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This study examined the effects of a conflict management training program on the performance levels of high school adolescent females. Twenty female adolescent students were randomly assigned in equal numbers to either an experimental or control group. The students in the experimental group participated in a one school-day training program in conflict management skills. The students in the control group participated in two hours of discussion on handling conflicts. Pre- and post-training performance was measured by videotape recordings, classroom behavior ratings, behavior checklist, and student records of referrals for discipline.

The results showed the following: (1) The videotapes revealed a clear relationship between training and skill acquisition. (2) In the classroom, the behavior ratings showed only limited behavior change following training. (3) Aggressive behavior decreased as evidenced by the scores on the Achenbach Teacher's Report Form (Achenbach & Edelbrock, 1986). (4) The number of referrals decreased for the majority of students but did not change differentially for the experimental and control groups.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

There is an increasing consensus among educational reformers, child advocates, and school boards that the time has arrived to take a broader perspective of defining and insuring student success (Thomas & Grimes, 1987). The school psychologist who is trained in applied behavior analysis will be in the forefront to shape the evolving concept of a student's success by advocating acquisition of interpersonal social competencies. For the at-risk high school student, acquisition of conflict management skills represents one of many essential foundations necessary for their success.

Acquisition of conflict-management skills provides an alternative behavior for the high school student who disrupts the learning process by exhibiting a high rate of anti-social behaviors (Feindler, 1990). According to Feindler (1990) and other researchers, frequent disruptions make the student susceptible to many academic difficulties as well as a wide array of social maladjustments. For example, Asher and Gottman (1981) noted poor peer relations; Herbert (1981) observed peer rejection; while Patterson, Reid, Jones, and Conger (1975) and Cartledge and Milburn (1986) recorded lower academic achievement. Ullman (1957) and Adelson (1980) documented an increase in the probability of adolescents dropping out of school due to poor
academic and/or social performance; and Gronlund and Anderson (1963) observed maladjustment in the school environment. In addition, Kohlberg, LaCrosse, and Ricks (1972), Cowen, Pederson, Babigian, Izzo, and Trost (1973), and Asher and Gottman (1981) predicted that adolescents who are not socially skilled will exhibit mental health difficulties during adulthood. Robins (1978), Olweus (1979), Achenbach and Edelbrock (1986), and Feindler and Ecton (1986) documented poor demonstration of adolescent social skills has resulted in increased substance abuse, criminal activity, and manifestation of psychiatric symptoms. Violent and aggressive behaviors then become the projected interpersonal coping strategies relied upon during adulthood (Feindler, 1990).

Failure to acquire conflict management skills will only create an increased pool of children at risk of failing to graduate from high school. When one fourth of this nation's youth fails to graduate from high school each year, all segments of our society are adversely affected (Freeland, 1986). It has ramifications on such social areas as law enforcement, employment, armed services, and education. The Michigan Department of Corrections reported 70% of all first time offenders are school dropouts (Thomas, 1986). The Education Commission of the States' Business Advisory Commission reported unemployment rates for high school dropouts are generally double that for high school graduates (Thomas, 1986). The United States Department of Defense (Thomas, 1986) enforced a monthly quota limiting school dropouts accepted in any branch of the armed services. The United States Department of Education (1990) reported the
nationwide dropout rate was 27.4% in 1988, up from 22.8% in 1972. Professionals and lay persons alike, involved in these social areas, are witnessing the fact that this society is educating its young people at a performance level that the National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983) reported is, at best, "mediocre." As a result, the Commission considered our nation's educational system "at risk" of eroding.

Concern for this educational state of affairs has manifested itself in public responses of several forms. Responses are in the form of re-examining the traditional and expanding the nontraditional paradigms of school responsibility. The proliferation of commission reports, task force recommendations, and participation of national organizations addressed this concern. Governmental officials recognized the urgency of the situation and published national reports such as *A Nation at Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983) and *Operation Rescue: A Blueprint for Success* (National Foundation for the Improvement of Education, 1986). Both of these monographs examined the quality of America's educational system. In 1987, the Committee for Economic Development published *Children in Need: Investment Strategies for the Educationally Disadvantaged* and the National League of Cities published *Children, Families and Cities: Programs that Work at the Local Level* (Kyle, 1987). These monographs focused on basic planning techniques for educational delivery systems. In addition, seventeen national associations collaborated their efforts to devise a preventative student dropout plan.
Associations such as the National Education Association, National Foundation for the Improvement of Education, national school boards and national parent-teacher associations were involved. Several State Departments of Education formed task forces to develop model policies on school dropout prevention and made recommendations to local school districts in Michigan, California, Maryland, and North Carolina. School districts in Michigan, such as Detroit, Southfield, Grand Rapids, and Battle Creek, have launched local efforts to develop and implement their own prevention programs. Student bodies have claimed their role. Peer tutoring and support groups are functioning in Michigan school districts such as Southfield, Ecorse, and Ann Arbor. Increased public commitment has been the impetus for continuing to search for solutions to this society's educational plight. As a result, social awareness of the problem is expanding.

A commitment to searching for solutions to increase excellence in education has been the priority agenda item for the organizations and individuals mentioned. Unfortunately, the search for solutions involved blaming. Fortunately, the frustration exhibited by those doing the blaming urged political and educational leaders to act forcefully and effectively to identify educational programs which result in notable student success (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983). Obviously, successful completion of school cannot be realized if a student drops out prematurely.

The decision to drop out of school is not conceived in a vacuum. The final decision is the cumulative result of many faulty choices as well as some not so faulty. The decision also can be the result of
intermittent reinforcement of disruptive behaviors by teachers, parents, peers, or nature itself (Elmquist, 1991; Sparks, 1990).

Student success will not and has not been achieved without transformation. Over the past century, the responsibility of the school to students has changed (Runkel, 1987). According to Joy Dryfoos (1991) in her article about school-based social and health services, "Schools need all the help they can get to prevent the negative consequences of early initiation to drugs, sex, aggressive behavior, and other forms of 'acting-out'" (p. 119). Dryfoos continues to point out that the "American educational system was not conceived or organized to address the 21st-century issues of homelessness and AIDS" (p. 119), and thus collaborative efforts to address these and other plights are critical.

In the past, the majority of attention was directed toward general education reform. Now, the schools are obligated to develop programs that address more than curriculum development and upgrading of funding priorities (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983). Local communities have "hand delivered" the schools the charge to not only teach academics, but also morals, values, sexuality, and social etiquette and to herald the schools to become a center for a wide range of psychological, health, social, recreational, and treatment services. School psychologists need to look beyond psychometric evaluations and move toward providing services and implementing programs that address students' behavioral deficits. It is the behavioral deficits that Thomas and Grimes (1987) consider to
be the outside contributors which affect successful school experiences.

There are several theories that attempt to explain disruptive school behavior (Walker, 1979). One explanation is based on the success of preschool experiences. Another theory identifies the parents' educational attainments and attitudes toward the school as critical factors. A more plausible theory interprets disruptive behavior as being attributed to deficits in the "survival skills" repertoire necessary to be successful in school. Cobb (1972) defines "survival skills" as the minimum behavioral requirements necessary for a student to effectively consume instruction. These behaviors include paying attention, listening to instructions, following directions, and complying with teacher demands.

Without mastery of these basic survival behaviors, Cobb says a student will eventually develop social adjustment problems as well as severe academic deficits. Consequently, the student is reinforced for acting out rather than for his/her academic strengths. Cobb also notes that students who come to school harboring behavior deficits in the area of "survival skills" attempt to adjust to frustrating and/or anger-provoking situations by manifesting disruptive behaviors. The frequency and magnitude of the disruptive behaviors usually escalates into a confrontation making it necessary to intervene with some form of conflict management.

**Genesis of Conflict Management in Education**

The use of conflict management skills to resolve disputes is not
a new phenomenon. The preponderance of research has been in the area of organizational development. Demonstrated success has been observed via training of upper and middle management personnel (Assael, 1969; Putnam & Wilson, 1982). Religious and peace activists have recognized the importance of teaching conflict management skills since the late 1960s and early 1970s. In 1980, the Children's Hearings Project in Cambridge, Massachusetts, offered mediation as an alternative to the court for youths and their families. Divorce courts and child custody cases have employed conflict management to mediate differences of couples (Irving, 1981). Education adopted conflict management strategies shortly after the civil rights era.

Organizations interested in preventing violence in the schools have multiplied across the country. Organizations such as the National Association for Mediation in Education (NAME) articulated that their goal was to "Teach students of all ages how to deal with anger constructively, how to communicate feelings and concerns without using violence and abusive language, how to think critically about alternative solutions, and how to agree to solutions in which all parties win" (NAME, 1981). Since 1971, the National Institute for Dispute Resolution (NIDR), located in Washington, D.C., has been actively designing, operating, and evaluating alternative methods to prevent conflicts in schools and community settings (NIDR, 1971). The American Bar Association's Special Committee on Dispute Resolution, based in Washington, D.C., acts as a clearinghouse in the field of school mediation (American Bar Association, n.d.). In 1980, the
Children's Hearing Project (CHP) in Cambridge, Massachusetts, offered mediation as an alternative to going to court for youth and their families (CHP, 1980). In 1981, Educators for Social Responsibility (ESR) pooled their independent activities and efforts into forming the National Association for Mediation in Education (NAME, 1981). NAME provides guidance to develop peer mediation programs and to promote curricula units about conflict. The Community Board Program in San Francisco, California, provides conflict resolution resources to educators (CBP, n.d.). Since 1986, Cornerstone Center for Justice and Peace (CCJP), located in Denver, Colorado, has disseminated information on conflict management to schools, churches, businesses and other organizations (CCJP, 1986).

Educational institutions have developed strategies to prevent violence in the schools. Wayne State University, located in Detroit, Michigan, has created a Peace and Conflict Studies Department devoted to examining, studying, and disseminating information regarding conflict resolution. George Mason University located in Fairfax, Virginia, offers a Master's degree in Conflict Management. Elementary and secondary schools across the United States have developed peer mediation programs with the purpose of teaching fellow students to assist in resolving students' minor disputes. Teachers have recognized the need to implement conflict resolution into classroom curricula to teach communication and mediation skills. Public secondary schools continue to be receptive to inclusion of conflict management in the school experience. Some schools view conflict management training as an integral component of the existing curriculum. The
majority see conflict management training as an additional student support system ("Schools Borrowing Successful Ideas," 1987).

Student support manifested itself in various conflict-management interventions. The behavioral interventions found effective for use with adolescents in public high schools usually included the components of social skills training and assertiveness training (Feindler, 1988; Filipczak, Archer, & Friedman, 1980; Lee, Hallberg, & Hassard, 1979; and Sarason & Sarason, 1981). The majority of the interventions involved modeling of the desired behavior, role playing and rehearsing the behavior, and providing feedback about the accuracy of the behavior. Modeling, role playing, and feedback along with transfer training are components of the promising social skill program, Structured Learning (Goldstein, Sprafkin, Gershaw, & Klein, 1980). Problem solving also was found to be an effective intervention by Feindler (1988) and Verduyn, Lord, and Forrest (1990). Problem solving was further categorized into verbal problem solving, discrete problem solving, and social problem solving. McCullough, Huntsinger, and Nay (1977) implemented a self-control training program that involved identifying antecedent components, performing thought-stopping exercises, and writing contracts. Evaluation of these behavioral programs and skills has shown evidence of positive behavior change. However, issues such as recidivism, maintenance, generalization, and social validity remain important to be examined (Fawcett, 1991; Feindler & Ecton, 1986; and Horner, Dunlap, & Koegel, 1988).
Acquisition of conflict management skills in the school environment has not been restricted to students. The utility and effectiveness of conflict management has attracted the attention of other school participants. Mordock (1988) recognized that parents may create and maintain acting-out behavior in some students. Mordock's report claimed that acting out by students is a result not of educational practices, but more of family factors. Mordock's goal was to enlighten school staff regarding the characteristics of parents of children who act out.

Special Education also has recognized the importance of conflict management. Public Law 94-142 (U.S. Department of Education, 1990) insures due process for parents of handicapped students dissatisfied with the Individual Educational Plan (IEP) devised by the school district. Mediation was used as part of due process to prevent costly hearings. State Departments of Education reported success by conducting mediation hearings with parents and local school officials. Connecticut, Massachusetts and California were the first of 11 states that provided mediation experts through their State Departments of Education. Gallant reported in her book, Mediation in Special Education Disputes (1982) that the present system of resolution was "seriously flawed" and "the adversarial nature of such hearings exacerbates the antagonism that so often exists between school personnel and parents" (p. 91). Gallant continued to report that mediation has "led to the exploration of a more positive optimal form of dispute resolution" (p. 1).

Local Special Services Directors witnessed increasing numbers of
conflicts between parents of handicapped children and the multidisciplinary team. Maher (1986) reported success in teaching Special Education Directors conflict management skills to mediate matters surrounding the development, implementation, and evaluation of the IEP. Frey and Young (1978) reported success when they taught an eight step conflict-management process to educators. Success was evaluated based on reported use of the process by principals with teachers in staff meetings, teachers in team buildings, parent groups, central administration meetings, and in family living classes.

National organizations and school programs that address disruption in the schools have provided excellent anecdotal records and narratives of the effectiveness of the programs. The programs have also provided evidence of accountability, documented success stories, and produced teaching guides to promote the idea. However, a minimal amount of systematic research and evaluation has been conducted on the formal measures of prosocial behaviors (Elliott, Sheridan, & Gresham, 1989). There continues to be a paucity of literature on conflict management in the public schools from an applied behavior analysis approach. There is even less research conducted on the acquisition of conflict management skills in the public schools from an applied behavior analysis position at the secondary level with a target population of at-risk students. The present study will address the latter issue.
CHAPTER II

METHOD

Students

A total of 20 suburban high school, female students participated in the conflict management training. All students were in the regular education curriculum. The students ranged in age from 15 to 17 years and were in either the tenth or eleventh grade. It was not determined if any of the students had been retained. The selection criteria included (a) enrollment in the high school's At-Risk Program, (b) teacher recommendation, and (c) at least two "conflict" disciplinary referrals within the preceding school year. Each student's behavior was colloquially labeled as "disruptive," "difficult to manage," or "confrontative" by the program staff.

The 20 female students were randomly assigned to either the experimental or the control group, 10 in each. All students reported no history of any systematic conflict management training in or outside of school prior to the experiment. Teachers were unaware to which group each student was assigned.

Each student was required to have a signed permission form on file before participating in the training. As shown in Appendix B, the form was entitled "Southfield High School Group Permission Form." The form's purpose was to record signatures of (a) the parent(s), (b) the director of the At-Risk Program, and (c) the student. The
signatures indicated that all parties were aware and agreed that the student could be a participant in the group.

Setting

Training for the 10 students in the experimental group was conducted apart from the high school in the school district's conference room located inside the administrative building. The conference room was constructed in the center of the building. The room was not totally isolated from business offices and employees. Reportedly, students' voices were not heard nor interfered with daily business operations.

The 150' x 75' carpeted conference room was partitioned into two halves. One side of the room contained three portable 6' x 4' tables with approximately 12 chairs and two exit doors. A ceiling-mounted projection screen hung on the north wall. On the west wall, hung a 4' x 3' piece of white poster paper with the agenda for the day on it. On the south and east walls, hung two commercially printed conflict management posters.

In contrast to the experimental group, training for the students in the control group was conducted in a classroom in the high school. The students in the control group were exposed to discussions regarding conflict management. The discussions were conducted in a 75' x 40' classroom that contained approximately 30 desks with attached chairs, a teacher's desk and chair, and a lecture podium. Windows overlooking the student parking lot covered one half of the north wall.
Videotaping took place on the stage of the High School auditorium. At times, stage prompts and other stage paraphernalia were exposed while taping. Students waiting to be videotaped sat in the audience section of the auditorium.

Materials

Materials included a videotape recorder and index cards. A 1/2-inch videotape recorder, a camera with a 5:1 zoom lens and a 12-inch television monitor were the equipment used to produce a permanent product of the roleplay responses of the students. Four, 5" x 8," white, typewritten, index cards were presented to each target student. As shown in Appendix C, each card contained instructions regarding the videotaping. As shown in Appendix D, the other cards contained descriptions of the scenarios.

A folder containing warm-up exercises, pre- and post-test, activity work sheets, articles of interest, pencil and writing paper was prepared and presented to each student. The activity work sheets were photocopied from various conflict management manuals. (See Appendix E for the agenda of the one-day training for the experimental group.)

A 35 mm slide presentation was produced from the book entitled Handling Your Disagreements by Joy Wilt (1980). A Bell and Howell slide projector and 4' x 6' ceiling-mounted projection screen were used to present the slides.
Staff

Three school employees made up the training staff. One person was a female social worker who had three years of experience teaching prosocial skills in a support group format in the middle school. One person was the high school's security supervisor who was trained in physical and verbal crisis prevention. One was the school psychologist who served as the experimenter and operated as the crisis intervention psychologist at the high school.

Two teachers of high school psychology were trained as observers. No special contingencies were arranged for their cooperation. Each teacher was assigned the responsibility to view videotapes and evaluate mastery level of target behaviors. A student from the advanced stage production crew operated the videotape equipment.

Dependent Variables

The present study investigated the effects of conflict management training on several dependent variables. Videotaping measured five dependent variables: (1) response latency, (2) eye contact, (3) facial expressions, (4) voice loudness, and (5) verbal response. The classroom behavior rating cards measured four dependent variables: (1) invitation to ARGUE, (2) delivering a THREAT, (3) TALKS out of turn, and (4) DISRUPTS the class. The Achenbach Teacher's Report Form (Achenbach & Edelbrock, 1986) measured aggressive behavior as defined on a subscale from that form. The school records
measured the number of disciplinary referrals a student acquired.

Experimental Design

A between-group research design was employed for a comparison between two groups of randomly assigned students. This type of design compared the pre- and post-training performance of the experimental and the control group.

Experimental Conditions

Baseline

Baseline data were collected two school weeks prior to the training and collected again for two school weeks following training. Baseline data were collected on both treatment groups. Assessments were conducted on four dependent measures.

Experimental Group Training

Following introductions, all students were informed that the purpose of the group was to learn alternative ways of handling conflicts and confrontative situations. The students also were told they would have opportunities to rehearse situations with other group members, observe facilitators and other group members model appropriate behavior, receive feedback from facilitators and members on their performance, and receive social reinforcement when applicable. The specific procedures of modeling, behavioral rehearsal, and feedback were explained.
The students in the experimental group actively participated in the training. The social worker, security supervisor, and the school psychologist interacted at different times with the experimental group. Students were transported from the high school at 7:30 a.m. via a school bus to the training site. The training session was held one school day from 8:00 a.m. until 1:30 p.m. The students left the training site at 1:30 p.m. via a school bus to return to the high school. School was dismissed at 2:05 p.m. Forty-five minutes were allotted for lunch at the training site. The total amount of training time, including lunch, was 5.5 hours which is equivalent to five weekly sessions.

The treatment package consisted of acquisition of five behavior skills. The behavior skills were introduced in the following order: eye contact, facial expression, response latency, voice intonations, and verbal response. The behavior skills were taught in two sequential units. The first unit included the nonvocal skills (eye contact, facial expression, and response latency). The second unit included the vocal skills (voice intonation and verbal responses). This sequential arrangement was borrowed from research conducted by Ollendick and Hersen (1979) when they taught social skills to juvenile delinquents.

These specific skills were selected because of their effectiveness in interpersonal communication skills training (Kolko, Dorsett, & Milan, 1981; Romano & Bellack, 1980). Reportedly, these skills are likely responses in a confrontation. Informal observation of random-
ly chosen students who were involved in conflicts during the previous school year provided additional evidence that these conflict management skills may be deficits in an "average" student's conflict management skill repertoire.

Control Group Discussion

Only the school psychologist interacted with the control group. The morning following the experimental group's training session, the control group met in a classroom at the high school for two consecutive class periods. The first period began at 7:30 a.m. and the second period ended at 9:26 a.m. The total amount of discussion time was 2.00 hours which is equivalent to two group sessions.

After the introductions, the students were informed that the purpose of the group was to listen and suggest alternative ways of handling conflicts. Various conversations regarding conflict management occurred and continued for the remainder of the time allowed. The school psychologist acted as a facilitator to the group discussion.

Follow-Up

To assess response maintenance of the training effects across time, one follow-up session was arranged. The follow-up session involved evaluating behaviors using the classroom behavior rating cards. Follow-up was conducted 16 school days following training for the experimental group and 13 school days following discussions with the control group.
Procedure

The four measures of the dependent variable were (1) videotapes, (2) classroom behavior ratings, (3) Achenbach Teacher's Report Form (Achenbach & Edelbrock, 1986) and (4) school records. The delivery schedule of the battery of procedures was administered prior to, during, and following training as shown in Table 1. Each procedure will be examined individually.

Videotapes

Videotapes recorded present and any acquired level of conflict management skills. Before videotaping began, typewritten directions and information were given to each student to read concurrently with the experimenter. The directions and information were on four index cards. One card contained roleplay directions. The other three cards contained descriptive information regarding scenarios. After all three scenarios were videotaped, the cards were collected and returned to the experimenter.

Each target student was videotaped prior to and three school days following the training. Each student enacted three, sixty-second scenarios with a confederate student. Occasionally, the confederate student was previously a target student or preparing to be a target student. The target student practiced one of the three scenarios once to prevent any practice effects and to reduce nervousness. The video that was used as the practice scene was not saved. The
Table 1
Delivery Schedule for Procedures Across Training Conditions for the Experimental and Control Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-Training</th>
<th>During Training</th>
<th>Post-Training</th>
<th>Follow-up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experimental</strong></td>
<td>Data Collection (10 school days)</td>
<td>-5.5 hours of training</td>
<td>Data Collection (10 school days)</td>
<td>-Classroom Behavior Ratings Sixteen school days following training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group n=10</td>
<td>-Videotapes</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Videotapes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Achenbach Child Behavior Checklist Ratings</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Achenbach Child Behavior Checklist Ratings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Classroom Behavior Ratings</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Classroom Behavior Ratings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-School Records</td>
<td></td>
<td>-School Records</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control</strong></td>
<td>Data Collection (10 school days)</td>
<td>-2.0 hours of discussion</td>
<td>Data Collection (10 school days)</td>
<td>-Classroom Behavior Ratings Three school days following discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group n=10</td>
<td>-Videotapes</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Achenbach Child Behavior Checklist Ratings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Achenbach Child Behavior Checklist Ratings</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Classroom Behavior Ratings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Classroom Behavior Ratings</td>
<td></td>
<td>-School Records</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-School Records</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
target student roleplayed each scenario consecutively until all three scenarios were taped. The stimulus scenarios were similar to confrontations that often occurred in this high school setting.

The videotape scenarios were scored by two psychology teachers to determine the mastery of the skills. Scoring criteria were borrowed from Kolko et al. (1981) in their assessment of a social skill training program. Table 2 presents the scoring criteria for the videotaped roleplay scenarios.

Table 2

Videotape Scoring Criteria for the Five Behavior Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior Skill</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description of Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eye Contact</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Poor: eyes oriented toward face of prompter for less than 1/3 of student's total talk time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Marginal: eyes oriented toward face of prompter between 1/3 and 2/3 of student's total talk time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Good: eyes oriented toward face of prompter for more than 2/3 of student's total talk time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Latency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Stimulus-to-response interval less than 3 seconds or greater than 6 seconds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Stimulus-to-response interval between 3 and 6 seconds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facial Expression</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Negative: grimace, scowl, frown, raised eyebrows, or squinting eyes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facial Expression</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Positive: smirk, smile or grin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Skill</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Description of Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice Intonation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Loud: raises voice, shouts, or screams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Soft: mumbles to self, no response at all, or whispers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Moderate: normal, conversational loudness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Response</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Antagonistic: hostile, insulting statements, cursing, inappropriate requests, orders, and other remarks that set the occasion for further verbal attacks from the prompter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Irrelevant: comment or question which fails to address the verbal content of the prompt, or no response at all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Expressive: one or more of the following responses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(a) Acknowledgement: any statement that acknowledges the prompter's behavior or feelings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Request: any request, phrased as a question, for the prompter to change her behavior that does not imply harm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Description: any description of or statement about the prompter's behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(d) Explanation: any statement that states the reason for the prompter's behavior.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Behavior Rating Observations

The teachers recorded the occurrence of specific classroom behaviors of the students placed in the experimental and control groups on classroom behavior rating cards (see Appendix F for an example of a classroom behavior rating card). The student behaviors of interest were: argues, threats, talks out of turn, and disrupts the class. The four behaviors were extracted from the Aggressive subscale on the Achenbach Teacher's Report Form (Achenbach & Edelbrock, 1986). See Appendix G for examples of operational definitions of the four target behaviors.

Observations were made in the program's study hall classes. These classes maximized the opportunity to observe acting-out behaviors and included routine physical movement and/or verbal interaction.

The program was in effect on a daily basis first through fourth hours. A different study hall was held every hour or four times each day. Therefore, students had a study hall at different times of the morning. For example, Student 1 could have study hall second hour while Student 2 could have study hall fourth hour. Observations were conducted on Tuesdays and Thursdays before, during and following the training.

The measurement method was partial interval time sampling. The 50-minute class period was divided into two, 25-minute intervals. The teacher recorded any occurrence of the target behavior at the conclusion of each interval on a recording card.
Achenbach Teacher's Report Form

The Achenbach Teacher's Report Form (Achenbach & Edelbrock, 1986) is a standardized, 118-item checklist used to record aberrant behaviors in children and adolescents ages 4 through 16. Behavior subscales on each checklist are labeled: Depressed, Social Withdrawal, Somatic Complaints, Schizoid-Obsessive, Hyperactive, Sex Problems, Delinquent, Aggressive, and Cruel. The primary subscale of interest in the present study is the Aggressive subscale.

As shown in Appendix H, the Achenbach Teacher's Report Form was completed by a teacher in the program who knew the student. The teacher completed the checklist before the training and seven school days following the training.

The Achenbach Teacher's Report Form authors reported a median Pearson correlation test-retest reliability for the Aggressive subscale for special education girls age 12-16 of .89. These correlations were significant by the t test at p<.05.

The checklist yields a computer printed profile that presents a visual representation of the subscales and its relationship to the other subscales.

Student Records

Any disciplinary referrals that the student received were recorded. Receiving a disciplinary referral is a routine method of altering and providing consequences to inappropriate student behavior. In the present study, a staff person, teacher or administrator
who was directly involved in witnessing a disruptive act could write a referral. In such cases, the student was required to review the referral with an assistant principal who then had the authority to deliver appropriate punishment.

The categories that would define the referral as a "conflict" referral were: class disruption, fighting, inappropriate behavior, rude, discourteous, insubordination, disobedient and "other." When "other" was checked, the exact behavior was investigated. The number of "conflict" referrals written for each student was monitored and recorded before, during, and after training.

Rating Procedure

A mock video and rating session were created for evaluation training. The mock video did not involve any students who served as subjects in the study. First, a practice video was made to present the skills necessary to rate the videos. Second, the practice video was made to illustrate the procedures for scoring the target behaviors. The scoring was done on data sheets to determine if the behavior occurred according to the definitions and criterion. Observers were trained to a minimum of 80% agreement (i.e., with an independent observer) criterion for each behavior.

For each student, three scenarios were videotaped preceding the training and the same three scenarios were videotaped following the training. From the three scenarios, one scenario was identified and used as a representative sample of that target student's conflict management skill level. The sample was selected based on the subjec-
tive opinion of the researcher. The camera angle and whether the target student did the majority of the talking were the criteria used to select a sample.

The raters saw a student's pre- and post-videotape five times. The first time, the raters viewed the video in entirety without scoring any behaviors. Each additional time, the raters focused on and scored one of the four behaviors: response latency, eye contact, facial expressions, voice loudness, and finally verbal responses. Each student's post-video was viewed in the same process. The raters continued to view each student's videotape until all sets for all students were viewed.

**Interrater Agreement for Videotaped Behaviors**

Interrater agreement for the videotaped behaviors was calculated for each behavior as well as an overall agreement. Agreement for each behavior was calculated by dividing the total number of agreements on which the two observers agreed on the occurrence of the behavior by the sum of the agreements plus disagreements and multiplied by 100 to yield a percentage. The overall interrater reliability was calculated by taking the average of the total agreements and multiplying by 100 to yield a percentage.

**Reliability of Classroom Observations**

Reliability checks were conducted on the classroom behaviors using the behavior rating cards. The checks were conducted on 8% of
the classes in the following manner. There were 9 days to gather data. There were 36 opportunities (4 classes each day for 9 days equals 36 opportunities) to gather data. Reliability checks were conducted in three classes/three opportunities. The three data-gathering opportunities were divided by 36 total opportunities to equal 8 and multiplied by 100 to yield a percentage.

The checks were done by the experimenter or a trained student assistant. The student assistant was given essential information on recording the target behavior using the operational definition and how to record occurrences and nonoccurrences. The student assistant attended the same training session with the teachers.

Reliability for each observation was calculated by multiplying the total number of intervals possible on each rating card (8) by the number of students in that particular classroom. The number produced was considered the total number of scoring opportunities. The number of agreements was then divided by the total number of scoring opportunities and multiplied by 100.
CHAPTER III

RESULTS

An overall analysis of the data generated from the present experiment showed that the videotaping recorded and documented a functional relationship between the conflict management training and the five target behaviors. The behavior rating cards reflected only the behavior, invitation to ARGUE, as showing a statistically significant decrease across time for the experimental group. The Achenbach Teacher's Report Form (Achenbach & Edelbrock, 1986) reflected a significant decrease in the pre- and post-assessment on the aggressive subscale for experimental group and a significant difference between the experimental and the control group. The overall number of referrals per student decreased across time for the experimental group. Reliability data for nonoccurrences of behavior was 100% as measured by the behavior rating cards.

Videotaped Performance

Videotapes were used to record the pre- and post-training behaviors of the 10 students in the experimental group. The control group was not videotaped. The five behavioral categories measured were (1) response latency, (2) eye contact, (3) facial expression, (4) voice loudness, and (5) verbal response. Two trained raters evaluated the five behaviors of each student.

Figures 1 through 10 show the performance level of individual
students on each of the five behavioral categories. Some data for Students 2, 3, and 4 are missing. Consequently, the data of these three students were graphed for either pre- or post-training behaviors. Complete data for the remaining seven students (1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10) are presented.

For the behavior category of response latency (rl), Students 1, 5, 7, 8, 9, and 10 demonstrated 100% acquisition of the behavior prior to the training and thus showed no increase in this skill area following training. Only Student 6 exhibited a decrease in percent performance of the targeted behavior from pre- to post-training.

For the behavior category of eye contact (ec), Students 1, 6, 8, and 10 demonstrated a 25% increase compared to pre-training scores. Students 7 and 9 demonstrated no gain in skills compared to pre-training scores. Percentage performance for Student 5 decreased 50%.

For the behavior category of facial expression (fe), all seven students demonstrated acquisition. Students 1, 5, 7, and 9 did not exhibit the behavior prior to training. Following training, Students 1, 5, and 9 exhibited a 50% increase and Student 7 exhibited a 25% increase.

For the behavior category of voice loudness (vl), Students 5, 6, 7, and 8 did not exhibit the behavior prior to training. Following training, Students 5, 7, and 8 demonstrated 100% acquisition while Student 6 demonstrated 75% acquisition. Students 9 and 10 exhibited 100% percentage performance prior in training.

For the behavior category of verbal response (vr), all students demonstrated acquisition following training. Students 1, 5, 6, 7,
Figure 1. Videotape Behavior Responses, Experimental Group, Subject 1.
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Figure 2. Videotape Behavior Responses, Experimental Group, Subject 2.

Capital M represents missing values

rl = response latency
ec = eye contact
fe = facial expressions
vl = voice loudness
vr = verbal response
Capital M represents missing values

Figure 3. Videotape Behavior Responses, Experimental Group, Subject 3.
Figure 4. Videotape Behavior Responses, Experimental Group, Subject 4.
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Figure 5. Videotape Behavior Responses, Experimental Group, Subject 5.
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Figure 6. Videotape Behavior Responses, Experimental Group, Subject 6.
Figure 7. Videotape Behavior Responses, Experimental Group, Subject 7.
Figure 8. Videotape Behavior Responses, Experimental Group, Subject 8.
Figure 9. Videotape Behavior Responses, Experimental Group, Subject 9.
Figure 10. Videotape Behavior Response, Experimental Group, Subject 10.

- rl = response latency
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- vl = voice loudness
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and 8 demonstrated 100% proficiency. Students 9 and 10 demonstrated 25% and 75% percentage performance accuracy, respectively.

Data were statistically analyzed using an Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) to evaluate the effect of the conflict management training on the five behavioral categories. Tables 3 and 4 display the pre- and post-mean difference analysis and the ANOVA summary across time for Rater "B." Table 3 shows the mean scores and standard deviation for Rater "B" for each behavior during each experimental phase. An overall analysis of the two conditions shows an increase from the pre-training mean to the post-training mean. The pre-training behavior mean of .828 increased to a post-training mean of 1.914, a difference of 1.086.

Rater "B" noted no change for Response Latency. A perfect mean score of 2 was earned during pre-training. Verbal Response was not seen at all during pre-training; however, the ratings of the behavior increased to a score of 2 during post-training.

Table 4 presents the ANOVA summary for the analysis of behaviors across time for Rater "B." The independent variable is time-of-therapy. This variable has two levels: pre-training and post-training. Type-of-behavior is the second independent variable. This variable has five levels: response latency, eye contact, facial expressions, voice loudness, and verbal response. Results of the analysis of variance led to the rejection of the hypothesis of differences due to time-of-therapy, $F(1,6)=236.31$; led to the rejection of the null hypothesis for the type-of-behavior, $F(4,24)=25.86$; and led to the rejection of the null for the interaction of time-of-therapy and
type-of-behavior, $F(4,24)=19.45$. Figure 11 depicts the pre- and post-training means for Rater "B."

### Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations of the Five Behaviors Across Time for Rater "B"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Pre-Training</th>
<th>Post-Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Latency</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye Contact</td>
<td>1.571</td>
<td>.535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facial Expression</td>
<td>.286</td>
<td>.488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice Loudness</td>
<td>.286</td>
<td>.756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Response</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>.828</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4

ANOVA Summary Table for Analysis of Behaviors Across Time for Rater "B"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>14.63</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.63</td>
<td>236.31*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>25.86*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>12.23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>19.45*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time X Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level

Tables 5 and 6 illustrate the pre- and post-mean analysis and the ANOVA summary across time for Rater "C." Table 5 shows the mean
scores and standard deviation for Rater "C" for each behavior during each experimental phase. An overall analysis of the two conditions shows an increase from the pre-training mean to the post-training mean. The pre-training behavior mean of .828 increased to a post-training mean of 1.542.

![Figure 11. Mean Pre- and Post-Training Scores for Rater B.](image)

Rater "C" noted the most amount of change for Verbal Response. A mean score of .143 was earned during pre-training and increased to a post-training mean of 1.714; a difference of 1.571. Rater "C"
noted the least amount of positive change for Eye Contact. A mean score of .857 was earned during pre-training and increased to a post-training mean of 1.143, a difference of .286.

Table 5
Means and Standard Deviations of the Five Behaviors Across Time for Rater "C"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Pre-Training Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Post-Training Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response Latency</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.857</td>
<td>.378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye Contact</td>
<td>.857</td>
<td>.378</td>
<td>1.143</td>
<td>.690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facial Expression</td>
<td>.286</td>
<td>.756</td>
<td>1.143</td>
<td>.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice Loudness</td>
<td>.857</td>
<td>1.069</td>
<td>1.857</td>
<td>.378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Response</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.378</td>
<td>1.714</td>
<td>.488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>.828</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.542</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6
ANOVA Summary Table for Analysis of Behavior Across Time for Rater "C"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>8.93</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.93</td>
<td>24.67*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>12.66</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>6.94*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time X Behavior</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>4.46*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level

Table 6 is the ANOVA summary for the analysis of behaviors across time for Rater "C." The independent variable is time-of-ther-
apy. This variable has two levels: pre-training and post-training. Type-of-behavior is the second independent variable. This variable has five levels: response latency, eye contact, facial expressions, voice loudness, and verbal response. The results of the analysis of variance led to the rejection of the hypotheses for time-of-therapy, $F(1,6)=24.67$; led to the rejection of the hypotheses for the type-of-behavior, $F(4,24)=6.94$; and led to the rejection of the interaction of time-of-therapy and type-of-behavior, $F(4,24)=4.46$. Figure 12 depicts the pre- and post-training means for Rater "C."

![Figure 12. Mean Pre- and Post-Training Scores for Rater C.](image-url)
Tables 7 and 8 illustrate the mean analysis and the ANOVA summary across pre-training for each rater. Table 7 shows the mean scores and standard deviation for Rater "B" and Rater "C" for each behavior during the pre-training experimental phase. An overall analysis of the two rater shows that Rater "B" scored more lenient than Rater "C". A difference of .50 was seen.

Table 8 is the ANOVA summary for the analysis of behaviors during pre-training for both raters. The independent variable is rater category. This variable has two levels: rater "B" and rater "C." Type of behavior is the second independent variable. This variable has five levels: response latency, eye contact, facial expressions, voice loudness, and verbal response. The results of the analysis of variance failed to lead to the rejection of the hypothesis of the rater-category, $F(1, 7) = .15$. The results led to the rejection of the hypotheses for the type-of-behavior, $F(4, 28) = 22.34$; and led to the rejection of the interaction of rater category and type of behavior, $F(4, 28) = 3.71$. Figure 13 depicts the pre-training mean scores for each behavior by rater.

**Table 7**

Pre-Training Means and Standard Deviations for Each Rater

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Pre-Training</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rater &quot;B&quot;</td>
<td>Rater &quot;C&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean  SD</td>
<td>Mean  SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Latency</td>
<td>2.000 .000</td>
<td>2.000 .000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye Contact</td>
<td>1.625 .518</td>
<td>.875 .354</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facial Expression</td>
<td>.375 .518</td>
<td>.250 .707</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Pre-Training</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rater &quot;B&quot;</td>
<td>Rater &quot;C&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice Loudness</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>.926</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.069</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Response</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.354</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>.900</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.850</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8

ANOVA Summary Table for Pre-training Analysis of Behaviors for Each Rater

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rater</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>38.38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.59</td>
<td>22.34*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rater X Behavior</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>3.71*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within Groups

*Significant at the .05 level

Tables 9 and 10 illustrate the mean analysis and the ANOVA summary across post-training for each rater. Table 9 shows the mean scores and standard deviation for Rater "B" and Rater "C" for each behavior during the post-training experimental phase. An overall analysis of the two raters shows that Rater "C" scored more lenient than Rater "B." A difference of .178 was seen.

Table 10 is the ANOVA summary for the analysis of behaviors during post-training for both raters. The independent variable is rater category. This variable has two levels: rater "B" and rater
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"C." Type of behavior is the second independent variable. This variable has five levels: response latency, eye contact, facial expressions, voice loudness, and verbal response. The results of the analysis of variance failed to lead to the rejection of the hypothesis of the rater-category, $F(1,8)=2.72$. The results led to the rejection of the hypotheses for the type-of-behavior, $F(4,32)=7.44$.

Figure 13. Mean Pre-Training Scores for Each Behavior by Rater.

The results failed to lead to the rejection of the hypothesis of
interaction effect of rater-category and type-of-behavior, \( F(4,28) = 3.71 \). Figure 14 depicts the post-training mean scores for each behavior by rater.

**Table 9**

Post-Training Means and Standard Deviations for Each Rater

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Rater &quot;B&quot;</th>
<th>Rater &quot;C&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Latency</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye Contact</td>
<td>1.667</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facial Expression</td>
<td>1.222</td>
<td>.441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice Loudness</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Response</td>
<td>1.667</td>
<td>.707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>1.711</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 10**

ANOVA Summary Table for Post-Training Analysis of Behaviors for Each Rater

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rater</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>7.71</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>7.44*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rater X Behavior</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level
The overall agreement between raters was 63.5%. The inter-rater agreement for the pre-training evaluation was 66.8%. During pre-training, the agreement between raters ranged from 38% for Eye Contact to 100% for Response Latency. The inter-rater agreement for the post-training evaluation was 57.8%. During post-training, the agreement between raters ranged from 22% for Eye Contact to 89% for Response Latency. The raters obtained the highest percentage of agreement on the behavior, response latency, 94% and obtained the lowest percentage agreement on the behavior, eye contact, 30%. Other categories for agreement were: facial expression, 53.5%; voice loudness, 76.5%; and verbal response, 72%.

Figure 14. Mean Post-Training Scores for Each Behavior by Rater.
Classroom Behavior Rating

Teachers recorded the occurrences of behaviors of students assigned to the experimental and to the control groups prior to and following the training. The class hour was divided into two, 25-minute segments for observation recordings. A partial interval time sampling procedure was employed.

Figures 15 through 24 show the behavior of individual students in the experimental group. Figures 25 through 34 show the behavior of individual students in the control group. The following behaviors were observed: invitation to ARGUE, delivering a THREAT, TALKS out of turn, and DISRUPTS the class. Only the behavior, invitation to ARGUE, showed a statistically significant decrease from pre- to post-training in the experimental group.

Six of the 10 students in the experimental group showed a decrease in the number of occurrences of the behavior, ARGUE. Students 1, 3, 4, 5, 8, and 10 showed a decrease in the number of occurrences by 75%, 80%, 100%, 50%, 100% and 33.3%, respectively. The number of occurrences for Students 6 and 9 remained the same. The number of occurrences of ARGUE increased for Students 2 and 7 from pre-training to post-training assessment.

One of the 10 students in the experimental group showed a decrease in the number of occurrences of the behavior, THREAT. Student numbered 10 decreased the number of occurrences by 100%. The occurrences of THREAT remained the same for eight students and increased for one student.
Figure 15. Behavior Rating Categories, Experimental Group, Subject 1.
Figure 16. Behavior Rating Categories, Experimental Group, Subject 2.
Figure 17. Behavior Rating Categories, Experimental Group, Subject 3.
Figure 18. Behavior Rating Categories, Experimental Group, Subject 4.
Figures 13 to 16 show the mean percentage of responses in Percentiles (Pre-training, During Training, Post-training, and Follow-up) for four categories of behavior: Argues, Threats, Talks, and Disrupts. The data is from Rating 19, Behavior Rating Categories, Experimental Group, Subject 5.
Figure 20. Behavior Rating Categories, Experimental Group, Subject 6.
Figure 21. Behavior Rating Categories, Experimental Group, Subject 7.
Pre-training
During Training
Post-training

Figure 22. Behavior Rating Categories, Experimental Group, Subject 8.
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Figure 23. Behavior Rating Categories, Experimental Group, Subject 9.
Figure 24. Behavior Rating Categories, Experimental Group, Subject 10.
Figure 25. Behavior Rating Categories, Control Group, Subject 1.
Figure 26. Behavior Rating Categories, Control Group, Subject 2.
Figure 27. Behavior Rating Categories, Control Group, Subject 3.
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Figure 28. Behavior Rating Categories, Control Group, Subject 4.
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Figure 29. Behavior Rating Categories, Control Group, Subject 5.
Figure 30. Behavior Rating Categories, Control Group, Subject 6.
Figure 31. Behavior Rating Categories, Control Group, Subject 7.
Figure 32. Behavior Rating Categories, Control Group, Subject 8.
Figure 33. Behavior Rating Categories, Control Group, Subject 9.
Figure 34. Behavior Rating Categories, Control Group, Subject 10.
Six of the 10 students in the experimental group showed a decrease in the number of occurrences of the behavior, TALKS out of turn. Students 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, and 10 showed a decrease in the number of occurrences by 50%, 100%, 66.6%, 1.16%, 100%, and 33.3%, respectively. The occurrences of TALKS remained the same for two students and increased for two students.

Six of the 10 students in the experimental group showed a decrease in the number of occurrences for the behavior, DISRUPTS the class. Students 1, 3, 5, 6, 9, and 10 showed a decrease in the number of occurrences by 30%, 25%, 37.5%, 100%, 100%, and 66.6%, respectively. The occurrences for DISRUPTS remained the same for two students and increased for two students. Classroom data were statistically analyzed using a Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) to evaluate the effects of the conflict management training on the four classroom behaviors: invitation to ARGUE, delivering a THREAT, TALKS out of turn, and DISRUPTS the class. The analysis examined whether there was a difference in the overall effect on the two treatment groups, experimental and control; the two time periods, pre- and post-training; and treatment groups by time periods.

The overall results of the analysis of variance led to the failure of the rejection of the hypothesis for groups, time, and groups by time. Individual analysis of each behavioral category showed that ARGUE was the only behavior that showed a statistical significance across time for the experimental group.

For ARGUE, there was no significant statistical difference between the experimental and control group behavior, $F(1,15) = .63$. 
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The data led to the rejection of the hypothesis of the pre- and post-training time periods for the experimental group, \( F(1,15)=4.73 \).
The data led to the rejection of the hypothesis of an interaction effect between group and time, \( F(1,15)=6.22 \).

Prior to training, the experimental group mean (\( \bar{X} = 2.2187 \)) exceeded the control group mean (\( \bar{X} = 2.000 \)). In the experimental group, the means of the behaviors ARGUE (\( \bar{X} = 2.635 \)) and DISRUPTS the class (\( \bar{X} = 3.000 \)) were higher than the control group. Conversely, in the control group, the means of the behaviors delivering a THREAT (\( \bar{X} = .889 \)) and TALKS out of turn (\( \bar{X} = 3.111 \)) were higher than the experimental group.

Following training, the control group mean (\( \bar{X} = 2.222 \)) was higher than the experimental group mean (\( \bar{X} = 1.406 \)). The individual means for all four behaviors were higher for the control group than for the experimental group.

Prior to training, the experimental group mean of 2.2187 decreased to 1.406 following training. Comparison of the pre- and post-training behaviors for the experimental group showed that the mean for invitation to ARGUE decreased from 2.625 to 1.000; the mean for delivering a THREAT made no change from .500; the mean for TALKS out of turn decreased from 2.750 to 1.750; and the mean for DISRUPTS the class decreased from 3.000 to 2.375. The control group mean of 2.000 prior to training increased to 2.222 following training.
The Achenbach Teacher's Report Form (Achenbach & Edelbrock, 1986) is a standardized assessment tool designed to evaluate the degree of aberrant behaviors in children and adolescents. For the present purposes, only the aggressive subscale was used to evaluate behavior of adolescents. A mean score of 50-69 indicates that the student's behavior is within the average range. A score of 70 or above indicates that the student's behavior is clinically significant.

As can be seen in Table 11, Student 5 of the experimental group was the only student who obtained a pre-test score within the clinically significant range. The score was 72. Post-test analysis showed that the score of Student 5 decreased from 72 to 69, which placed the score within the average range. Post-test data showed that seven scores of students decreased, three scores remained the same, and no scores increased. The greatest amount of decrease was evidenced by Student 1. The score of Student 1 decreased 5 points.

Table 11
Achenbach Child Behavior Checklist
Teacher Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-</td>
<td>Post-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-</td>
<td>Post-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \bar{x} = 62.6 \quad \bar{x} = 60.3 \quad \bar{x} = 62.8 \quad \bar{x} = 62.6 \]

In comparison to the control group, no scores were in the clinically significant range prior to the training. The post-assessment showed that four scores decreased, two scores remained the same, and four scores increased.

The Achenbach data were statistically analyzed using an independent \( t \) test to compare means of the experimental and the control group, to compare the pre- and post-training means of the experimental group, and to compared the pre- and post-training means of the control group. The results of the \( t \) test led to the rejection of the hypothesis between the experimental and the control groups \( t(19) = 2.88 \). The results led to the rejection of the hypothesis of the pre- and post-training scores of the experimental group, \( t(9) = 3.98 \). The results failed to reject the hypothesis of the pre- and post-training
scores of the control group, \( t(9) = .43 \).

As can be seen in Table 11, pre-training means for the experimental and control group were 62.6 and 62.8, respectively. Post-training means for the experimental and control group were 60.3 and 62.6, respectively. The mean of the experimental group decreased from 62.6 to 60.3 following training. The decrease of 2.3 points showed movement of the score closer to the test mean of 50. The mean of the control group decreased from 62.8 to 62.6 following training. The difference of .2 points moved the score closer to the test mean of 50.

School Records

One of the criteria used to receive conflict management training was that the school records showed that each student received at least two disciplinary referrals during the school year prior to training. All students in the experimental and the control group met the criterion. As can be seen from Table 12, Students 5 and 1 in the experimental group generated additional referrals by the conclusion of the training. Eight, or 80% of the students in the experimental groups did not generate additional referrals. Students 1, 8, and 10 in the control group generated additional referrals by the conclusion of the training. Seven, or 70% percent of the students in the control group did not generate additional disciplinary referrals.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Experimental Pre-</th>
<th>Experimental Post-</th>
<th>Control Pre-</th>
<th>Control Post-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

This study examined the effects of conflict management training on the performance of students as measured by (a) videotape recordings, (b) classroom behavior ratings, (c) a teacher's report form and (d) school records.

The overall results showed the following: The videotaping revealed a clear relationship between the training and skill acquisition. In the classroom, the behavior ratings showed a statistically significant decrease in the behavior, ARGUE. Scores on the aggression subscale of the Achenbach Teacher's Report Form (Achenbach & Edelbrock, 1986) showed a statistically significant difference between pre- and post-assessment for the experimental group and a statistically significant difference between the experimental and the control group. Lastly, the number of referrals decreased for the majority of students.

Videotape

The videotape portion of the present experiment supports previous research indicating that videotaping can be an effective tool for documenting a relationship between social skills training and target behaviors (McCullough, Huntsinger, & Nay, 1977; Ollendick & Hersen, 1979). Feindler and Ecton (1986) and McGinnis and Goldstein (1984) suggested the use of videotaping to evaluate terminal readi-
ness and as a method of self-evaluation. Statistically, there was a significant change between pre- and post-training assessment.

Student proficiency levels showed the most improvement from pre- to post-assessment on the behavior, verbal response. Students made the least amount of improvement on the behavior, voice loudness. The proficiency level for the behaviors, response latency and eye contact decreased from pre- to post-assessment.

There are several methodological flaws with the videotaping method. First, the control group was not videotaped. Thus the data collected on the control group could not be used for comparison to determine if the training led to behavior acquisition for the experimental group. Second, there was an empirical evaluation procedure conducted prior to training to ascertain the performance levels of the target behaviors. If such an evaluation had been conducted, it would have shown that none of the behaviors had the same pre-training proficiency level. For example, prior to training, all students exhibited the behavior, response latency at 100% proficiency while exhibiting verbal response at only 6% proficiency. Third, the role-play scenarios were not empirically selected for their relevance to individual subject's deficits or excesses. Rather, the scenarios were selected and based on similar provocation scenarios in the school setting. Fourth, the same script scenarios were used for pre-assessment as well as the post-assessment. Therefore, the time interval between the administration of the two measures could be a factor affecting validity. New scenarios could have provided an additional measure of generalization of the skills to situations not
encountered.

Achenbach Teacher's Report Form

Researchers such as Feindler and Ecton (1986) documented results to show that the Achenbach Teacher's Report Form (Achenbach & Edelbrock, 1986) is sensitive enough to be useful with adolescents and reflect the acquisition of the training techniques and skills specific to an intervention program. Kolko et al. (1981) reported their success using an adjustment scale, similar to the Achenbach. Like the Achenbach, the purpose of the scale was to measure staff perceptions of social skills in a naturalistic setting. Present statistical results support the research for relationship between conflict management training and exhibition of the student's acting-out behavior in the school setting as witnessed by classroom teachers.

Classroom teachers reported that the scores of seven of the ten students in the experimental group decreased. The decreased score indicates movement closer to the mean of the test. Following training, the score of one student decreased from the clinically significant range to the normal range.

Despite the high reliability values associated with the Achenbach, some assessment issues are mentioned. According to Feindler and Ecton (1986), an indirect method of assessment such as the Achenbach reduces the reliability and validity of the information obtained. Feindler and Ecton suspect that in similar situations, the
responses of the teachers may be influenced by that teacher's relationship with the student, especially in a setting associated with possible prior operating environmental contingencies. Thus teachers could subjectively evaluate performance.

Behavior Rating Card

A card for recording a student's behavior was developed to collect data by direct observation. A similar type of recording procedure was used by Feindler in 1979, when she successfully recorded the anger outbursts of an adolescent male in a residential classroom.

In the present experiment, only the behavior ARGUE statistically significantly decreased from pre-training to post-training for the experimental group. Ironically, during post-evaluation, it was observed that the control group mean was less than the experimental group mean indicating that the acting-out behaviors of the control group students decreased more than the acting-out behaviors of the experimental group. This small but discriminable change may be attributable to the subjects in the control group were aware they were participants in a study. Interestingly, during post-training assessment, the control group mean was greater than the experimental group mean. As hypothesized, the experimental group mean decreased from pre-assessment to post-assessment. Conversely, the control group mean increased from pre-assessment to post-assessment.

There are some methodological concerns with the behavior rating cards. First, the behaviors of interest were not empirically determined prior to training. The behaviors were chosen based on teacher
observations, suggestions, and samples from a behavior checklist. Second, it was speculated that the target behaviors would occur independently of each other. However, the behavior DISRUPTS was a category that proved to be dependent on other categories. For example, when a teacher marked "TALKS out of turn" they also marked "DISRUPTS the class." Third, teachers reported student reactivity as obtrusive and detrimental to the learning process during the gathering of reliability data and follow-up data. Consequently, the frequency of gathering reliability data was conducted less than planned. Similarly, follow-up data were gathered on only one occasion in one classroom. Sattler (1988) noted that a student's reactivity to the observer could present a possible threat to the validity of the reliability checks. Fourth, there was considerable inter-student variability as seen from the behavior rating cards. According to Feindler and Ecton (1986) this variability of behaviors may indicate a need for a comprehensive initial analysis of the adolescent's acting-out behavior.

Student Records

Counting disciplinary referrals of students was not considered a direct method of gathering data. However, Feindler and Ecton (1986) suggested that this method of gathering data was a valid measure by which to assess the proficiency of dependent variables. The results of this portion of the experiment showed that two students in the experimental group received disciplinary referrals following the
training. Two out of ten students, or 20% is considered a low number. It is speculated that this low number of additional referrals may be due to the effectiveness of the training or due to the fact that the referrals were viewed as a high response-cost contingency placed on the student's acting-out behavior.

Although acquisition of conflict management skills and a decrease of acting-out behavior have been demonstrated to be successful with adolescents, Feindler and Ecton (1986) caution that an effective treatment outcome is not assured. Applying this theory to the present research, it is speculated that the most critical reason for a less than effective program outcome in the present experiment may be lack of training time. Borrowing from staff development research, the 5.5 hours of training administered to the experimental group was considered "awareness" training (Elmquist, 1991; Sparks, 1990). That body of research maintains that a change in behavior cannot be expected with a few hours of instruction. Totten (1988) found that behavior change increases drastically with more allocated hours. Staff development research claims that behavior change can occur only once the skill has been presented, the subject has the opportunity to imitate the skill, the subject has an opportunity to witness the reinforcing properties of the skill and the subject has an opportunity to practice the skill.

Finally, certain reservations should be expressed concerning the generalizability of these findings. Clearly, the relationships that have been reported may only be applicable to female students. The absence of male students makes the research difficult to discover
generalizable relationships. Pilot-study data suggested that procedures to define alternative conflict management response choices for males may need to vary from traditional procedures. It appears that males may be more receptive to exceptionally strong peer influence tactics. Walker, Hops, and Greenwood (1981) contend that there are genuine sex-role differences attributed to differential training and behavioral expectations to which boys and girls experience in the socialization process.

Further, a portion of the results of the present experiment are evaluated on the basis of the average group performance. By using a group analysis, it is not known which students in the experimental group were affected by the training. Despite these limitations, a between-subject design provides additional research information.

Single-subject research designs represent important methodological tools in the study of applied behavior analysis. However, because the present research was conducted in a school setting with imposed restrictions, the present experiment utilized the between-groups research methodology. Kazdin (1982) wrote that a between-subject research design provided "alternative ways to gather information of applied interest" (p. 220). Kazdin continued to note the contributions that between-subject research can make to applied research. Between-subject designs (a) are useful when comparing two or more treatments, (b) provide information about the magnitude of change between groups that do not receive the training, (c) are useful with large scale applications, and (d) allow for the examination
of two or more variables simultaneously.

In summary, although this research suffers from methodological flaws, further research into the acquisition of conflict management skills in high school adolescents is very much warranted. These present findings illustrate that training time in a public school should not be compromised in hopes of expediting skill acquisition. However, it appears that minimal training from the two-hour discussion appeared to have some effect on the performance levels of students. Whether the effect was from the information or the knowledge of participation in a study is unclear. Classroom behavior for the students in the control group, at times, was "better" than students in the experimental group. Again, this difference may be attributed to the fact that the students in the control were aware their behavior was under investigation. These findings also support the concept of empirically evaluating pre-training behavioral levels. And finally, these findings suggest further investigation into discovering alternate conflict management choices for male subjects.
Appendix A

Approval Letter From the Human Subjects
Institutional Review Board
Date: August 23, 1990
To: Leslie Skinner-Hughes
From: Mary Anne Bunda, Chair
Re: HSIRB Project Number 90-07-20

We have received the revisions to your research protocol as requested in our August 1, 1990, memo and find these revisions to be satisfactory. Therefore, this letter will serve as confirmation that your research protocol, "Conflict Management: An Alternative Skill for At-Risk Students," has been approved, as revised, after full review by the HSIRB. The conditions and duration of this approval are specified in the Policies of Western Michigan University. You may now begin to implement the research as described in the approval application.

You must seek reapproval for any change in this design. You must also seek reapproval if the project extends beyond the termination date.

The Board wishes you success in the pursuit of your research goals.

xc: Drs. Howard Farris/William Redmon, Psychology

Approval Termination: August 23, 1991
Appendix B

Southfield High School Group Permission Form
Southfield High School Group Permission Form

Date: __________________________

I am aware that ____________________________________________ will be participating in a Personal Growth Group every __________________ during ___________ hour.

Discussions in this group may include topics such as substance abuse, interpersonal relationships, coping with the stresses of high school, adjusting to divorce, peer pressure, etc. Each group is facilitated by one or two trained adults.

I also understand that successful classroom performance is most important, and that if the parent, student or teacher believes that group participation is interfering with that goal, membership will be terminated.

Parent Signature ___________________ Student Signature ___________________

Teacher Signature ___________________ Facilitator Signature ___________________

TEACHER: Although the facilitator will take attendance and report absences to the attendance center—according to current policy, you MUST still include this student on your daily absence form.
Appendix C

Videotape Instructions
VIDEOTAPE INSTRUCTIONS

Following are the general instructions the student read concurrently with the experimenter before the taping:

"____, you are going to be video taped as part of your involvement in this training. ____ will serve as your partner. I would like for you to respond as naturally as possible. 'As naturally as possible' means you may act and/or verbally say anything you would ordinarily do or say as if this situation actually happened. You have only one restriction. You may not physically touch or strike ____.

"If this video is going to be effective, the role play has to be serious. It has to simulate a natural situation. Play only your role. For each scenario, ____ will speak first. You will then respond. Continue role playing this scenario until you are told to stop. Ask all questions before the role play, not during."

"Now carefully read along with me a description of each scenario."
Appendix D

Role-Play Scenarios
Scene 1 - Disruptive behavior in the classroom. During a class test, you have been observed talking to a student behind you. You are asking the student behind you for a pencil to use to take the test. The teacher suspects the two of you are cheating. The teacher accuses you in front of the entire class. Teacher: "---, you are talking while we are taking a test. That means you must be cheating!"

You say:

Scene 2 - Loyalty of a friend. Your best friend has suddenly taken a special interest in your boyfriend/girlfriend. Your boyfriend/girlfriend tells you that your best friend has been calling him/her every night. Best friend: "Your boyfriend/girlfriend sure is cute. I bet I could snatch him/her from you."

You say:

Scene 3 - Ownership of a purse. You and a friend are in the lunch room. You walk away to get a pop. When you return your purse/pouch is gone. Nobody knows what happened to it. The next day you notice your friend is carrying a purse/pouch much like the one you had. You suspect it is yours. You tell your friend your purse/pouch was stolen yesterday and since she/he didn't have one yesterday, you think the one she is carrying is yours.

Friend: "Don't come on me like that. This is my purse/pouch. F--k you, bitch."

You say:
Appendix E

Agenda of One-Day Training for the Experimental Group
OUTLINE OF AGENDA FOR EXPERIMENTAL GROUP TRAINING

Agenda

7:45 a.m. Leave Southfield High School
8:00 a.m. Arrive at Administration Building
8:15 – 8:30 a.m. Introductions - Ms. Leslie Hughes
     Purpose of Workshop
     Description of procedures used
     Modeling
     Roleplay
     Feedback
     What is our role?
     What is your role?
     Pre-test
8:30 – 10:00 a.m. Skillstreaming Presentation
     Ms. Evva Hepner, School Social Worker
     Skill Alternatives to Aggression
     #25 Negotiation
     #26 Using Self-control
     #28 Responding to Teasing
     #29 Avoiding Trouble with Others
10:00 – 10:15 a.m. Break
10:15 – 11:30 a.m. Crisis Prevention
     Mr. Mark Pajot, High School Security Supervisor
     Body Language
     Body Stance/Proximity
     Eye Contact
     Voice Control: tone, volume, cadence
11:30 – 12:15 p.m. Lunch
12:15 – 1:15 p.m. Slide Presentations
     Review of skills
1:15 – 1:30 p.m. Handouts/post-test
     Evaluations
1:30 p.m. Leave to return to Southfield High School
Appendix F

Behavior Rating Card
Behavior Recording Card

Student ________________________ Date ________________________
Teacher ________________________ Class ________________________

- The student is unaware that his/her behavior is being recorded.
- Only record a student's behavior on Tuesdays and Thursdays.
- The class period is divided in two 25 minute blocks. During each block of time, mark "+" on the space if the behavior occurred. If the behavior did not occur, mark "-" on the space.
  The longer space is for any comments you may have.
- More than one category can be marked per block.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>First Block</th>
<th>Second Block</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talks Out of Turn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disrupts Class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Return this card to Leslie Hughes, Crisis Intervention Psychologist in "B" House at the end of the day.
Appendix G

Operational Definitions of Target Behaviors
An operational definition of the behaviors along with examples follow

**Argue**

A three statement sequence of negative verbal provocations. Mark this category if you observe or hear a verbal fight or screaming match involving two or more students including the target student. Include any verbal provocations which occur in sequence, such as teases, ownership statements, refusals, denials, and other verbal responses with negative effect and meaning. Exclude threats, playful arguing and true debates.

Examples:
1. "You jerk. "Don't call me names." "I'll do what I want."
2. "Give me my s--t." "It's mine, so get out of my face." "Liar, you stole it out of my locker."

**Threat**

A verbal statement or physical gesture to hurt another person or destroy something belonging to another. Verbal statements must include a behavioral referent to aggressive responding, such as "I'm gonna kick your butt." Gestures may include fist swinging, raised stick, giving the finger, etc. Exclude playful, good-natured threats (I'll get my 90 year old grandma after you!) and threats that are unrealistic in terms of the behavioral
repertoire of a student (I'll crush your mother with my big toe"). Include any threat which the student may be able to carry out.

Examples:
1. "I'll let the air out of your tires."
2. "It's all over for you. You're dead."

**Talks out of turn**

A verbal noise or statement unsolicited by the teacher. Include any excessive guttural noises and coughing. Exclude comments made during an open class discussion that contribute to the discussion or responses from a student that is produced from eagerness to answer.

Examples:

1. "I know. The answer is ..."
2. Interrupting a conversation between the teacher and a student or another student and student. Disrupts classroom. Any physical act or verbal statement made by a student that interrupts or prevents the teacher from lecturing, completing an illustration, or continuing an instructional activity. The teacher's focus is diverted to the student in order to (a) control the student's behavior and/or (b) re-establish a learning environment. Include a report from another student regarding a student who is causing a disruption. Exclude a student entering the room quietly after the tardy bell.
Examples:

1. Student enters room at tardy bell, doesn't take his seat. Starts a conversation with one or more students and continues to talk after the teacher prompts the class to begin working. Student sits after the teacher instructs him or her to do so.

2. Student refuses to follow the teacher's instruction or request. Instead, the student engages in an argument. Teacher asks the student to leave the room.

3. Student is involved in a confrontation or argument with another student. Teacher intervenes.
Appendix H

Achenbach Teacher's Report Form
TEACHER'S REPORT FORM

For office use only

Your answers will be used to compare the pupil with other pupils whose teachers have completed similar forms. The information from this form will also be used for comparison with other information about this pupil. Please answer as well as you can, even if you lack full information. Scores on individual items will be combined to identify general patterns of behavior. Feel free to write additional comments beside each item and in the space provided on page 2.

PUPIL’S NAME

 Parents’ usual type of work, even if not working now. (Please be as specific as you can—for example, auto mechanic, high school teacher, homemaker, laborer, lathe operator, shoe salesman, army sergeant)

Fathers’ type of work:

Mo, _____ Date, _____ Yr

Mo. _____ Date, _____ Yr

MOTHERS’ USUAL TYPE OF WORK:

TOO DAYS DATE

PUPIL’S BIRTHDATE (if known)

THIS FORM FILLED OUT BY:

Teacher (name)

Counselor (name)

Other (specify)

name:

I. How long have you known this pupil? ________ months


III. How much time does he/she spend in your class per week?

IV. What kind of class is it? (Please be specific, e.g., regular 5th grade, 7th grade math, etc.)

V. Has he/she ever been referred for special class placement, services, or tutoring?

□ Don’t Know 0. □ No 1. □ Yes—what kind and when?

VI. Has he/she ever repeated a grade?

□ Don’t Know 0. □ No 1. □ Yes—grade and reason

VII. Current school performance—list academic subjects and check appropriate column:

Academic subject 1. Far below grade 2. Somewhat below grade 3. At grade level 4. Somewhat above grade 5. Far above grade

1. __________ __________ __________ __________

2. __________ __________ __________ __________

3. __________ __________ __________ __________

4. __________ __________ __________ __________

5. __________ __________ __________ __________

6. __________ __________ __________ __________
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VIII. Compared to typical pupils of the same age:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How hard is he/she working?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How appropriately is he/she behaving?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How much is he/she learning?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How happy is he/she?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IX. Most recent achievement test scores (if available):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of test</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Percentile or grade level obtained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X. IQ, readiness, or aptitude tests (if available):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of test</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>IQ or equivalent scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Does this pupil have any illness, physical disability, or mental handicap? □ No □ Yes—please describe

What concerns you most about this pupil?

Please describe the best things about this pupil:

Please feel free to write any comments about this pupil's work, behavior, or potential, using extra pages if necessary.
Below is a list of items that describe pupils. For each item that describes the pupil now or within the past 2 months, please circle the 2 if the item is very true or often true of the pupil. Circle the 1 if the item is somewhat or sometimes true of the pupil. If the item is not true of the pupil, circle the 0. Please answer all items as well as you can, even if some do not seem to apply to this pupil.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>0 = Not True (as far as you know)</th>
<th>1 = Somewhat or Sometimes True</th>
<th>2 = Very True or Often True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Acts too young for his/her age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Fears he/she might think or do something bad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Feels he/she has to be perfect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Vary True or Often True</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Behaves like opposite sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Defiant, talks back to staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Bragging, boasting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Can't get his/her mind off certain thoughts; obsessive (describe):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>-collar, restless, or hyperactive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Clings to adults or too dependent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Complains of loneliness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Confused or seems to be in a fog</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Cries a lot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Fidgets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Cruelty, bullying, or meanness to others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Daydreams or gets lost in his/her thoughts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Disobedient at school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Disturbs other pupils</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Doesn't get along with other pupils</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Destroys property belonging to others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Difficulty following directions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Disobedient at school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Disturbs other pupils</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Eats or drinks things that are not food—don't include sweets (describe):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Feels dizzy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Feels too guilty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Talks out of turn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Overtired</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Overconforms to rules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Overweight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Physical problems without known medical causes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Aches or pains</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Headaches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Nausea, feels sick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Problems with eyes (describe):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Other (describe):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Easily jealous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Can't concentrate, can't pay attention for long</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Hangs around with others who get in trouble</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Hears sounds or voices that aren't there (describe):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Impulsive or acts without thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Likes to be alone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Lying or cheating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Bites fingernails</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Nervous, high-strung, or tense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Nervous movements or twitching (describe):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>Overheight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>Physical problems without known medical causes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>Other (describe):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 = Not True (as far as you know)</td>
<td>1 = Somewhat or Sometimes True</td>
<td>2 = Very True or Often True</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 57. Physically attacks people</td>
<td>0 1 2 84. Strange behavior (describe):</td>
<td>0 1 2 85. Strange ideas (describe):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 58. Picks nose, skin, or other parts of body (describe):</td>
<td>0 1 2 86. Stubborn, sullen, or irritable</td>
<td>0 1 2 87. Sudden changes in mood or feelings 0 1 2 88. Sucks a lot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 59. Sleeps in class</td>
<td>0 1 2 89. Suspicious</td>
<td>0 1 2 90. Swearing or obscene language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 60. Apathetic or unmotivated</td>
<td>0 1 2 91. Talks about killing self</td>
<td>0 1 2 92. Underachieving, not working up to potential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 61. Poor school work</td>
<td>0 1 2 93. Talks too much</td>
<td>0 1 2 94. Teases a lot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 62. Poorly coordinated or clumsy</td>
<td>0 1 2 95. Temper tantrums or hot temper</td>
<td>0 1 2 96. Seems preoccupied with sex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 63. Prefers being with older children</td>
<td>0 1 2 97. Threatens people</td>
<td>0 1 2 98. Seeks people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 64. Prefers being with younger children</td>
<td>0 1 2 99. Too concerned with neatness or cleanliness</td>
<td>0 1 2 100. Fails to carry out assigned tasks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 65. Refuses to talk</td>
<td>0 1 2 101. Truancy or unexplained absence</td>
<td>0 1 2 102. Underactive, slow moving, or lacks energy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 66. Repeats certain acts over and over, compulsions (describe):</td>
<td>0 1 2 103. Unhappy, sad, or depressed</td>
<td>0 1 2 104. Unusually loud</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 67. Disrupts class discipline</td>
<td>0 1 2 105. Uses alcohol or drugs for nonmedical purposes (describe):</td>
<td>0 1 2 106. Overly anxious to please</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 68. Screams a lot</td>
<td>0 1 2 107. Dislikes school</td>
<td>0 1 2 108. Is afraid of making mistakes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 69. Secrecive, keeps things to self</td>
<td>0 1 2 109. Whining</td>
<td>0 1 2 110. Unclean personal appearance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 70. Sees things that aren't there (describe):</td>
<td>0 1 2 111. Withdrawn, doesn't get involved with others</td>
<td>0 1 2 112. Worrying</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 71. Self-conscious or easily embarrassed</td>
<td>0 1 2 113. Please write in any problems the pupil has that were not listed above:</td>
<td>0 1 2 114.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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