Award to Problem Solver of the Week.)
- B. Class writes newsletter for parents about the above problems and solutions.

BOOSTERS FOR STEPS FOR MANAGING CONFLICT (STOP LIGHT) POSTER

Art and Math

- A. Do a TV survey. Put a photocopy of poster near TV for a week. What methods are people on TV using to handle conflicts? Are these methods good for real life?

Art and Language Arts

- A. Create your own comic strip using a conflict management strategy.
- B. Create your own cartoon character, and write and draw about a 'series' of problems that he/she gets into, and out of, using good strategies.

Mathematics

- A. Recreate this poster while teaching the division of circles

Language Arts

- A. Written or Oral:
How I Used Compromise
Chance
Taking Turns, etc., to Solve a Conflict
- B. Use words on chart for spelling.
- C. Create and act out conflict skits before, then after, use of strategy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

RECOMMENDED RESOURCES

RECOMMENDED RESOURCES

It would be wonderful if we could leave each school with a Library of Resources. However, the next best thing is to recommend resources that we think you will find valuable for purchasing or borrowing.

PRIMARY

RECOMMENDED STORY BOOKS

1. Alexander and the Horrible, No Good, Very Bad Day by Judith Viorst
2. Tight Times by Barbara Shook Hazen
3. Move Over Twerp by Martha Alexander
4. The Tenth Good Thing About Barney by Judith Viorst (When a Pet Dies)
5. There's a Nightmare in My Closet by Mercer Mayer (Coping with Fears)
6. Story of Ping by Marjorie Flack (Problem Situations)
7. The Story of Peter Rabbit by Beatrix Potter (Problem Situations)
8. Duso R1 - Story Books 1, 2 Psy Can, P.O.Box 290, Station V, Toronto, Ontario M6R 3A5
(stories about understanding self and others - sharing, co-operation, solving problems)
9. Feelings by Alik
10. I'll Fix Anthony by Judith Viorst

RECOMMENDED FILMS AND VIDEOS

1. <i>A New Zebra in Town</i>	OBE Media #20-1893 (People are All the Same Inside)
2. <i>Noises in the Night</i>	OBE Media #10-2373 (Children's Fears)
3. <i>Walter the Lazy Mouse</i>	OBE Media (Problem Solving)
4. <i>I'm Feeling Alone</i>	OBE Media #10-0290 (Exploring Feelings)
5. <i>I'm Mad at Me</i>	OBE Media #10-0292 (Exploring Feelings)
6. <i>Zardip's Search for Healthy Feelings</i>	OBE Media V291617 (Exploring Feelings)
7. See Catalogue <u>Sunburst Communication</u> , 920 Mercer Street, Windsor, Ontario N9A 7C2 for excellent videos related to these topics	

JUNIOR

RECOMMENDED VIDEOS

1. <i>Taking Responsibility: Standing Up For Yourself</i> (Assertiveness)	OBE Media 90-5258
2. <i>I.A.L.A.C. (I am Loveable and Capable)</i> (Dealing with Put Downs)	Available from Children Learning for Living 239-2668
3. <i>Zardip's Search for Healthy Feelings</i>	OBE Media V291617
4. <i>Rainbow War</i> (Discrimination) OBE	OBE Media 20-3304
5. See Catalogue <u>Sunburst Communication</u> , 920 Mercer Street, Windsor, Ontario N9A 7C2 for excellent videos related to these topics	

RECOMMENDED STORY BOOKS

1. *Trouble with Friends* - Berenstein Bears
2. *Every Kid's Guide to Handling Fights with Brothers and Sisters*, by Joy Berry
3. *Angel Child, Dragon Child*, by Michelle Maria Surat
4. *Willy the Wimp*, by Anthony Browne
5. *Ronald Morgan Goes to Bat*, by Patricia O'Reilly
6. *Froggett's Revenge*, by K M Peyton
7. *Bully For You*, by Child's Play

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Canadian Mental Health Association Living Colour - Building Self-Esteem and Developing Communication Skills. Ontario Division.
- Cech, Maureen Global Child-Multicultural Resources for Young Children. Ottawa, 1990.
- Dodgson, Judith Severn School Peace Project. A Conflict Resolution Program for Elementary Schools.
- Kreidler, William J. Creative Conflict Resolution. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1984.
- Legg, Jane Children Learning for Living Curriculum. Ottawa: Ottawa Board of Education, 1989.
- Morganett, Rosemarie S. Skills for Living. Group Counselling Activities for Young Adolescents. Champaign, Illinois: Research Press, 1990.
- Nickerson, Dr. Carl, Cheryl Lottis and Elaine Porter Miraculous Me. Comprehensive Health Education Foundation, Seattle, Wash., 1980.
- O'Connor, Diane S. I Can Be Me. Health Communications Inc., 1987.
- Palomares, Unaldo, and Ben Logan A Curriculum on Conflict Management. Human Development Training Institute, 1975.
- Schmidt, Fran, and Alice Freedman Creative Conflict Solving for Kids. Miami Beach: Grace Contrino Abrams Peace Education Foundation, Inc., 1985.
- Schmidt, Fran, and Alice Freedman Peacemaking Skills for Little Kids. Miami Beach: Grace Contrino Abrams Peace Education Foundation, Inc., 1988.
- Swan, Helen Building Conflict Solving Skills. Topeka, Ks.: Kansas Child Abuse Prevention Council, 1990.
- Weissberg, Caplan, Bennetto and Jackson Sixth Grade Social Problem-Solving Module. New Haven, Conn.: 1990/91.

END

1 6 0 6 - 9 7

FIN