1900 Biscayne Boulevard
Miami FL 33132
(305) 576-5075
toll-free (800) 749-8838
fax (305) 576-3106

ADHERING TO PROGRAM FIDELITY:
RESEARCH-BASED EFFECTIVENESS
OF THE PEACE EDUCATION FOUNDATION MODEL

Catherine H. Diekmann
Revised and Updated by Chuck Bryant
© 1999–2011 Peace Education Foundation, Miami, Florida

As the number and variety of youth violence prevention programs steadily increase, so do the standards for choosing and implementing such programs. For example, Safe and Drug-Free Schools grant recipients must meet certain standards, known as the Principles of Effectiveness, for achieving measurable results. "Effective" programs are guided by research regarding best practices and based on evaluation that provides evidence the program prevents or reduces violence or disruptive behavior among youth.

This document answers frequently asked questions by explaining the theoretical foundation of the Peace Education Foundation (PEF) model and providing evidence that the PEF model meets the standards for effective programs.

Q: What is the Peace Education Foundation?

A: PEF is a non-profit educational organization established in 1980. The PEF's mission is to educate children and adults in the dynamics of conflict and to promote peacemaking skills in homes, schools and communities throughout the world. This mission is served by providing educational materials, and offering innovative training and that makes nonviolent conflict resolution not merely a passing interest or fad, but a lifestyle.

PEF offers grade-level specific classroom-tested curricula for Pre-K through grade 12 as well as training and implementation assistance. The general purpose of the PEF model is to teach social competency and conflict resolution skills and create a school environment based on trust, caring and respect. While each curriculum is presented in a developmentally appropriate format, PEF curricula as a whole have a unified scope and sequence of content and skills. Internationally, these curricula are being used in more than 20,000 schools.

Q: What research supports the PEF model?

A: The PEF model is based on a comprehensive body of research related to teaching social competency skills, reducing disruptive behavior and creating a positive learning environment. Significant research themes include:

Violence Prevention

PEF defines violence as intentional acts of aggression with the intention of causing pain or discomfort to others, either directly (from bullying and fighting to a disrespectful tone and name calling) or indirectly (as in theft or vandalism). This definition reflects the fact that violent behaviors such as these disrupt the learning environment and make schools unsafe places (LeBlanc, Lacey, & Mulder, 1998). This definition is also based on research regarding violent behaviors indicating that interpersonal peer violence is stable throughout development (Farrington, 1991; Olweus, 1984; Patterson, 1982). Indeed, children who have been found to display violent behaviors during elementary school are more likely to be involved in the juvenile justice system and to display violence later in life (Cairns, & Cairns, 1991; Eron, 1987; Farrington; Olweus, 1991). Thus, it is the responsibility of educators to be attuned to both the direct and indirect forms of violent behavior noted in elementary schools that later escalate into more severe violence in high schools (LeBlanc, Lacey, & Mulder, 1998)

Multicomponent Approach

The PEF model is not a single-component intervention but a lifestyle to be taught and practiced over time. Meta-analysis research has shown that multimodal, structured social skills training programs are the most successful approaches for positively affecting youth behavior and for reducing youth aggression and delinquency (Lipsey, 1992; Lipsey & Wilson, 1993)

Social Development

The PEF model is draws on the competency model of child social development (Hawkins, Catalano, Morrison, O'Donnel, Abbot and Day, 1992). This concept shifts the focus from what is "wrong" with youth to what can be done to facilitate their healthy development. A well-implemented PEF program promotes the protective factors deemed necessary to mitigate the effects of risk: caring and support, high expectations and opportunities for meaningful success (Bernard, 1991).

Resiliency

The content and process of the PEF model is based on research that proves resiliency can be fostered in youth. Resiliency is the ability to bounce back from life's inevitable stresses. Resilient individuals display the following attributes:

1. Social competence: empathy, caring, communication skills, etc.

1. Problem-solving: ability to think reflectively and flexibly to attempt alternate solutions to both cognitive and social problems.

1. Autonomy: having a sense of one's own identity, to act independently and exert some control over one's environment

1. Sense of Purpose and Future: healthy expectancies, goal directedness and persistence. (Bernard, 1991)

Teaching Methodology

PEF's teaching methodology draws on social learning theory: children learn through modeling, practice and reinforcement (Bandura, 1997). The teacher has a key role, facilitating the process by which students hone their social competency skills. This methodology includes five techniques:

1. Regularly model skills such as reflective listening, I-Statements and problem solving.

2. Teach skills by promoting basic understanding and recognition of the skills as well as providing an opportunity to practice the skills in low-stress situations.

3. Coach students by supporting their efforts to translate mental knowledge into practical application and providing feedback regarding their efforts.

4. Encourage students to use skills appropriately by providing brief prompts and reminders. Reinforce students' efforts through praise and recognition of intrinsic rewards.

5. Export students' skill proficiency by involving them in opportunities for meaningful participation such as service learning projects or mentoring less-experienced students.

Process Goals and Progress Feedback

Research shows that self-efficacy, achievement and long-term strategy use is instilled when students are given a process goal of learning a strategy and receive feedback in learning the strategy (Schunk & Swartz, 1993). As noted above, the PEF model incorporates process goals and progress feedback so that students can apply and internalize new skills.

Developmentally Appropriate Approach

Research indicates that age-appropriate programming helps promote the effectiveness of student instruction. (Arends, 1998; Burden & Byrd, 1999; Posner, 1995.) The PEF model provides a different social competency/conflict resolution curricula for each grade level from PreK through high school. While the scope and sequence of essential components are consistent throughout the entire collection, each curriculum features age-appropriate content and skills. In addition to ensuring that students master skills in a developmentally progressive manner, this approach also maintains long-term student interest and buy-in by offering new and relevant lessons each year of their education.

Multi-Lesson and Multi-Year Model

To promote long-term use of pro-social skills, violence prevention programs should begin at an early age and continue over the course of multiple years (Hawkins, Von Cleve & Catalano, 1991; Zigler, Taussing & Black, 1992; Tolan & Guerra, 1994). Toward this end, the *PeaceWorks* teacher's guides include these lesson counts:

Grade	
Pre-K	86 (brief lessons, in 16 "Focus" sections)
K	27 lessons
1	39 lessons
2	30 lessons
3	67 lessons
4	44 lessons
5	46 lessons
6	36 lessons
7	35 lessons
8	44 lessons
MLK	43 (*Fighting Fair: Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., for Kids*, grades 4-8)
Sr High	31 lessons

Best Practices for Teaching the Curricula

Generally, *PeaceWorks* lessons should be taught a *minimum* of 15-30 minutes per week, for at least 13 weeks, to achieve the outcome of improvement in social-emotional skills. At all ages, especially in the younger grades, successful implementation requires teachers to apply and reinforce the lessons' content in response to routine conflicts and other teachable moments. Merely teaching the lessons by a schedule will accomplish little long-term change if students do not learn how to apply the knowledge in everyday situations.

Grade	
Pre-K:	1-2 lessons per week, 10-15 minutes per session, daily reminders
Grades K–2:	1-2 lessons per week, 15-20 minutes per session, daily reminders_
Grades 3-5:	1-2 lessons per week, 20-30 minutes per session, daily reminders
Grades 6-12:	1-2 lessons per week, 30-45 minutes per session, daily reminders

School Climate

Many of the aspects that measure school climate, respect, a sense of community and continuous growth of social competency skills, are integral to the PEF model. By improving student social competency, behavioral disruptions to the learning environment diminish and thus school safety and climate improve (LeBlanc, Lacey, & Mulder, 1998).

Effective Schools and Student Achievement

In addition to promoting a positive school climate, a successfully implemented PEF model can have additional outcomes that include

    (1) Improvements in order and discipline,
    (2) Development of a caring community, and
    (3) Opportunities for students to develop self-responsibility (Grossman et al., 1997; LeBlanc, Lacey, & Mulder, 1998; LeBlanc, 1996; Speirs, 1994).

These same three findings correlate with the findings from the research on effective schools. Not only do these outcomes help create more effective schools, but they also have positive effects on student learning (Arends, 1998; Joyce, Hersh, & Hartoonian, 1993).

Q: What content and skills are essential to the PEF model and why?

A: The PEF model encompasses a broad range of social competency concepts and skills grouped into six essential components. When operational, these concepts and skills correlate to many of the life skills identified as crucial to young people's academic success and social development. (Kendall & Marzano, 1994) The essential components of the PEF model include:

1. Community Building
The attitudes and skills involved in community building (i.e., establishing trust, exploring common interests and respecting differences) help promote a positive school climate. A school's climate affects the behavior and achievement of its students. We emphasize these three characteristics of a healthy school climate:

(1) Maximized learning time — more of the school day and class period devoted to active learning activities,
(2) Order and discipline — where rules are established by mutual agreement and are consistently and fairly enforced, and
(3) A sense of community — build feelings which contribute to reduced alienation and increased performance of students and staff alike.
(Patterson, Purkey, & Parker, 1986)

2. Developmentally Appropriate Rules

These Rules clearly define appropriate behavior: the *I Care Rules* from PreK to grade three, *Peace Scholar Rules* in grade four, *Peace Rules* (or *Rules for Fighting Fair*) from grades five through twelve and for family workshops. Each set helps foster a proactive discipline plan in which the teacher models respect, tolerance and positive social skills, rather than relying on punitive programs which seek mainly to gain student compliance to externally imposed behavior expectations rather than to teach responsible, need fulfilling behaviors (Crawford & Bodine, 1993).

3. Understanding Conflict

This component includes defining analyzing and de-escalating conflict. Understanding conflict matters because everyone has conflicts; it is a normal and sometimes necessary part of life. Young people need to learn that they may not get exactly what they want when resolving a conflict but they can disagree without fighting. Being able to handle conflict without aggression is key to preserving personal safety (Slaby, Wilson-Brewer, & Dash, 1994).

4. Perception and Diversity

This component included understanding different points of view, expressing empathy and appreciating diversity. How young people see the world depends on where they "sit." People tend to see what they want to see. They tend to pick out and focus on those facts that confirm their prior perceptions and to disregard or misinterpret those that call their perception into question. Young people must learn that understanding the "other side's" thinking works to serve their interests as well and helps to solve problems (Fisher & Ury, 1991).

5. Anger Management

In addition to teaching students to cope with emotions such as sadness, fear and stress, this component sensitizes students to their anger cues, triggers and style. The goal is to learn responsible ways for managing anger and other emotions. Anger often precipitates violence and is detrimental to the classroom climate and student achievement because students who are concerned about their safety and security will be unable to focus on learning. (Wilde, 1995)

6. Effective Communication

Skills such as reflective listening, I-Statements and non-inflammatory ways of expressing one's needs and emotions are fundamental interpersonal competencies. When individuals cannot or do not communicate effectively, the loss is both to them personally and to the larger group to which they belong. (Katz & Lawyer, 1985)

Additional, more sophisticated concepts and skills in the PEF essential components include:

— Bully/victim/bystander issues
— Affirming self and identity
— Maintaining healthy relationships
— Peer refusal skills
— Self-empowerment
— Dealing with bullies
— Impulse control

— Goal setting
— Acting with courage and conviction
— Understanding violence

Q: Does the PEF model include a peer mediation program?

A: Yes. The peer mediation process begins as a part of the Understanding Conflict component. However, formal mediation training should occur only after students learn and use the basic social competency skills needed to solve their own conflicts. This helps promote self-reliance and accountability. Should a particular conflict prove too difficult for two disputants to resolve on their own, they can use mediation, a structured process facilitated by a neutral third party. While mediation is a beneficial enhancement to the PEF model, mediation alone will not change a school's climate or the overall social competency of the student body.

Q: How does the PEF model address concerns about parent involvement?

A: Research confirms that when adults, particularly parents, reinforce negative, aggressive behavior or fail to model and reinforce pro-social behavior, young people may continue to follow these "scripts" when they interact with others at school or in the community (Patterson, 1982). Thus, parent involvement in and support for a school-based violence prevention program is critical to its success. The PEF model provides both materials and training to address this need. *Time Out! for Families* (previously known as *Fighting Fair for Families*) provides an easy-to-read, engaging text that teaches parents communication skills, anger management techniques and basic meditation skills they can use at home. The *Time Out!* Trainer's Implementation Manual contains everything a trainer needs to successfully implement a parent conflict resolution workshop. A variety of scripted presentations, step-by-step instructions, useful forms and even advertising suggestions are included to simplify implementation.

Q: To what extent must the PEF model be implemented to obtain effective results?

A: Three basic categories depict the levels to which the PEF model may be institutionalized school-wide. We characterize them as:

• Beginning: most staff have basic information regarding the PEF model, some have been trained in the model, few actually practice or teach the requisite attitudes, concepts and skills

• Moderate: most staff have been trained in the PEF model, some practice and teach the requisite attitudes, concepts and skills, mediation training has begun, parent training has begun

• Extensive: all staff have been trained in the PEF model, most teachers practice and teach requisite attitudes, concepts and skills, the peer mediation program is active, the parent program is active, student competency in skill is exported (e.g., service learning projects etc.)

The PEF model is most effective when implemented extensively and according to the implementation guide provided below. In this case, meaningful improvements in the school climate and student performance are most likely. Comprehensive implementation of the PEF model takes commitment, planning and consistent follow-through. This process is best facilitated with PEF training and technical assistance but the actual implementation responsibility lies with individual school stakeholders. (e.g., administrators, teachers, non-instructional staff, students, parents and juvenile justice officers, etc.)

Q: What implementation steps are necessary to make the PEF model fully operational and obtain reliable, replicable results?

A. We recommend this basic implementation guide.

Phase One: Develop an advisory committee to oversee implementation
      1. Identify representatives of all stakeholder groups (district-level administration, school administration, teachers, support staff, students, parents, law enforcement, juvenile justice etc.)

Phase Two: Assess needs and resources relative to implementation
      1. Assess the school community for shared values that stakeholders believe would promote a positive climate and improve student achievement (e.g., everyone feels respected, conflict is resolved nonviolently, etc.)
      2. Compare the current state to the desired state (e.g., use climate surveys, focus groups, etc. to determine needs)
      3. Assess existing resources (grants, programs, curriculum initiatives, staff, technology) that could aid the PEF model implementation

Phase Three: Develop an implementation plan based on assessment
      1. Set measurable goals and objectives relative to the needs assessment
      2. Determine PEF materials, training and technical support needed
      3. Create an initial time line
      4. Develop a monitoring/evaluation protocol
      5. Collect base-line data (referrals, suspensions, attitude surveys, etc.)
      6. Prepare an initial budget (materials, training, stipends, substitute time, incentives, supplies, refreshments, advertisements, etc.)

Phase Four: Obtain buy-in for the proposed plan
      1. Present proposed plan to all stakeholder groups
      2. Educate all stakeholder groups about potential benefits of the plan
      3. Elicit feedback from all stakeholder groups
      4. Integrate stakeholder groups' feedback into the existing plan
      5. Obtain stakeholders' final approval for the revised plan

Phase Five: Secure funding
      1. Coordinate with existing programs promoting similar goals
      2. Seek collaboration for new funding initiatives
      3. Research prospective funding sources
      4. Prepare for meeting with prospective funding sources
      5. Approach prospective funding sources

Phase Six: Begin initial implementation
      1. Determine implementation team member responsibilities (materials purchase, training assistance, etc.)
      2. Provide professional development training to familiarize teachers with essential components of the PEF model
      3. Purchase and distribute grade-level appropriate PEF curricula for all teachers involved in student instruction
      4. Provide time for teachers to review materials, practice basic skills and discuss concerns prior to beginning student instruction
      5. Create a realistic, comprehensive student instruction schedule that reflects stated goals and objectives (e.g. all students will learn all skills etc.)
      6. Provide on-going collegial coaching and technical assistance for teachers
      7. Provide support staff training, monitoring, evaluation, etc.

Phase Seven: Enhance implementation

1. Determine successes and challenges via informal teacher monitoring and self-reporting
2. Provide special topic follow-up training for teachers (e.g., effective lessons, de-escalation techniques, student skill coaching techniques)
3. Provide parent training
4. Schedule teacher sharing sessions
5. Continue student instruction
6. Visit other sites that have also implemented the PEF model
7. Begin peer mediation training (if school has reached moderate implementation level)
8. Initiate opportunities for students to export their skill competency (e.g., mentor younger students, co-teach with adults, service learning projects)
9. Implement PEF model enhancements (e.g., peace day, student mentoring, random acts of kindness week, etc.)

Phase Eight: Monitor and evaluate implementation process and outcome
1. Gauge the school's implementation level as either beginning, moderate, or extensive; evaluation results will reflect this level.
2. Implement evaluation protocol
3. Report findings to all stakeholders
4. Plan for additional training and support as per existing implementation level and evaluation results

We recommend allowing least a full school year to get this process under way. For more lasting results, expect to develop the program fully over two to three years.

Q: What evaluation evidence exists to prove the PEF model is effective and replicable?

A: A variety of independent evaluations in different school sites have proven the PEF model to be effective. Each study's target group, procedures, results and publication status is detailed below. A final page presents a table summarizing relevant aspects of these and other reports according to Safe and Drug Free Schools criteria.

A Review of Selected School-Based Conflict Resolution and Peer Mediation Projects

Target Group: One Miami area elementary school. Three classes (one class each from grades four, five and six) were selected as the experimental group. Three control classrooms, one from each of grade four, five and six, were chosen randomly from the remaining classrooms. Assignment of the children to classrooms was random. Eighty-three students were in the experimental group, and 88 were in the control group.

Procedures: Teachers in the experimental group were trained in the PEF model. Those teachers then introduced students to the PEF during a seven-week implementation period. PEF concepts and skills were infused into existing language arts and social studies curricula through almost daily 30-minute sessions. Students were also encouraged to solve interpersonal conflicts using knowledge and skills obtained through the sessions.

The experimental effect was measured through pre- and post-test teacher-administered surveys of student attitudes and knowledge and through written, weighted incidence data by school staff regarding aggressive behaviors.

Results: Pre- and post-test survey scores improved for the treatment group. Mean scores for the control group changed little. The sum of weighted behavior incidence data in the experimental group decreased from 82 to 1. A decrease also occurred in the control group, from 103 to 85. The reduction in the control group may have occurred because the experimental group influenced them outside of class time.

Results suggest the PEF model improved students' conflict resolution behavior and support the hypothesis that this model is useful and beneficial in the classroom setting.

Publication: This study was published in a peer-reviewed journal. (Powell, Muir-McClain, & Halasyamani, 1995)

Discipline Data Analysis Report for Olympic Heights High School

Target Group: The student population of a high school in the Palm Beach County (FL) School District.

Procedures: Olympic Heights High School teachers implemented the PEF model beginning in Fiscal Year (FY) 1996. In this first year, all teachers were trained in the PEF model. Teacher from each academic department were instructed to teach specified lessons within a particular component of the PEF model. (e.g., Social Studies teachers taught the Understanding Conflict component; Language Arts teachers taught the Effective Communication component, etc.) This way all students received the same lessons of all six components. During FY97 and FY98, all teachers taught all components at a specified period. This way, all students received the same lessons in a similar sequence from the same teacher.

One of the expected outcomes for a successfully implemented model is a marked reduction in the number of discipline incidents. To determine if Olympic Heights High School had any measurable improvement in their discipline data, End-of-Year Incident Summaries, End-of-Year Action Summaries, and two areas of the School Environment Safety Incident Reports Summary Data for FY96, 97 and 98 were all obtained. Discipline data was generated and analyzed from four other area high schools to measure trends as compared to Olympic Heights.

Results: Olympic Heights High School had a significant reduction in fights each year from FY96 to FY98. Trend analysis comparison with the four other area high schools indicates Olympic Heights demonstrated the only downward trend in fights during all three years studied.

Another area reviewed on the School Environment Safety Incident Report was the district-defined events (essentially the total number of discipline events at the school that were not considered serious, state-reportable events). Olympic Heights was the only high school in the area to show a decrease in the number of events from FY97 to FY98.

The Incident Summary report for Olympic Heights High School for FY96 through FY98 revealed marked decrease in all categories of student discipline referrals, including the "3 D's" on the student discipline referral form, disobedience, disruptive and disrespectful language. The other four schools in this study all had increases each year for each of the "3 D" categories.

Finally, the number of duplicated suspensions out of school decreased dramatically from FY97 to FY98. Though there were no particular trends in suspensions with the other high schools reviewed, Olympic Heights was the only school that had a significant decrease in both duplicated and unduplicated out of schools suspensions. Additionally, Olympic Heights was the only area high school with a three- year downward trend in percentage of students suspended.

Publication: Safe Schools Center, Palm Beach County School District, 1998.

A Conflict Resolution/Student Mediation Program: Effects on Student Attitudes and Behavior

Target Group: Thirty-seven elementary and middle schools in Miami-Dade County (FL) School District Region II.

Procedures: This school district chose to create their own variation of the PEF model by implementing in two phases. The first phase (school year 1991-1992) involved training one administrator and one counselor or teacher at each school in student mediation and the subsequent training of a cadre of students to facilitate student mediation. The second phase involved the training of two teachers at each school in conflict resolution to teach conflict resolution to the student body. Several schools had all their teachers trained in conflict resolution skills. One school chose not to implement student mediation in order to focus on conflict resolution.

Data regarding student mediation were collected from Mediator Report Forms completed for each incident throughout the school year. Changes in student behavior were assessed using the records of referral incidents for misbehavior maintained in the schools district's Student Case Management System (SCMS). A pre- and post-test survey was administered to six classes in a Region II elementary school to assess the attitudes of students who received training in conflict resolution. The same survey was administered to students in six classes in the same school and students in six classes in another school, none of whom had received training in conflict resolution. The classes were matched for grade level and racial/ethnic makeup.

Results: The elementary schools that had the highest levels of implementation of student mediation from 1991-92 to 1992-1993 saw a significant reduction in the rate of incidents. The decline could be attributed to an improvement in behavior at the schools. Survey results indicated that conflict resolution training changed student attitudes toward resolving conflicts positively. Trained students were more willing to respond to conflict with compromise rather than threats and violence.

Publication: This study was published in a peer-reviewed journal. (Hanson, 1994)

Fighting Fair for Families Follow-up Survey

Target Group: 163 parents who had participated in a PEF model parent workshop then entitled *Fighting Fair for Families* (since revised and published as *Time Out! Resolving Family Conflicts*) sponsored by the Safe Schools Center of the Palm Beach County (FL) School District.

Procedures: Upon completion of a workshop, parents completed an initial survey consisting of seven questions. Parents were asked to signify their willingness to provide follow-up data by supplying the Safe Schools Center with a telephone number and first name, thus allowing telephone contact to be made roughly two months after conclusion of the workshop. The follow-up survey consisted of the original seven questions plus an additional ten items. Between March and July 1995, 358 contacts were made yielding 163 completed responses.

Results: Seventy-nine percent of respondents reported improvement with the way conflicts are handled in their home. Seventy-six percent reported improvement in the way feelings are treated in their home. Seventy percent reported improvement in the way people listen to each other in their home. Fifty-six percent of respondents stated that, to some extent, the workshop affected the way their family talks to each other and resolves. Thirty-four percent of respondents stated the workshop affected their family's communication and conflict resolution style a lot.

Publication: Safe Schools Center, Palm Beach County School District, 1995.

Q: How can additional information regarding the PEF model, training and evaluation be obtained?

A: Contact the Peace Education Foundation at (800) 749-8838 or info@peace-ed.org.

References

Arends, R. I. (1998). *Learning to teach* (4th ed.) Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.

Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Barnett, R. V., Adler, A., Easton, J., & Howard, K. P. (2001). An evaluation of the Peace Education Foundation's conflict resolution and peer mediation program. *School Business Affairs*, July, 29-39.

Bernard, B. (1991). *Fostering resiliency in kids: Protective factors in the family, school and community.* Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.

Burden, P. R., & Byrd, D. M. (1999). *Methods for effective teaching* (2nd ed.) Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Cairns, R. B., & Cairns, B. D. (1991). Social cognition and social networks: A developmental perspective. In D. H. Pepler & K. H. Rubin (Eds.). *The development and treatment of childhood aggression* (pp. 249- 278). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Crawford, D. & Bodine, R. (1993). The school for quality learning. Champaign, IL: Research Press, Inc.

Eron, L. D. (1987). Aggression through the ages. In *School safety: Special issue on bullies* (pp. 12-17). Malibu, CA: Pepperdine University, National School Safety Center.

Farrington, D. P. (1991). Childhood aggression and adult violence: Early precursors and later life outcomes. In D. J. Pepler & K. H. Rubin (Eds.). *The development and treatment of childhood aggression* (pp. 5-31). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Garmezy, N. & Rutter, M. (1985). *Stress, coping, and development in children.* New York: McGraw Hill, 75-86.

Grossman, D. C., Neckerman, H. J., Koepsell, T. D., Liu, P. Y., Asher, K. N., Beland, K., Frey, K., and Rivara, F. P. (1997). Effectiveness of a violence prevention curriculum among children in elementary school. *Journal of the American Medical Association, 277* (20), 1605-1611.

Hanson, M. K. (1994) A conflict resolution/student mediation program: Effects on student attitudes and behaviors. *Journal of School Research and Information. 12* (4), 9-14.

Hawkins, J. D., Von Cleve, E., & Catalano, R. F. Reducing early childhood aggression: results of a primary prevention program. *American Academy of Childhood and Adolescent Psychiatry.* (30). 208-17.

Hawkins, J. D., Catalano, R. F., Morrison, D. M., O'Donnel, J., Abbott, R. D., & Day, L. E. (1992). The Seattle social development project: effects of the first four years on protective factors and problem behaviors. In J. McCord & R. Tremblay (Eds.). *The prevention of anti-social behavior in children.* New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Fisher, R. & Ury, W. (1991). *Getting to Yes.* New York, NY: Penguin Books.

Joyce, B. Hersh, R. & Hartoonian, B. (1993). *The Structure of School Improvement (2nd ed.).* New York, NY: Longman.

Katz, N. H. & Lawyer, J. W. (1985) *Communication and Conflict Resolution Skills.* Dubuque, IA.: Kendall Hunt Publishing Co.

Kendall, J. S., & Marzano, R. J. (1994). *The systematic identification and articulation of content standards and benchmarks (Update).* Aurora, CO: Mid-Continent Regional Educational Laboratory.

LeBlanc, P. (1996). *Report to the Palm Beach County School Board on the conflict resolution program: Two case studies of the impact of conflict resolution in the classroom.* West Palm Beach, FL: Safe Schools Center.

LeBlanc, P., & Lacey, C. (2001). *Evaluation report on the Allegany Foundation grant "Making peace work in the Miami-Dade County Public Schools 2000-2001."* Miami, FL: Peace Education Foundation.

LeBlanc, P., Lacey, C., & Adler, A. (2000). *A case study of the implementation of conflict resolution in a second grade classroom.* Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Conference.

LeBlanc, P., Lacey, C. & Mulder, R. (1998). Conflict resolution: a case study of one high school class's experience. *Journal for Just and Caring Education, 4* (2), 224-244.

Lipsey, M. (1992). Juvenile delinquency treatment: A meta-analytic inquiry into the variability of effects. In T. Cook, H. Cooper, D. Cordray, H. Hartman, L. Hedges, R. Light, R. Louis & F. Mosteller (Eds.), *Meta- analysis for explanation* (pp. 83-126). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Lispsey, M. & Wilson, D. (1993). The efficacy of psychological, education and behavioral treatment: Confirmation from meta-analysis. *American Psychologist, 48,* 1181-1209.

Olweus, D. (1984). Aggressors and their victims: Bullying at school. In N. Frude & H. Gault (Eds.), *Disruptive behavior in schools* (pp. 57-76). New York: John Wiley.

Patterson, G. R. (1982). *A social learning approach to family intervention.* Eugene, OR: Castilia.

Patterson, J. L., Purkey, S. C. & Parker, J. V. (1986) *Productive School Systems for a Nonrational World.* Virginia: ACSD.

Posner, G. J. (1995). Analyzing the curriculum (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Powell, K. E., Muir-McClain, L. & Halasyamani, L. (1995) A review of selected school-based conflict resolution and peer mediation projects. *Journal of School Health, 65,* 426-431.

Safe Schools Center of the Palm Beach County School District. (1995) *Capsule summary: Fighting fair for families follow-up survey.* West Palm Beach, FL: Safe Schools Center.

Safe Schools Center of the Palm Beach County School District. (1998) *Discipline data analysis report for Olympic Heights high school.* West Palm Beach, FL: Safe Schools Center.

Schunk, D. H., & Swartz, C. W. Goals and progress feedback: Effects on self-efficacy and writing achievement. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 18,* 337-354.

Slaby, R., Wilson-Brewer, R., & Dash K. (1994). *Aggressors, Victims and Bystanders: Thinking and Acting to Prevent Violence.* Newton, MA: Education Development Center.

Slavin, R. E. (1992). When and why does cooperative learning increase achievement? Theoretical and empirical perspectives. In R. Hertz-Lazarowitz & N. Miller (Eds.). *Interaction in cooperative groups: The theoretical anatomy of group learning* (pp. 145-173). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Speirs, R. (1994). *Decreasing suspensions in grades nine through twelve through the implementation of a peace curriculum.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service Number ED 378 090)

Tolan, P. H., & Guerra, N. G. (1994). *What works in reducing adolescent violence; an empirical review of the field.* Boulder, CO: Colorado Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence.

Wilde, J. (1995). *Anger Management in Schools.* Lancaster, PA: Technomic Publishing Co. Inc.

Zigler, E., Taussig, C. & Black, K. Early childhood intervention. *American Psychologist, 47,* 997-1006.