

Copyright © 2011 by Lahab Al-Samarrai
All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

This study utilizes Allan Guggenbuhl's seven-step Mythodrama method of resolving conflict and bullying in a school setting which has proven successful in Europe, applies this to a school setting in the United States, and measure that application to see if this intervention for addressing conflict and bullying is successful in a setting in the United States. Pre- and post-testing was conducted and some statistically significant improvement post-intervention was found. Study results suggest this methodology would have efficacy when applied broadly in US schools.

For the light in my darkness, Sarah

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my committee chair, Barbara Berger, Ph.D., for her wisdom and insight throughout my education at the Institute for Clinical Social Work. I would also like to thank John Ridings, Ph.D., for his tireless efforts to help me understand and clarify the data findings throughout this research project. I would also like to thank Dennis McCaughan, Ph.D. for his compassion and understanding in knowing the importance of this project and my readers, Carol Ganzer, Ph.D. and Peter Shaft, MSW for their time, patience and encouragement throughout this arduous process. Special thanks to Allan Guggenbühl, Ph.D. for his generosity and encouragement in teaching me the methodology that is central to this study, as well as his mentoring and friendship over these past several years. I am grateful for my education experience at the Institute for Clinical Social Work and to all my teachers, mentors and consultants including Lisa Cohen, MSW. Thanks to my mentor Murray Stein, Ph.D. and to my friend who helped me tremendously, Lee Roloff Ph.D.

So many people have brought me to this point. My brothers Samer and Munqith maintain their constant support. I am grateful to my mother Rajaa who will not see me graduate and my father Hassan who pushed me towards excellence. My Aunt Huda's struggles in life lead me to into this field. My best friend and mentor who died too young, Michael Hudac, and his widow, Sarah Christian, shepherded me along this path and their children, Anna, Lada, Neisy and Mike continue to be a source of delight. To my friends Ayad and Jihad who encouraged me and supported me always, and to all those who helped me along the way, thank you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
LIST OF TABLES.....	vii
Chapter	
I. Introduction.....	1
General Statement of Purpose	
Significance of the Study for Clinical Social Work	
The Problem to Be Studied and Objectives to Be Achieved	
II. Review of Relevant Literature.....	13
III.	
Methodology.....	27
Hypotheses to Be Tested or Questions to Be Explored	
Statement of Assumptions	
Research Strategy	
IV. Findings.....	40
Sample Demographics	
Univariate Analysis	
Control Variables	
Independent Variables	
Dependent Variables	
Bivariate Analyses	
Results of Hypotheses Testing	
V. Discussion of findings.....	54

TABLE OF CONTENTS – *Continued*

Chapter	Page
VI. Reflections Toward Further Study.....	63
VII. References.....	66
VIII. Appendices	
A. Appendix 1: Pre-Test.....	72
B. Appendix 2: Post-Test.....	78
C. Appendix 3: CPI Form.....	86
D. Appendix 4: Consent Forms.....	90
E. Appendix 5: Students’ Written Thoughts on Violence and Movies.....	95
F. Appendix 6: Students’ Favorite Weapons.....	110
G. Appendix 7: Group Suggestions.....	113
H. Appendix 8: Students’ Constructive Criticism.....	130
I. Annotated Bibliography.....	151

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Results of the Univariate Analyses.....	39
2. Results of the Paired Samples T-Test.....	42
3. Results of the Independent Samples T-Test.....	43

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

General Statement of Purpose

The growth of violence among children and adolescents has become a growing concern both in the United States and in Europe. Recent examples include the Columbine School shootings, 2008 shootings at Northern Illinois University in which a student gunman killed six and wounded 18, and a shooting in February 2009 by a teenage gunman in Frankfurt, Germany that killed 15, the majority of which were girls and women and the horrific incident in Erfurt, Germany when a student shot seventeen teachers and classmates. The growth of violence among children and adolescents has reached crisis proportions as the incidence of student and teacher shootings has reached epidemic proportions. Stories of bomb threats, bullying, gang activity, harassment and shootings have populated the media.

In addition to recent shootings at Northern Illinois University and Virginia Tech, there have been shootings in other elementary schools, middle schools, high schools and universities. This is not a class phenomenon; it occurs in poor, middle income and more affluent communities. This phenomenon is international in scope as these incidents of violence have happened in Finland, Germany, the United States and other countries. The prevalence shows a problem that has not been addressed or explained adequately. A recent study by the U.S. Secret Service indicates that several myths have sprung up in the popular vernacular about the perpetrators of school

violence that are false and misleading (Dedman, 2007). The rise of violence in schools has outstripped the development and implementation of programs to address those issues. Paradoxically, while much of the available research on violence intervention programs focuses on programs that target children ages 6-12, the majority of the reported incidents of violence in the United States, and those that receive the greatest notice in the popular press, occur in adolescent populations, that is, among children ages 12 and up.

The purpose of this study is to explore a conflict resolution strategy that has demonstrated positive results with adolescent populations in other countries. Allan Guggenbuhl, founder of the Institute for Conflict Management in Zurich, Switzerland, has used a methodology he has named Mythodrama to work with adolescents in school settings to negotiate conflict in a non-violent manner and introduces skills they can use to successfully resolve future conflicts. This methodology will be applied with a population of US adolescents to demonstrate whether this strategy would have efficacy here.

Significance of the Study for Clinical Social Work

If this study proves that the same strategy can be used successfully in the United States, it will provide an additional tool for school social workers to utilize in managing adolescent conflict. It will also add to the body of research knowledge in the field of clinical social work. This study should help expand the ideas about methods for dealing with conflict and the resolution of conflict. The study of managing violence in schools may offer a deeper understanding of the society as a whole for teachers, parents, students, social workers, psychologist and police officers.

Current theory purporting that there is a single way to understand violence in schools is a cookie cutter approach. It infers a “bad apple has upset the apple cart.” This “no tolerance” approach is doomed to fail because it sheds very little light on the basis of conflict. Thus, more tragic conflicts erupt because of escalations in the reoccurrence of violent outbursts.

It is part of the mission of social workers to help bridge the divides that pull our society apart. The Mythodrama method examined in this study is one such strategic technique to help bridge gaps and facilitate the coming together of people by the exploration of the myths, stories and symbols they hold sacred. It is in understanding the psychological dynamics of a conflict that we understand ourselves and our society.

The Problem to be Studied and Specific Objectives to Be Achieved

It can reasonably be said that most people, when confronted with conflict would rather avoid or run away from it. Recent neurological research using MRIs confirms what is generally accepted, which is that conflict signals danger and danger innately engages the “fight or flight” response that resides in the limbic system of the brain. Accessing this limbic response engenders action from the base, animalistic part of the brain, creating consequences that are, at best, disconcerting and at worst, violent. Thus, conflict can reasonably be seen as a precursor to violence, in any population, but more specifically for the purposes of this study, in children and adolescents in the school setting.

The objective of this study is to review a methodology used successfully to achieve conflict resolution among adolescents in public schools in Europe. The

research will attempt to replicate those results in an American public school. The intent is to determine if the same process used in Europe among adolescents for conflict resolution will work in the United States and to provide new a tool to help adolescents come to resolution.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE

In advance of this study, it is important to review the prevailing methodologies used to address conflict in the United States. There are many ideas regarding violence and the resolution or prevention of violence among professionals, and many theories about how aggression factors into the creation and mitigation of conflict. It is also relevant to review literature regarding methodologies with an archetypal base since the Mythodrama method utilizes Jungian archetypes as a theoretical base to better understand the Mythodrama methodology being investigated in this study.

In looking at resolving conflict, we must also look at aggression, which is both a cause of and a negative reaction to conflict. Aggression is variously seen as a defense to the “psychological self” and a breakdown of normal defense processes (Fonagy, Moran & Target, 1993), a primary, innate drive tied to sexual drives rather than a defense against environmental intrusions (Anna Freud, 1971), and a reawakening of problems left over from childhood (Greenacre, 1970). A controversy that has divided the psychoanalytic world is whether aggression is a human instinct or not. Mitchell writes aggression lies at both the core of the self and also on the periphery (Mitchell, 1993).

Much of the literature about aggressive behavior looks at correlations between aggression in adolescence and early childhood intervention. A National Institute of Mental Health study at the University of Colorado Boulder looked at whether concern for others correlates to aggressive/disruptive behavior in pre-school children and found important links between parenting style and pro-social development as a factor in whether or not children retained concern for others as they matured (Hastings, Zahn-Waxler Robinson, Usher & Bridges, 2000). Another study examined the long-term impact of two preventive interventions used with first graders: one classroom centered and the other focused on parents' interaction with the school and good parenting skills. Children in a random sample that were exposed to these interventions in first grade were revisited five years later, and the study found that later success correlated to early risk assessment and intervention (Ialongo, Poduska, Werthamer, & Kellam, 2001). Additionally a two-year study of preschool and kindergarten students shows that interpersonal cognitive problem-solving skills (ICPS), which are lacking in children exhibiting aggressive behavior, can be taught and mitigate maladjustment over a 5-year longitudinal study (Shure & Spivack, 1980). Another study looks at the efficacy of an intervention program called Linking the Interests of Families and Teachers (LIFT) in violence prevention among elementary school children. The results indicated that when parents participated in parent education classes, teachers learned better ways to manage inappropriate student behavior and volunteer playground monitors learned better skills for supervising and rewarding children. In addition, children who were initially targeted as aggressive became virtually indistinguishable from average children (Stoolmeier, 2000).

Several methodologies have been utilized to manage conflict in primary school-age populations. Brown and Jones (Aber, Brown & Jones, 2003) showcase a school-based intervention program called the Resolving Conflict Creatively Program (RCCP). This program works with children in grades 1-6 in New York City public elementary school. Across gender, race and economic categories, children whose teachers taught the program's conflict resolution methods exhibited fewer conduct problems, depressive symptoms and aggressive behaviors. Using this classical theory base, August, Hektner, & Bloomquist evaluated the impact of a violence prevention program called Early Risers on young children who were identified as at high risk for aggressive behavior. Early Risers is a six-week initial program with two years of follow up support. Their study found improvement in academic performance and behavioral self-regulation (August, Hektner & Bloomquist, 2001).

Longitudinal studies demonstrate the lifelong impact of childhood aggression left unaddressed. Drawing participants from the ongoing Jyvaskyla Longitudinal Study of Personality and Social Development, a study that looks at the relationship between childhood aggression and long-term unemployment in adulthood, found that maladjustment in school begins a cycle of maladjustment in adulthood that correlates to problem drinking, limited occupational choices and long-term unemployment (Kokko & Pulkkinen, 2000).

Stuart Twemlow (1995) suggests that a dyadic relationship exists between victim and victimizer that is similar to the transference and counter-transference relationship in psychoanalytic treatment. He suggests the importance of community psychoanalysis and building peaceful school environments with emphasis on the opportunity for group intervention by students, teacher, counselors, administrators and psychotherapists.

Twemlow, Fonagy, et al. (2000) had some success with their intervention technique, called the CAPSLE Program, which combines psychoanalytic and Adlerian methodologies. They applied them at an elementary school in which a second grade girl was assaulted by a group of second grade boys and found that program participation was associated with pronounced improvement in students' academic achievement scores when bullying was addressed via a low cost anti-violence intervention. Yet, their focus was on bullying behavior, not conflict resolution. One group intervention method used successfully in Europe to support conflict management is Allan Guggenbuhl's Mythodrama method, which has its origins in analytical psychology from a Jungian perspective. Because this theory is the basis for this study, a review of some Jungian literature is also warranted here.

Key to the understanding of conflict from a Jungian perspective is an understanding of Jung's concept of the Shadow. Jung identifies the shadow as the unconscious side of a human being that contains those parts of oneself that are perceived to be, at best, weak and at worst, demonic (Jung, 1912). Miller explores the different aspects of the shadow - personal, collective and archetypal - as they influence personality development. When there is a split between the shadow and the ego there is an effect on the development of the personality (Miller, 1981). As Jung says, "Everything that man should, and yet cannot, be or do - be it in a positive or negative sense - lives on as a mythological figure and anticipation alongside his consciousness, either as a religious projection or - what is still more dangerous - as unconscious contents which then project themselves spontaneously into incongruous objects, e.g., hygienic and other "salvationist" doctrines or practices. All these are so many rationalized substitutes for mythology, and their unnaturalness does more harm than good" (Jung, 1940).

Jung believed that a person cannot become conscious without the recognition of and struggle with the shadow. He referred to it as a “mortal struggle” that confronts the “ego-personality” and requires the difficult work of looking within as well as without. There are aspects of the shadow that are more difficult to assimilate because of the affective quality that tends to be projected onto the other. Jungians say that no object can stand in the sun without a shadow. When we fail to assimilate and make the shadow conscious it will always be projected out, disintegrated and dissociated. Then our world becomes a dark illusive place that emotionally drains us. Due to this, the outside world becomes a replica of our unknown side - unpredictable, scary, unstable and dangerous. Marie-Louise Von Franz (1993) writes of how the shadow is projected upon others, noting that the object of projection typically shares significant characteristics with the person doing the projecting (p. 256).

People who believe that the shadow is out in the world and is never associated with them are convinced that others are evil and bad. Therefore, the other becomes the object of fear and distrust, always up to no good. Dissociation from the shadow causes people to become dangerous to themselves and others. The shadow is less dangerous to the person and the world when it is recognized as a part of the person. We can become better in the world when we recognize that evil lives within, not just without. Moreover the repression and dissociation of the shadow can cause the most helpful and good intentions of people to become misguided and oppressive.

In his collected works, Jung addressed the Shadow several times with a variety of examples as to what form and shape the shadow can take in an individual’s unconscious as well as the collective unconscious. The core of the shadow for Jung is not that the shadow is evil as much as it is disconnected from consciousness. This disconnection

causes great conflict with the other because it generates projections of primitive, fearful, hateful aspects of the psyche.

Jung writes “It is a frightening thought that man also has a shadow side to him, consisting not just of little weaknesses and foibles, but of a positively demonic dynamism. The individual seldom knows anything of this; to him, as an individual, it is incredible that he should ever in any circumstances go beyond himself. But let these harmless creatures form a mass, and there emerges a raging monster; and each individual is only one tiny cell in the monster's body, so that for better or worse he must accompany it on its bloody rampages and even assist it to the utmost. Having a dark suspicion of these grim possibilities, man turns a blind eye to the shadow-side of human nature. Blindly he strives against the salutary dogma of original sin, which is yet so prodigiously true. Yes, he even hesitates to admit the conflict of which he is so painfully aware” (p. 35).

In this quote Jung addresses the frightening part of the unconscious; a part which appears when the shadow is collectively projected toward a minority of people or groups of people. Who have become the scapegoats in society? In the “Two Essays on Analytical Psychology” Jung writes, again, addressing the issue of the shadow as a continuous drama in human beings occurring in everyday life.

He states,

We know that the wildest and most moving dramas are played not in the theater but in the hearts of ordinary men and women who pass by without exciting attention, and who betray to the world nothing of the conflicts that rage within them except possibly by a nervous breakdown. What is so difficult for the layman to grasp is the fact that in most cases the patients themselves have no suspicion whatever of the internecine war raging in their unconscious. If we remember that there are many people who understand nothing at all about themselves. We shall be less surprised at the realization that there are also people who are utterly unaware of their actual conflicts” (p. 425).

When a group of people project their suspicion and anger on another group, it is very difficult for the projecting group to have empathy, or any form of identification, with the group who become the object of the projections. Thus, the groups become enemies of each other. By defining an enemy, the need for remorse or humanity is mediated. It becomes acceptable, maybe even admirable, to kill, destroy, or isolate the enemy groups. In a school setting, those defined in this way are bullied and called names that disgrace by connotation. They might be taunted with terms like “weak,” “weird,” “fat,” “gay,” “black,” “poor,” “stupid,” “ugly,” “outcast,” and “foreign.”

Jung says that man has always split things into two separate spheres that have opposite characteristics, suggesting that this split is a reflection of the division that existed in primitive man in the intrapsychic polarity between the conscious vs. the unconscious. Because primitive man had yet to develop the ability to evaluate his own knowledge, he saw subject and object as undifferentiated because his own internal opposition was unconscious and therefore projected onto the world.

Marie-Louise Von Franz explains that the split that occurs in the external world is a direct reflection of our inner world being projected outwardly! Jung believes that perception of the external is always a direct reflection of our internal psychology whether it is based on fact or not. Thus, when we project anger and suspicions on others it feels as real as if they actually had done something to us, even though we know nothing about them. Thus, when we go to war with other countries we vilify their people, religion and culture (p. 260). We distance ourselves from any similarities that we might have with them. In schools kids are merciless towards other kids who are considered different or “outcasts.”

Jung writes that over time we have been able to distinguish and recall some of our projections such that conscious knowledge developed into a form of scientific thinking, which was the first step in the “despiritualization” of the world. Thus, though now for the most part, our understanding of what constitutes “God” is less rooted in the natural world (trees, mountains, weather, etc.) and we understand more of our world (through) scientific exploration and discovery, there are still many gaps in our knowledge (p. 140). We fill these in with projections, and we feel as sure of the veracity of those projections as we are of our scientific knowledge. Scientific exploration and discovery has moved our consciousness forward, yet the forces of the unconscious continue to pull us back towards the darkness.

The unknown is that part of us that wants to believe in myth and stories, not in the scientific revolution. People tell stories of our great heroes and they don’t want to see those heroes at Walter Reed Hospital, or in the coffins returning home. In schools, the traumatic consequences of bullying and violence leave lifetime scars on victims. Each individual is that which he cannot tolerate. Each is the same as the wounded adolescents and young soldiers who have not been given the chance to survive as heroes. And, what happens when the hero’s journey ends; do they disappear or become bitter old man and women? Life in the world can be a very dark place, where we stumble and fall. We are the only ones that can turn on the lights and play the music of life.

Jung provides some insight into the theoretical underpinnings of the Mythodrama method when he states:

The individual ego could be conceived as the commander of a small army in the struggle with his environments war not infrequently on two fronts, before him the struggle for existence, in the rear the struggle against his own rebellious instinctual nature. Even to those of us who are not pessimists our existence feels more like a struggle than anything else. The state of peace is a desideratum, and

when a man has found peace with himself and the world it is indeed a noteworthy event” (p. 693).

Guggenbuhl utilizes the work of counseling and psychotherapy from a Jungian perspective and transforms it into a method for resolving conflict in schools. He adapts and applies Jungian theory using both developmental and remedial methods with students, teachers and school counselors. Writing from his experiences as a psychologist in Swiss Canton Schools, he has gathered material to analyze what makes children behave violently toward each other. Guggenbuhl reexamines many assumptions about violence and childhood and has devised a methodology which he calls Mythodrama. This technique is a resource for finding alternative strategies for violence prevention and dealing with violence among school children.

This study uses Guggenbuhl-Jungian Mythodrama as a theoretical framework for conflict resolution and investigates this methodology from an Analytical Psychology perspective. Mythodrama is defined as a conflict resolution approach, the purpose of which is to help people in an unbearable or a very difficult situation. It is a method of intervention that aims to produce concrete solutions and answers to conflict by providing new perspectives to the people involved. By facilitating the creation of novel ideas and anticipating different consequences in complex situations, the method both illuminates the darkness and respects the chaos that exists.

A defining principle in Mythodrama is the understanding that the irrational cannot always be explained away and must be respected for its power. Mythodrama does not dismiss the unconscious and respects the process that people go through. It tries to provide new ways of explaining and unpacking the entanglements of the group. In this context, conflict is not viewed as misunderstanding or as something avoidable; rather, it

is viewed as necessary for growth and change. In conflict it is not necessary to state the obvious, but it is important to dare or challenge conscious thought in order to perceive the issues from a deeper psychological perspective.

Guggenbuhl writes:

Mythodrama is a conflict resolution approach, which is applied in crisis intervention in problematic school classes, in group and trauma therapy and in team development. Mythodrama works with the myths/cryptodogmas which dominate a specific group unconsciously. (e.g., “we are victims,” “we are the lonely heroes,” etc.) These myths or cryptodogmas influence the thinking patterns of groups and induce their emotional condition. During conflicts, when hostility, hatred or violence predominates, the participants abandon the rational point of view. Their cognitive structures, perceptions and emotions are affected by these instinctual forces, which take over during conflicts. When we want to deal effectively with conflict, be it violence or bullying, we have to take into consideration these unconscious forces. Mythodrama addresses this archetypal dynamism inert in the psyche of man, by choosing a story, legend, tale or metaphor, which reflects the respective myth. If the myth is made conscious, the group can proceed to work on it. The myths not only influence our conflict behavior, they can also be the source of new ideas and solutions. In Mythodrama specially trained practitioners use specific techniques, to work with the mythic patterns of a group of people. After having carried out the program, the clinician initiates concrete solutions or changes within the group or the system to which the group belongs. The solutions have to be answers to the problems, which were defined before starting the program. The solutions are evaluated after a certain time period (follow up). The aim of Mythodrama is to use the group’s own imagination to disclose hidden resources and initiate concrete steps, with which to solve the particular problem, from which the group is suffering (2003).

Mythodrama is based on two psychological assumptions:

1. People are all against the need for conflict and when they are calmer, more attuned with emotional states, there is a greater ability and willingness to resolve conflict.
2. Problems occur because of conflict that transforms personality. This causes a cessation in thinking and generates action in accordance with the rational part of the self as a defense against hidden parts of personality. We start to show a crazy aspect of our personality.

The ways conflict alters our perceptions and the way we would like to deal with situations is skewed. We find ourselves as emotional beings showing our anger and rage. The perspective from which we view others becomes narrow. The person starts to destroy everything that walks in path; it confronts what does not conform to our ideas and views. Thus, the person who cuts one off in traffic is an idiot, not a person that just made us aware that we are not paying attention to the road. In conflict we also become aware of our bodies, our heartbeat, sweating hands, our voice cracking and our muscles tightening. The emotions force us to hear our bodies, thus our innate response becomes primitive and “fight or flight” responses become more acceptable. Conflicts also create stories; these stories are psychological insights to the way we view the world and how we think the world views us.

Mythodrama is the approach that takes all of these different issues and psychological phenomena into consideration toward forming a solution. Mythodrama is based on the ideas of Analytical Psychology developed by the Swiss psychiatrist Carl G. Jung. Analytical Psychology suggests that we are beings that are driven by unconscious forces not just by cognitive ideas and behaviors. These unconscious drives need to be addressed and understood and they can be part symbols, stories and metaphors.

Hübner and Singer say that,

Mythodrama is a group therapy procedure and a conflict resolution methodology which was developed by Allan Guggenbühl (www.ikm.ch, Guggenbühl in 1999). It marries the ideas of the psychodrama of Jakob Levis Morenos and the analytic psychology C.G. Jung. Mythodrama springs from the notion that the behavior of the person is steered by collective processes as well as his personal biography, his will or expression of his personality. In group psychotherapy, conflict presentation or teamwork, the method must consider the collective dynamic. Mythodramas manifest themselves above all in the groups with which we identify emotionally. At a deep level of the psyche, the collective unconscious connects the members of such groups. Therefore, what the one perceives and feels is often

also expression of a collective process. We must integrate the collective dimension into the individual psychological analysis and we need special metaphors and concepts to recognize these group mechanisms. Often the statements and actions of individual become clear only after we understand the parallel collective depth processes.

Complexes or archetypes control not only the psychological setting of the individual, but can also take hold of a group such that the individual then adopts the psychic complex which dominates the group. These complexes or archetypes express themselves in suitable myths, stories which are produced or are selected by the archetypal constellation of the group. For group members these myths have a heightened plausibility. They are cited when the group must master new challenges, is threatened or must process a trauma. In the group they have the function of axiomatic explanations. They are valid enough for the group members to be seen as grounds for an action or problem. Such myths hide behind many catchwords that are part of the group's collective vernacular and belief system (2000)

Guggenbuhl writes,

Three important catchwords that have their own intra-group definitions are "communication," "knowledge" and "power." Archetypal underpinnings behind such catchwords show up in group-suitable stories. Behind communication, for example, the Hermes/Aphrodite Mythos may be hidden; behind education, Apollo and with the subject Power we look to the group to identify its archetypal stories. Those stories that are agreed to be plausible to the group must be understood as myths, which reflect the archetypal structure of the group.

Guggenbühl Mythodrama intervention distinguishes itself by a methodology that respects this deep psychological structure. In contrast to a method such as psychodrama it focuses not on the individual's situation, but rather on the central myth of the group. Guggenbühl Mythodrama intervention also distinguishes itself by an exact finite process: Problem definition, mood-setting, history / myth, imagination, representation or treatment, reflection and, finally, concrete conversion or measure. First the group participants must identify the personal problem of an individual in the group or that of the group itself that is the focus of the Mythodrama work. In the second phase the group leader organizes a mood-setting exercise to help the group to experience itself as a community using play, music, etc. Next the group leader tells a history that is selected according to the previously identified myth. The identification of the myth occurs intuitively, without preliminary talks or special questionnaires.

The history of the group interaction is embodied in the myth and group members and changes the mood of the group. In this context the group history

serves as a medium of the contact rather than as a pedagogical modality. The group leader fortifies the history story with what are called mental movers, which are small unlikely, weird or illogical details which are inserted into the history myth and should work as irritants. With the Mythodrama the history is not told to a conclusion, but is left open-ended. Each listener is asked to imagine the end independently.

The representation or treatment phase follows this imagination phase. This occurs differently in each different intervention and is determined according to the challenges of each group. Teams or families are brought together to devise an end to the history and to play it out afterwards. The end of the history can also be shown in drawings. In the last phase of the intervention, the group's Mythodramas are acted out in the form of a play or symbolically interpreted in pictures and on the source question addressed. Thus the problem or the question identified by the group or by the individuals at the beginning of the meeting is seen in a new light with the help of the material produced by the group processes. These spontaneous dramas and drawings help the individual to find his or her own resources for reframing the myth. The play can also be used by the group to critically review the myth and creatively succeed in exposing it and reframing it in a more productive and positive way. If the Mythodrama is used as a conflict presentation technology, concrete changes should be decided upon as the final outcome of the intervention. This can occur at an individual level or be initiated by the entire group and must be concrete and measurable enough to be recognized by those outside the group (2003).

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

In addition to introducing a conceptual model of the Mythodrama method, this chapter reviews the design and procedures used in the present study. This review will include an examination of research hypotheses, sampling procedures, the research instruments, the measurement of the study variables, and the data analysis plan.

Hypotheses to Be Tested or Questions to Be Explored

The primary hypothesis to be tested is that the Guggenbuhl Mythodrama method, which has been used successfully in European schools, will have similar efficacy when utilized in a school setting in the United States.

H1: The Mythodrama crisis intervention program proves to be effective in reducing frequency of verbal bullying among middle school students.

H2: The Mythodrama crisis intervention program proves to be effective in reducing frequency of physical bullying among middle school students.

H3: The Mythodrama crisis intervention program proves to be effective in increasing the quality of teacher-student relationships among middle school students.

H4: The Mythodrama crisis intervention program proves to be effective in increasing school participation among middle school students.

- H5: The Mythodrama crisis intervention program proves to be effective in decreasing exclusion among middle school students.
- H6: The Mythodrama crisis intervention program proves to be effective in decreasing demolishing among middle school students.
- H7: The Mythodrama crisis intervention program proves to be effective in decreasing negative nicknames calling among middle school students.
- H8: The Mythodrama crisis intervention program proves to be effective in decreasing vandalism in school.
- H9: The Mythodrama crisis intervention program proves to be effective in decreasing blackmailing among middle school students.
- H10: The Mythodrama crisis intervention program proves to be effective in decreasing weapons threats among middle school students.
- H11: The Mythodrama crisis intervention program proves to be effective in increasing class cohesion among middle school students.

Statement of Assumptions

1. The Pre-adolescent population at a Mid-High School in Washington State is representative of a typical United States city with the same type of adolescent population.
2. Conflict resolution is a challenge in U.S. schools for which new interventions are not always welcome.
3. Effective conflict resolution strategies can help lessen violent behavior among adolescents in the school setting.

Research Strategy

Type of Study and Design

This research project intends to study the effectiveness of a violence prevention and conflict management approach called Mythodrama, which was developed by Dr. Allan Guggenbuhl. This technique was tested successfully in two western European countries, Switzerland and Sweden. The current research proposes to investigate the effectiveness of the Mythodrama method, developed by Dr. Allan Guggenbuhl at the Institute for Conflict Management in Zurich. This intervention will focus on 100 adolescents, ages 12-14, both male and female. The research oversampled by 30% (n=130) to ensure the target sample of 100 students.

This research used a pre-experimental in design with a pre-test/post-test analysis only, with no experimental or control group. The students were sampled in the same day (for both pre and post data collections) in one of five sessions in the school's career class (23-30 students per group). All participants were given the Mythodrama intervention over the course of 3 months.

The participant recruitment plan consisted of targeting students from a single mid-high school with a middle class population of students. The school has a suburban public school population of students ages 12-14. The data was gathered from 8th and 9th grade students in the Career Finding class. Recruitment strategies included methods such as providing an information session on Mythodrama to teachers and parents and distributing flyers to students.

The effectiveness of the intervention program was determined by gathering and analyzing quantitative and qualitative data. The quantitative data, as well as some qualitative statements, was gathered by means of a pre- and post-test survey that

measures students' perceptions of violence and their willingness to endorse violence. Publically available school report card data were also reviewed. The questionnaires were distributed before (pre test=T1) and after (post test=T2).

According to Guggenbuhl,

Assuming that the way is cleared for a cooperative venture, the participating school (or selected classes) can expect some or all of the following elements of a Mythodrama intervention:

Intervention Element 1 – A preliminary discussion with the teachers involved to ascertain their perceptions of the problem (requiring four hours of school time)

Intervention Element 2 – The intervention team visits the school and undertakes a systematic observation of the referred classes (requiring six hours of school time).

Intervention Element 3 – Work with the problem classes on four occasions (requiring 24 hours of school time).

Intervention Element 4 – Consultancy with the teacher requiring at least two hours of school time).

Intervention Element 5 – Follow-up meeting with each class after one month (requiring four hours of school time).

Intervention Element 6 – Final meeting with the teacher requiring four hours of school time).

1. The evaluator will collect data before, during and after a Mythodrama intervention;
2. The evaluator will collect a pre and post survey necessary to test the hypotheses outlined by the research proposal.

These measures will comprise:

1. The establishment of quantitative indices of violent, bullying and aggressive behavior at the class and school level, based upon student responses to questionnaires. (For both ethical and practical reasons, it will not be possible to identify or target for intervention particularly violent or aggressive individuals);

2. A content analysis of the violent aggressive fantasies, myths and rituals manifested within the class obtained through structured observation;
3. An audit of the provisions available in the school associated with violence prevention and intervention (including critical incident analysis and details about existing problems as well as for the observed changes during the intervention phase)-gained through document analysis (such as the overall school report card) as well as content analysis of discussions with the school contact group.

Scope of Study, Setting, Population and Sampling; Sources and Nature of Data

This research used a pre-experimental design with a pre-test/post-test analysis only, with no experimental or control group. The students were sampled in the same day (for both pre and post data collections) in one of five sessions in the school's career class (23-30 students per group). The students self-selected themselves into the program by simply agreeing to be in the study. All participants were given the Mythodrama intervention over the course of three months. All participants in the present study were informed that their participation in the study was voluntary and they could withdraw from the study at any time. They were issued an assent form (Appendix D) detailing their rights, the purpose of the study, and how the survey data would be used. The youth participants reviewed the assent form in the presence of this researcher, who asked them to provide a brief summary of what was being asked to them in order to verify their understanding of the form. This researcher answered each participant's questions related to the assent form, then asked him/her to sign the assent form. The assent form provided the name and telephone number of the principle investigator so youth participants could ask any questions that might arise subsequent to the completion of the interview.

The participant recruitment plan consisted of targeting students from a single mid-high school with a middle class population of students. The school has a suburban public

school population of students ages 12-14. The data will be gathered from 8th and 9th grade students in the Career Finding class. Recruitment strategies included methods such as providing an information session on Mythodrama to teachers and parents and distributing flyers to students.

This study was conducted at a two-year mid-high school enrolling 1200, 8th and 9th grade students in Everett, Washington, a community in the northern suburbs of Seattle. While the school principal was in favor of the project and submitted a signed letter of support to the researcher, he/she requested that the name of the school remain anonymous. The school enjoys a diversified economic base. The demographic breakdown at the school is as follows: American Indian (1%), Asian (4.1%), Afro-American (2.7%), Hispanic (7.8%), White (82.1%), Pacific Islander (.5%), Asian Pacific Islander (4.6%) and the Average Class Size is 26.5 students. Students self select for honors classes. The following data reflects the percentage of Mid High students benefiting from supplemental programs: Free or Reduced Meals (20.9%), Special Education (9.3%), and transitional bilingual (.7%). Mid High is attended by all 8th and 9th grade students in a Seattle suburb— over 1,200 students. Mid High does not retain suspend, or expel students unless all avenues for success have been explored. At Mid High the unexcused absence rate is .3%.

The Mid High was completed and opened in the Fall of 2007. It sits on 37 acres and was built as a comprehensive high school. When student population increases, Mid High is positioned to transition into the district's second high school. The school was built to facilitate personalized teaching and integrated curriculum instruction. It has four teaching wings with a total of 65 classrooms.

Instruments to be utilized in this study (questionnaires and self-reports from students) are similar in content to those used by the Institute for Conflict Management and Mythodrama in Zurich, Switzerland. For the statistical analysis, the researcher will use multiple item scales. Single item scales will also be used in the statistical analysis.

Data Collection Methods and Instruments and Description of the Research Site

This study utilized two separate data collection instruments: the Conflict Management Study Survey (CMSS) and the Cognitive Processing Inventory (CPI). The history and details of each instrument are listed below.

Conflict Management Study Survey (CMSS)

The Conflict Management Study Survey (CMSS) is a survey designed to differentiate between two general outcomes: bullying, and school/class climate. An additional seven single items are included: exclusion, demolishing, origin, vandalism, blackmailing, weapon threats, class cohesion. The bullying is sub-divided into two scales: Verbal Bullying and Physical Bullying. The factor analysis for the Verbal Bullying scale yielded a one-dimensional solution a ($\alpha = .70$) and the Physical Bullying scale yielded a one-component solution ($\alpha = .65$). School/Class Climate is also sub-divided into two scales: Teacher-Student Relationships and Student's Participation in School. The factor analysis for Teacher-Student Relationships yields a one-dimensional solution ($\alpha = .78$). The factor analysis for Student's Participation in School loaded on one single factor ($\alpha = .70$). Additionally, seven independent items can also be measured (such as vandalism and origin).

Cognitive Processing Inventory (CPI)

The Cognitive Processing Inventory (CPI) is a behavior rating scale designed to provide a norm-referenced rating of real-life information processing strengths and weaknesses of students with learning disabilities (or potential learning disabilities). The CPI can be completed by parents, teachers, or even the students themselves (http://www.ldinfo.com/cpi_faqs.htm#1). For the purposes of this study, the students completed the CPIs for themselves. The CPI helps to identify 'risk factors' from a student's background which may point to the origin of their cognitive processing difficulties. The CPI provides scores in processing in the following areas: auditory, visual, sequential/rational, conceptual/holistic, processing speed and executive function.

A Global Processing Index (GPI) can be produced from the CPI as a standard score (with a mean of 100 and standard deviation of 15) and simply represents the average "overall" rating of a particular subject. This is used to determine the relative significance of any differences found across the six processing domains. The GPI provides a standardized comparison between a specific person's rating and the "norms" of the standardization sample who have already been rated. An evaluation of test-retest reliability was performed which compared initial and follow-up parent CPI ratings of 150 students at approximate one-year intervals. Of the 150 follow-up sets of ratings, 92% were found to show a pattern of processing which identified identical areas of relatively significant strength and weakness as were noted on the initial rating. This suggests an overall stability correlation of approximately .92 (http://www.ldinfo.com/CPI_Manual.htm). For student/self the GPI has a split-half reliability coefficient of .92 and a concurrent validity score of .71.

Measurement of Independent Variables

Time phase.

The independent variables utilized in the present study included time phase. Only a single variable (Time Phase) was used in this present study, and was broken out into two nominally dichotomous choices: Time 1 (1 = pre-test, prior to Mythodrama intervention) and Time 2 (2 = post-test, after Mythodrama intervention).

Measurement of dependent variables.

The dependent variables utilized in the present study included verbal bullying, physical bullying, teacher-student relationship, student's participation, exclusion, demolishing, origin, vandalism, blackmailing, weapon threats, class cohesion, and student report on program effectiveness.

Verbal Bullying – For bullying, the survey is able to distinguish between direct and indirect forms as well as vandalism at school. Direct forms of bullying again as subdivided into verbal and physical bullying as well as aggression aimed at personal objects. The verbal bullying scale includes three items, which are rated on a 4-point frequency scale (1 = almost daily, 2 = once a week, 3 = once a month and 4 = never).

Physical Bullying – The physical bullying scale includes two items, using the same frequency scale. Since the blackmailing item showed the lowest component loading, it was not included in the scale.

Teacher-Student Relationship – The teacher-student relationship scale includes three items, which are rated on a 4-point scale (4 = most positive extreme of range to 1 = most negative extreme of range).

Student's Participation – The student participation scale includes four items, and two separate rating scales. For the items "As students in our school, we are included in

decisions vs. are confronted with facts" and "As students in our school, we are asked about our opinion vs. are not asked about our opinion," the same on a 4-point scale was used (4 = most positive extreme of range to 1 = most negative extreme of range). For the items "We can state our ideas for school events" and "We have a say in our school," a 5-point scale was used (1 = not true at all, 2 = rather not true, 3 = half/half, 4 = rather true, and 5 = exactly true).

Exclusion – The question measuring Exclusion from the CMSS is "Do other students exclude you?" and is determined using a 4-point frequency scale (1 = almost daily, 2 = once a week, 3 = once a month and 4 = never).

Demolishing – The question measuring Demolishing from the CMSS is "Do other students demolish your personal belongings?" and is determined using a 4-point frequency scale (1 = almost daily, 2 = once a week, 3 = once a month and 4 = never).

Origin – The question measuring Origin from the CMSS is "Are you called by nicknames due to your origin?" and is determined using a 4-point frequency scale (1 = almost daily, 2 = once a week, 3 = once a month and 4 = never).

Vandalism – The question measuring Vandalism from the CMSS is "Is vandalism in school an issue?" and is determined using a 4-point frequency scale (1 = almost daily, 2 = once a week, 3 = once a month and 4 = never).

Blackmailing – The question measuring Blackmailing from the CMSS is "Have you been blackmailed?" and is determined using a 4-point frequency scale (1 = almost daily, 2 = once a week, 3 = once a month and 4 = never).

Weapon Threats – The question measuring Weapon Threats from the CMSS is "Have you been threatened with weapons?" and is determined using a 4-point frequency scale (1 = almost daily, 2 = once a week, 3 = once a month and 4 = never).

Class Cohesion – The question measuring Class Cohesion from the CMSS is "How do you perceive the cohesion of your class?" and is determined using a 4-point scale (1 = no cohesion, 2 = little cohesion, 3 = pretty good cohesion, and 4 = very good cohesion).

Student Report on Program Effectiveness – There four questions measuring Student Report of Program Effectiveness from the CCMS. The first question is "Are things different for you in class since the intervention?" and is determined using a 5-point scale (5 = Yes, very positive change, 4 = Yes, some positive change, 3 = No difference, 2 = Some negative change, and 1 = Very negative change). The second question is "How does the class run now?" and is determined using a 5-point scale (5 = Clearly better, 4 = Somewhat better, 3 = No difference, 2 = Somewhat worse, and 1 = Clearly worse). The third question is "Has your teacher changed?" and is determined using a 5-point scale (5 = Yes, very positive change, 4 = yes, some positive change, 3 = No difference, 2 = Some negative change, and 1 = Very negative change). The final question is "Has the attitude in your class changed during the last three months?" and is determined using a 5-point scale (5 = Yes, very positive change, 4 = yes, some positive change, 3 = No difference, 2 = Some negative change, and 1 = Very negative change). A composite variable was not created for Student Report on Program Effectiveness; meaning that all four items were analyzed independently.

Control variables.

The variables that were held constant throughout the various regression analyses included respondent' gender, class period, and level of information processing. These three variables are described below. While respondent's grade level and race were originally targeted as control variables during the planning phase of this study, they were

not included because there was very little variance observed in these variables during the course of the study (all students were in the 8th grade at the time of the study and the majority of students were White).

Respondent's Gender – At the time of the pre-test (Time 1), respondents were asked to identify the gender group they belong (Appendix A). For purposes of the present study, the gender categories were collapsed into two different groups (Male = 1, Female = 2).

Class Period – At the time of the pre-test (Time 1), this researcher identified which class period the youth participant belonged to (Appendix A). For purposes of the present study, the class period categories were collapsed into four different groups (Class Period #1 = 1, Class Period #2 = 2, Class Period #3 = 3, and Class Period #5 = 4).

Level of Information Processing – At the time of the pre-test (Time 1), respondents were asked to complete the Cognitive Processing Inventory (CPI) (Appendix 3), which would produce an interval-level Global Processing Index (GPI) score. For purposes of the present study, the GPI score was collapsed into three different groups (Lower = 1, Average = 2, and Upper = 3). A lower score may suggest rather significant overall information processing difficulty, but it would not necessarily suggest low cognitive ability.

Data Analysis Plan – The data were analyzed through the use of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 14.0. First, the distribution of each variable was examined. Frequencies were computed for all categorical variables, and univariate statistics were obtained for all continuous variables. Associations between variables were then examined through the use of chi-square tests, and Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficient (Pearson's r).

In the next stage of data analysis, paired sample *t*-tests and independent samples *t*-tests were used to examine the within and between group differences on all dependent variables at Time 1 and Time 2. The unpaired, or "independent samples" *t*-test is used when two separate sets of independent and identically distributed samples are obtained, one from each of the two populations being compared. For example, suppose we are evaluating the effect of a medical treatment and we enroll 100 subjects into our study, then randomize 50 subjects to the treatment group and 50 subjects to the control group. In this case, we have two independent samples and would use the unpaired form of the *t*-test. The randomization is not essential here—if we contacted 100 people by phone and obtained each person's age and gender, and then used a two-sample *t*-test to see whether the mean ages differ by gender, this would also be an independent samples *t*-test, even though the data are observational (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Student's_t-test).

Dependent samples (or "paired") *t*-tests typically consist of a sample of matched pairs of similar units, or one group of units that has been tested twice (a "repeated measures" *t*-test). A typical example of the repeated measures *t*-test would be where subjects are tested prior to a treatment, say for high blood pressure, and the same subjects are tested again after treatment with a blood-pressure lowering medication (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Student's_t-test).

To decrease the likelihood of accepting chance results as being statistically significant, two-tailed tests were employed for all hypotheses tested. Additionally, the minimum standard for determining statistical significance was set at $\alpha = .05$. Thus, for both tests (unpaired and paired) only pairs with a significance level at or below 0.05 are considered statistically significant (meaning that it was the intervention that likely caused the change and not a chance variable).

Plan for Data Analysis

Analysis will show the pre-test versus the post-test. The researcher worked with Dr. Allan Guggenbuhl, director of the Institute for Conflict Management in Zurich, Switzerland, to review data analysis protocols used successfully there and determine methodology that are most likely to create valid results in the experimental school setting.

Statement on Protecting the Rights of Human Subjects

To ensure that all study participants offer informed consent, an Institute for Clinical Social Work Individual Consent for Participation in Research form was signed by the study participants (students) and their parents were asked to sign a parent permission form. That ICSW form describes the purpose of the study, procedure, costs/benefits, possible risks/side effects, privacy/confidentiality, and subject assurances.

To make every effort to ensure the confidentiality and privacy of the study participants the researcher ensured that all identifying information and research data that collected was identified by coding (or pin numbers), rather than by any identifying subject names or school information. All materials collected by the researcher were kept in a locked cabinet at the researcher's office. The participant school has been provided with a copy of the final publication of the research which they can share with any research participant or outside entity at their discretion.

There is a minimal degree of risk in this study for the participants. Although there are no legal or physical risks in this study, it is primarily designed to help participants in the research to identify, understand and resolve conflict-related situations. The researcher

is a licensed clinician trained to work through any emotional or psychological problem that arises during the research. Should such incidents occur, the researcher would inform the school's own counseling and teaching staff of any potential changes in behavior of any participants resulting from the study. Due diligence will be employed by the researcher to resolve any behavioral, emotional or psychological reactions that may be invoked due to this study. Any participant has the right to withdraw, terminate or decline participation in the research at any time during the course of the study.

Direct benefits to participants in this study are that the participants learn direct methods to resolve conflict, deal with conflict situations and resolve problems with non-violent strategies. Based on the nature of this study and its probable outcome, benefits to participant's well-being were anticipated to far outweigh any potential risk.

The present study was approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the Institute for Clinical Social Work in Chicago.

Limitations of the Research Plan

There are a variety of potential limitations to this research plan. First, the sample size is relatively small and from one geographical region, one grade level (8th grade students) and one school, thus limiting the ability to generalize the findings. Additionally, there was very little variance for race (87% of the sample was White). In addition, this study is not able to defend many threats to internal and external validity since no control or comparison group will be used. While there are multiple theoretical perspectives from which to examine this population, this study focused only on a single conflict resolution methodology generated from the theory of Mythodrama. Thus, while the results speak to the efficacy of this methodology with this population, it cannot be seen as a panacea for

adolescent or other types of conflict resolution in general. Finally, much of the data was gathered from self-report from adolescents, which always presents the potential for bias. (memories of participants may not be complete or accurate or subjects will not fully disclose information).

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

This chapter is organized into three main parts: The first part examines the sample demographics and the univariate analyses for the variables included in Table 1. The second section examines bivariate relationships between the independent and dependent variables, including the demographic control variables. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the tests of the eleven hypotheses and student's report on program effectiveness, and a summary of the findings.

Sample Demographics

Based on a sample of 106 participants, the respondent's mean age was 13.6 years, with a range of 13 to 15 years and a standard deviation of .49 years. Their racial composition was 87.7% White, 3.8% Hispanic, 1.9% African American, and 6.6% Asian. The gender composition was 65.4% Male and 34.6% Female. The respondent's mean CPI score was 94.4, with a range of 10 to 129, and a standard deviation of 19.4. The CPI group composition was 17.2% lower, 78.8% average, and 4% upper. Their class period composition was 24.5% first period, 26.4% second period, 25.5% third period, and 23.6%

fifth period (no participants were recruited from 4th period). One-hundred percent of respondents were in 8th grade.

Univariate Analysis

The following subsections will present the results of univariate analyses, including means and standard deviation. The subsections cover control variables, independent variables, and dependent variables.

Control Variables

The three control variables used throughout the various statistical analyses – respondent's gender, respondent's class period, and respondent's level of information processing – were discussed in Chapter IV, under Sample Demographics.

Independent Variables

For Time Period, 106 participants out of 113 recruited students completed surveys at Time 1 (a 93% response rate) and 106 students completed surveys at Time 2 (a 93% response rate). A total of 106 participants had both Time 1 and Time 2 matched survey data (100% of participants matched).

Dependent Variables

The independent variables in this section are reported at pre-test (Time 1) only in an effort to achieve a baseline and assess levels of need. Verbal bullying had a mean value of 9.5, with a range of 3 to 12, a standard deviation of 2.5 and a median value of 10. Physical Bullying, at pre-test, had a mean value of 7.4, with a range of 3 to 8, a standard deviation of 1.0, and a median value of 8. Teacher-Student Relationships had a mean value of 7.7, with a range of 3 to 15, a standard deviation of 3.2, and a median

value of 7. Student's Participation had a mean value of 11.7, with a range of 7 to 18, a standard deviation of 2, and a median value of 12.

Exclusion had a mean value of 3.3, with a range of 1 to 4, a standard deviation of .91, and a median value of 4.0. Approximately half of the participants (54.4%) reported that exclusion never took place prior to the start of the intervention. Additionally, 7% said it took place on a daily basis, 7% said it happened on a weekly basis, and 28.8% said it happened on a monthly basis.

Demolishing had a mean value of 3.7, with a range of 1 to 4, a standard deviation of .58, and a median value of 4.0. The majority of participants (84.2%) reported that demolishing never took place prior to the start of the intervention. Additionally, 1% said it took place on a daily basis, 5% said it happened on a weekly basis, and 9.9% said it happened on a monthly basis.

Origin had a mean value of 3.3, with a range of 1 to 4, a standard deviation of .94, and a median value of 4. Over half of the participants (60%) reported that origin, or name calling, never took place prior to the start of the intervention. Additionally, 7.8% said it took place on a daily basis, 9.7% said it happened on a weekly basis, and 22.3% said it happened on a monthly basis.

Vandalism had a mean value of 2.8, with a range of 1 to 4, a standard deviation of 1.0, and a median value of 3.0. Less than half of all participants (31%) reported that vandalism never took place prior to the start of the intervention. Additionally, 12.6% said it took place on a daily basis, 20.4% said it happened on a weekly basis, and 35.9% said it happened on a monthly basis.

Blackmailing had a mean value of 3.8, with a range of 2 to 4, a standard deviation of .44, and a median value of 4.0. Almost all of the participants (90%) reported that

blackmailing never took place prior to the start of the intervention. Additionally, 3.9% said it happened on a weekly basis, and 5.8% said it happened on a monthly basis.

Weapon Threats had a mean value of 3.8, with a range of 1 to 4, a standard deviation of .58, and a median value of 4.0. Nearly all of the participants (90%) reported that weapon threats never took place prior to the start of the intervention. Additionally, 1.9% said it took place on a daily basis, 2.9% said it happened on a weekly basis, and 3.9% said it happened on a monthly basis.

Class Cohesion had a mean value of 2.9, with a range of 1 to 4, a standard deviation of .66, and a median value of 3.0. Almost all of the participants (80.5%) reported that class cohesion was perceived as good or very good prior to the start of the intervention. Additionally, 2% said there was no cohesion and 17% said there was a little cohesion.

Questions related to the construct, “Student Self-Report on Program Effectiveness” was recorded at post-test only.

TABLE 1
RESULTS OF THE UNIVARIATE ANALYSES
(N = 106)

Variable	n	(%)	M	SD	Range
Demographic Controls					
Respondent's Age	97		13.6	.49	13-15
Respondent's Gender	101				
Male	57	(65.4)	--	--	--
Female	44	(43.6)	--	--	--
Class Period	106				
1	26	(24.5)	--	--	--
2	28	(26.4)	--	--	--
3	27	(25.5)	--	--	--
5	25	(23.6)	--	--	--
CPI Score	97		94.4	19.4	10-129
CPI Group					
Lower	17	(17.2)	--	--	--
Average	78	(78.8)	--	--	--
Upper	4	(4.0)	--	--	--
Respondent's Race	106				
White	93	(87.7)	--	--	--
Hispanic or Latino	4	(3.8)	--	--	--
African American or Black	2	(1.9)	--	--	--
Asian	7	(6.6)	--	--	--
Other	0	(0)	--	--	--
Respondent's Grade Level	106				
8 th	106	(100)	--	--	--
Conflict Management Variables (pre-test)					
Verbal Bullying	103		9.5	2.5	3-12
Physical Bullying	103		7.4	1.0	3-8
Teacher-Student Relationship	99		7.7	3.2	3-15
Student's Participation	100		11.7	2.0	7-18
Exclusion	104		3.3	.91	1-4
Demolishing	101		3.7	.58	1-4
Origin	103		3.3	.94	1-4
Vandalism	103		2.8	1.0	1-4
Blackmailing	103		3.8	.44	2-4
Weapons Threats	103		3.8	.58	1-4
Class Cohesion	97		2.9	.66	1-4
Independent Variable					
Time Period					
Time 1 (Pre)	106	(100%)	--	--	--
Time 2 (Post)	106	(100%)	--	--	--

Number of valid responses for variable.

Bivariate Analyses

Paired samples t-tests were used to examine within group differences of the dependent variables between Time 1 and Time 2 in an effort to discern whether or not statistically significant differences existed between the identified groups. Relationships between nominal variables were tested using chi-square statistics.

Results of Hypotheses Testing

The results of the tests on each of the hypotheses as well as the analytic tools used to evaluate each hypothesis will be presented in detail in the next three subsections.

H1: The Mythodrama crisis intervention program proves to be effective in reducing frequency of Verbal Bullying among middle school students.

A paired-samples t-test was conducted to compare the frequency of Verbal Bullying at Time 1 (pre-intervention) and Time 2 (post-intervention). There was not a significant difference in the frequency of Verbal Bullying experienced by participants at Time 1 ($M=9.5$, $SD=2.5$) and Time 2 ($M=9.7$, $SD=2.4$; $t= -1.2$, $\alpha = .197$). These results suggest that the Mythodrama intervention in this case does not really have an impact on the frequency of verbal bullying. Specifically, the results showed that students experienced verbal bullying both before and after the intervention (see Table 2).

An independent-samples t-test showed that there was a significant difference in the frequency of verbal bullying experienced by participants at pre-test with a lower GPI score ($M= 9.1$, $SD= 2.2$) and upper GPI score ($M= 11.5$, $SD= 1.0$): $t= -3.3$, $\alpha= .00$. These results suggest that students with lower CPI scores may be at greater risk for experiencing Verbal Bullying (see Table 3). In addition, a second independent-samples t-test was

conducted to compare the frequency of Verbal Bullying experienced by participants at post-test with a low GPI score ($M= 8.5$, $SD= 2.6$) and upper GPI score ($M= 11.2$, $SD= .95$): $t= -3.2$, $\alpha= .05$ (see Table 3). When controlling for gender and class period, the results still showed was not a significant difference in the frequency of Verbal Bullying.

TABLE 2
RESULTS OF THE PAIRED SAMPLES T-TEST

	Time Period		t	df
	Time 1	Time 2		
Verbal Bullying	9.5 (2.5)	9.7 (2.4)	-1.2	102
Physical Bullying	7.4 (1.0)	7.5 (1.0)	-1.2	101
Teacher-Student Relationship	7.7 (3.2)	7.8 (2.8)	-.59	97
Student's Participation	11.7 (2.0)	11.8 (2.0)	-.31	99
Exclusion	3.3 (.94)	3.5 (.89)	-2.4	103*
Demolishing	3.7 (.58)	3.8 (.46)	-.66	100
Origin	3.3 (.94)	3.4 (.89)	-1.2	102
Vandalism	2.8 (1.0)	2.9 (1.0)	-.93	101
Blackmailing	3.8 (.44)	3.9 (.31)	-1.1	102
Weapons Threats	3.8 (.49)	3.8 (.42)	-.53	102
Class Cohesion	3.8 (.55)	3.8 (.50)	-.40	102

Note. * = $p \leq .05$. Standard Deviation appears in parentheses below means.

TABLE 3
RESULTS OF THE INDEPENDENT SAMPLES T-TEST

	GPI Category		t	df
	Lower	Upper		
Verbal Bullying Pre	9.1 (2.2)	11.5 (1.0)	-3.3	19*
Verbal Bullying Post	8.5 (2.6)	11.2 (.95)	-3.2	19*
Physical Bullying Pre	7.5 (3.2)	8.0 (2.8)	-2.3	19*
Physical Bullying Post	7.5 (.94)	8.0 (.00)	-2.0	19*

Note. * = $p \leq .05$. Standard Deviation appears in parentheses below means.

H2: The Mythodrama crisis intervention program proves to be effective in reducing frequency of Physical Bullying among middle school students.

A paired-samples t-test was conducted to compare the frequency of Physical Bullying at Time 1 (pre-intervention) and Time 2 (post-intervention). There was not a significant difference in the frequency of physical bullying experienced by participants at Time 1 (M=7.4, SD=1.0) and Time 2 (M=7.5, SD=1.0): $t = -1.2$, $\alpha = .221$. These results suggest that the Mythodrama intervention in this case does not really have an impact on the frequency of Physical Bullying (see Table 2).

An independent-samples t-test showed that there was a significant difference in the frequency of Physical Bullying experienced by participants at pre-test with a low GPI score (M= 7.5, SD= 3.2) and upper GPI score (M= 8.0, SD= 2.8): $t = -2.3$, $\alpha = .03$. These results suggest that students with lower GPI score may be at greater risk for experiencing Physical Bullying (see Table 3). In addition, a second independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare the frequency of Physical Bullying experienced by participants at post-test with a low GPI score (M= 7.5, SD= .94) and upper GPI score (M=7.5, SD=.00):

$t = -2.0$, $\alpha = .05$ (see Table 3). When controlling for gender and class period, the results still showed was not a significant difference in the frequency of Verbal Bullying.

H3: The Mythodrama crisis intervention program proves to be effective in increasing the Quality of Teacher-Student Relationships among middle school students.

A paired-samples t-test was conducted to compare the quality of Teacher-Student Relationships at Time 1 (pre-intervention) and Time 2 (post-intervention). There was not a significant difference in the quality of Teacher-Student Relationships experienced by participants at Time 1 ($M = 7.7$, $SD = 3.2$) and Time 2 ($M = 7.8$, $SD = 2.8$): $t = -.59$, $\alpha = .751$. These results suggest that the Mythodrama intervention in this case does not really have an impact on the quality of teacher-student relationships (see Table 2). When controlling for gender, class period, and level of reasoning ability, the results still showed was not a significant difference in the quality of relationships.

H4: The Mythodrama crisis intervention program proves to be effective in increasing School Participation among middle school students.

A paired-samples t-test was conducted to compare the level of student participation in school at Time 1 (pre-intervention) and Time 2 (post-intervention). There was not a significant difference in the level of student participant in school reported by participants at Time 1 ($M = 11.7$, $SD = 2.0$) and Time 2 ($M = 11.8$, $SD = 2.0$): $t = -2.4$, $\alpha = .556$. These results suggest that the Mythodrama intervention in this case does not really have an impact on the level of student participation in school (see Table 2). When controlling for gender, class period, and level of reasoning ability, the results still showed was not a significant difference in the quality of relationships.

H5: The Mythodrama crisis intervention program proves to be effective in decreasing Exclusion among middle school students.

A paired-samples t-test was conducted to compare the frequency of Exclusion in school at Time 1 (pre-intervention) and Time 2 (post-intervention). There was a significant difference in the frequency of Exclusion in school reported by participants at Time 1 (M= 3.3, SD= .94) and Time 2 (M= 3.5, SD=.89): $t = -2.4$, $\alpha = .018$. These results suggest that the Mythodrama intervention in the case of the current study does have an impact on the frequency of Exclusion experienced by participants (see Table 2). When controlling for gender, class period, and level of reasoning ability, the results still showed was not a significant difference in the quality of relationships.

H6: The Mythodrama crisis intervention program proves to be effective in decreasing Demolishing among middle school students.

A paired-samples t-test was conducted to compare the frequency of Demolishing of personal belongings at Time 1 (pre-intervention) and Time 2 (post-intervention). There was not a significant difference in the frequency of demolishing reported by participants at Time 1 (M= 3.7, SD=.58) and Time 2 (M= 3.8, SD= .46): $t = -.66$, $\alpha = .508$. These results suggest that the Mythodrama intervention in this case does not really have an impact on the frequency of demolishing experienced by participants(see Table 2). When controlling for gender, class period, and level of reasoning ability, the results still showed was not a significant difference in the quality of relationships.

H7: The Mythodrama crisis intervention program proves to be effective in decreasing negative nicknames calling (Origin) among middle school students.

A paired-samples t-test was conducted to compare the frequency of being called nick-names (Origin) at Time 1 (pre-intervention) and Time 2 (post-intervention). There was not a significant difference in the frequency of nick-name calling reported by participants at Time 1 (M= 3.3, SD= .94) and Time 2 (M= 3.4, SD= .89): $t = -1.2$, $\alpha =$

.197. These results suggest that the Mythodrama intervention in this case does not really have an impact on the frequency of nick-name calling experienced by participants (see Table 2). When controlling for gender, class period, and level of reasoning ability, the results still showed was not a significant difference in the quality of relationships.

H8: The Mythodrama crisis intervention program proves to be effective in decreasing vandalism in school.

A paired-samples t-test was conducted to compare the frequency of vandalism in school at Time 1 (pre-intervention) and Time 2 (post-intervention). There was not a significant difference in the frequency of vandalism observed by participants at Time 1 ($M= 2.8, SD= 1.0$) and Time 2 ($M= 2.9, SD= 1.0$): $t= -.93, \alpha = .351$. These results suggest that the Mythodrama intervention in this case does not really have an impact on the frequency of vandalism in school (see Table 2). When controlling for gender, class period, and level of reasoning ability, the results still showed was not a significant difference in the quality of relationships.

H9: The Mythodrama crisis intervention program proves to be effective in decreasing Blackmailing among middle school students.

A paired-samples t-test was conducted to compare the frequency of being blackmailed at Time 1 (pre-intervention) and Time 2 (post-intervention). There was not a significant difference in the frequency of being blackmailed reported by participants at Time 1 ($M= 3.8, SD=.44$) and Time 2 ($M= 3.9, SD= .31$): $t= -1.1, \alpha = .253$. These results suggest that the Mythodrama intervention in this case does not really have an impact on the frequency of blackmailing experienced by participants (see Table 2). When controlling for gender, class period, and level of reasoning ability, the results still showed was not a significant difference in the quality of relationships.

H10: The Mythodrama crisis intervention program proves to be effective in decreasing frequency of Weapons Threats among middle school students.

A paired-samples t-test was conducted to compare the frequency of being threatened with weapons at Time 1 (pre-intervention) and Time 2 (post-intervention). There was not a significant difference in the frequency of being threatened reported by participants at Time 1 ($M=3.8$, $SD=.49$) and Time 2 ($M=3.8$, $SD=.42$): $t=-.53$, $\alpha=.592$. These results suggest that the Mythodrama intervention in this case does not really have an impact on the frequency of being threatened by weapons experienced by participants (see Table 2). When controlling for gender, class period, and level of reasoning ability, the results still showed was not a significant difference in the quality of relationships.

H11: The Mythodrama crisis intervention program proves to be effective in increasing Class Cohesion among middle school students.

A paired-samples t-test was conducted to compare the quality of Class Cohesion at Time 1 (pre-intervention) and Time 2 (post-intervention). There was not a significant difference in the quality of Class Cohesion reported by participants at Time 1 ($M=3.8$, $SD=.55$) and Time 2 ($M=3.8$, $SD=.50$): $t=-.40$, $\alpha=.685$ (see Table 2). When controlling for gender, class period, and level of reasoning ability, the results still showed was not a significant difference in the quality of relationships.

Student Report on Program Effectiveness

For question #1 (Are things different for you in class since the intervention?") 37% of participants reported no difference, 9.5% reported very positive changes, and 53% reported some positive changes. Chi-square tests were used to examine the associations between respondent's race, class period, level of information processing, and

question #1. Chi-square tests did not detect a statistically significant association between respondent's gender and question #1.

For question #2 ("How does the class run now?"), 32% reported no difference, 11% said the class clearly ran better, and 56% said it ran somewhat better. Chi-square tests did not detect a statistically significant association between respondent's gender and question #2.

For question #3 ("Has your teacher changed since the intervention?"), 45% reported no difference, 8.5% said they saw very positive changes in their teacher, and 46% said they saw some positive changes. Chi-square tests did not detect a statistically significant association between respondent's gender and question #3.

For question #4 ("Has the attitude in your class changed?"), 23% reported no difference, 2% reported some negative change, 81% said they saw very positive changes in their teacher, and 64% said they saw some positive changes. Chi-square tests did not detect a statistically significant association between respondent's gender and question #4.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

This project was designed to assess the efficacy of the Mythodrama crisis intervention method that was developed by Dr. Allan Guggenbuhl.

Of the 11 hypotheses tested, only one (Exclusion) resulted in a statistically significant difference. However, it is important to note two observations about the present study: (a) the frequency of most types of bullying and conflict were generally low prior to the start of the intervention, and (b) even though frequency was low, improvements were experienced in all categories moving in the desired clinical direction. In addition, participants reported that post-intervention, the classroom environment improved in a very practically significant way. Thus, while most of the hypotheses were rejected, there was still some evidence demonstrating the effectiveness of the Mythodrama intervention

Interestingly there were minor differences in the amount of bullying and violence experienced depending on level of information processing ability. Although the variation is not statistically significant, students with lower levels of processing ability were likely to report experiencing more verbal and physical bullying whereas students with higher ability reported fewer incidences of both types of bullying.

During the 3 months of the intervention, the process became important to the students and they were eager to participate. The intervention seemed to give a voice to the frustrations that students have regarding the expression of their opinions. Their interest is demonstrated not only anecdotally but statistically. Regarding items in the survey that assessed students' mood and general disposition about their school, on average students reported that they had less fear and felt better about their school during the post intervention survey than they had during the pre-intervention survey. Students reported improved relationships with their teachers and with other students. They also provided a higher ranking for how they saw their class working at the post-intervention survey.

In written comments, students shared their thoughts about violence and their fascination with it; how violence stirs their imaginations and how it was exciting to watch. At the outset of the study they could not make the psychological connection between violent actions they witness occurring to others and the notion that, if they are not intervening in bullying, they are in some way tacitly supporting it. Students who participated in the intervention came to understand that allowing or ignoring bullying helped to foster its continuation.

Discussion in the intervention began with the participating students focused on the ways differentiation occurs between those in the "in-group" and those in the "out-group." Students talked about cleanliness, grooming and fashion as differentiators. Being well groomed and fashionable was seen as an "in-group" characteristic, whereas paying too much attention to the dress code (e.g., boys wearing their pants high at the waist) is an "out-group" signifier. Caring about one's grades was seen as an "in-group"

signifier. Other “out-group” signifiers were related to attitude. The use of words like “goofy,” “weird” or “yelling at people’s faces” are considered attitude-related signifiers of “out-group” status. Having friends and/or girlfriends/boyfriends signified “in-group” status.

During the intervention the facilitator explained that, because conforming to one’s peers is privileged in this age range, those who develop more slowly, or who come later to an enhanced awareness of what it takes to conform, become targets of those who are more aware of their surroundings and their peers. Because disapproval can cause loss of status, when “in-group” members feel uncomfortable with how they look, feel, or think, they must protect themselves. Their tendency is to project that perceived flaw in themselves onto an “out-group” member, then chastise that scapegoat. Various cases of scapegoating were identified by the participants, ranging from localized school bullying incidents (when people are ostracized, jokes told at a student’s expense, pranks played on one student by another) to more extreme cases of genocide (Holocaust, Rwanda) followed by the notion that whole groups affect the thinking of the individual.

During the intervention, the facilitator increased student awareness about the powerful influence that they have as a group. Looking at the ratio of students to teachers, as well as the ratio of bullying peers to non-bullying peers, students recognized that their “inside” perspective enabled them to see more of what is going on than teachers or administrators. Students observed that rules change over time based on how well they work and whether students follow them or not. Using the example of Mahatma Gandhi’s non-violent efforts that drove the British Empire from India was of particular interest to this group. Students learned that if they want a school that is more welcoming and

agreeable, one with less violence, they have the ability to unite for the purpose of making that change.

The discussion gained momentum when the classroom teacher joined by offering her own behavior for examination:

Teacher: “Why do you think kids are picked on here? Raise your hand if you’ve ever been picked on before!”

Facilitator: (prompting responses) “None of these kids have ever been picked on before...”

Teacher: “I know more than that because I’ve picked on some of you myself!

Student to Teacher: “You slapped me on the back of my head but I wasn’t listening.”

Teacher: “So that makes it ok?”

Student: “Well, I wasn’t listening...but it was a Cheap Shot!”

Teacher: “It was a cheap shot! So, why do people get picked on?”

Using this example as a launching point, classroom discussion shifted to the subject of that which people are consciously aware of concerning their own behaviors and reactions to the experience or witnessing of bullying and violence. The new focus enabled students to explore the idea of developing greater consciousness of their own attitudes and behaviors. They became aware of the tendency to become increasingly desensitized to violence over time.

The teacher related another story of a student who did not like what another student wrote in a paper. The first student expressed his displeasure by grabbing the paper out of the writer’s hand, crumpling it up, and tossing it across the room. In the teacher’s view this was a violent act. The group expanded the discussion by observing how laughter can be a weapon and why witnessing an act without stopping it is tantamount to approval.

Facilitator: “OK, so in defining violence, we get desensitized. Unless somebody shoots somebody, we don’t think of it as violence. Because of this desensitization, somebody might kick somebody else or push them into the wall saying, “Oops! My fault. I was just kidding!”

Male Student: “Would it be ok to laugh at the kid who came up and showed you the kid that fell and tripped on their face?”

Facilitator: “It’s generally okay to laugh. The only problem with it is that sometimes laughing encourages bad behavior.”

Male Student continues: “No, wait...it’s...”

Facilitator: “A comedian can make jokes and people can laugh. As long as you know you’re going to a show and you’re seeing a comedian. If somebody’s running down the stairs and the kid in front of them puts out their leg, and they fall down the stairs, it might look funny”

Male student interrupts: “You know it’s really sad, but funny.”

Facilitator: “It might look funny that this kid crumbled on the floor, but let’s think of it another way. You could have been the person who was running in the front...”

Female Student: “Ok, so if you laugh at the guy, but you go and help him up, is that ok?”

Facilitator: “What I’m asking is, are you encouraging that person who kicked or tripped the guy? Is this behavior that should be discouraged?”

Facilitator: [mugs] “Oh, yeah that’s pretty funny!” If you make two kids fall at the same time, I’ll laugh even harder!’ Now you’re participating and you’re no longer being a passive observer. What if you’re coming around and you saw somebody...you laughed and then you went to help them up and said, “Sorry that was funny but are you ok?’ There’s a problem with that, yes?”

Male student: “So is it okay to laugh if you don’t laugh until you ask them if they’re ok...and then if they start laughing...is it ok to laugh with them?”

Facilitator: “I said it’s always ok to laugh as long as you know what you are doing. I’m saying be conscious of what you are doing. Ok? So, if I slapped you and everybody laughed [students begin to laugh and giggle] did my behavior make me look big because you looked silly? Maybe it was uncalled for.

Some people take behavior that embarrasses them as someone wanting them to fall; like they want you to get hurt because they are entertaining everybody. I mean Jim Carey does it all the time, but that’s the movies. But, what happens at school is that kids take advantage of other kids and they become the butt of the jokes. Right?

[A single “Uh huh” is heard from one of the students.]

Story and myth are used prominently in this segment of the intervention as a way to frame or make conscious a problem with which students may struggle to come to consciousness. Discomfort with acknowledging these self reflections make it difficult to bring to light even more subtle forms of intimidation. Part of generating this recognition includes awareness that those who are thriving in the system are unlikely to want things to change and are often those who are doing the bullying. Expanding the understanding of the students helps them to comprehend the social complexities. Even understanding how calling someone a “snitch” when they threaten to out a bully is another way of using power and retains the status quo.

The intervention begins by using myths and stories much more iconic and removed from the students’ day-to-day reality, but eventually uses material that brings them closer to the experience of people they know well. In one instance, the teacher, told a story of her own experience. She told the students about being bullied in high school, what occurred, how she handled it, and what the long term consequences have been for her as an adult.

The teacher explained that she’d been singled out and ostracized by a group of popular girls who taped chocolate covered dog biscuits to her locker and began referring to her as “bitch.” Not only did other kids, join in the teasing, but her best friend, concerned that she would become a target as well, chose to stop spending time with her... The teacher shared that, while taunting was hard, losing her best friend was devastating.

Clearly, the students were able to relate to their teacher’s experience and began sharing some stories of their own. The stories they related and the discussions that

followed indicated a beginning awareness of the power of the by-stander or the power of the group to exert influence. In the small group format, students demonstrated an understanding of the teacher's experience by talking about their experiences of being bullied and shunned. Others in the group were able to see the power they had to they relieved the situation. Not allowing the "shunning," for example, might have been accomplished by inviting the person to sit with friends at lunch. The discussions made the students aware of the feelings of both victim and bully. The guided discussion that followed made conscious the conclusion that their power lies not in exclusion but in the ability to unite around a common cause. Coming to comprehend the strength of the group to negate the effectiveness of bullies brought to awareness the recognition that with power comes responsibility. The authority that is the result of using power to evoke respect could be clearly differentiated from using violence for purposes of intimidation.

Next the discussion turned to the kinds of changes that the students wanted. They focused on serious substantive changes (e.g., how to deal with grievances rather than how high or low one can wear one's pants). Ultimately, students identified that substantive problems exist, planned to address them, and discussed recommendations to bring to the faculty and administration in order to help address those issues. The facilitator passed these ideas to the administration and faculty hoping to spark a dialogue about mutually addressing these issues.

Toward the end of the intervention, participants wrote critiques of both the research and the researcher. The majority of complaints were centered on classmates who were perceived as either participating too much, or not at all. Several participants indicated that the researcher interrupted students too often during the intervention.

There were limitations inherent in the study that also bears mention. Ideally an intervention like this one would occur over the course of an entire school year, in all classrooms, and in several different schools. This particular study included 106 students who volunteered for the study and it took place over an eight week period. There were a total of 16 sessions. The students came from their regular classes or lunch and would leave the project to go to other classes. The principal popped in a few times to say hi and demonstrate interest, but otherwise never interfered with the groups. Despite the interest shown in the project by most everyone, the counseling department proved to be an exception. In the three months I was at the school neither the counselors nor the school social worker introduced themselves. Their lack of interest may have been another limitation because the lines of communication were obstructed so that findings and feedback could not be transmitted.

The primary reason that the mythodrama method has been successful is that it provides a vehicle for students to confront and address aspects of their unconscious, reflecting a darker part of the self (what Jung would call “the shadow”) in the context of story within a group setting. These darker aspects of the adolescent psyche are not typically allowed to be expressed in a school setting. According to Jung, “all psychic content of which we are not yet conscious appears in projected form as the supposed properties of outer objects” (1959). The more adolescents’ shadow aspects are repressed, the more these aspects are attributed to “the other” and acted out among their peers and with the adults in their lives. It is this addressing of the shadow in the mythodrama method that helps bring into the conscious mind darker aspects adolescents might otherwise project onto their peers. According to Marie Louise Von Franz, “In this process, the unconscious of the projector does not as a rule pick just

any object at all, but rather one that has some or even a great deal of the character of the projected property” (1993). This means that adolescents view their peers as projected aspects of themselves. An adolescent projects the shadow into other adolescents, who are in many ways like himself. This explains why those who bully their peers see themselves as victims rather than as victimizers. The mythodrama method reveals the fantasy behind the reality, forcing the adolescent to look in the mirror and recollect the projection.

Despite the time frame for the intervention in this study being short, it is possible that the statistical improvements are the result of actual reductions in bullying and/or harassment in school. However, given that the category “Never” on the Likert scale of the intervention was selected more often post –intervention than pre-intervention, one might also conclude that a benefit of the intervention was to provide clarity about what actions constitute harassment and bullying. Students may have developed more ability to determine whether they were indeed victims of harassment.

CHAPTER VI

REFLECTIONS TOWARD FURTHER STUDY

This intervention, however briefly it was tested for this study, is very important in the way it helps students and teachers express their opinions regarding harassment and bullying at their school. The particulars of class size and intervention session time for this study lead this writer to conclude that in future interventions there should be no more than 5-6 participants per group. This smaller group would allow ample space and time for all to be heard. Multiple researchers might be required to properly conduct an expanded version of the intervention.

This intervention showed how important it is for students' voices to be heard in regard to violence and bullying at their school. Because they are at the center of the violence that occurs at their school, they are best positioned to provide effective resolutions to limit it. A benefit of this research is that it demonstrates an effective technique for violence intervention. The bottom-up rather than top-down approach, illustrates the importance of engaging and listening to the adolescents themselves. They are most able to provide effective strategies to resolve problems with violence and harassment that are occurring in their lives.

Several examples were given by the participants in this study regarding what they would like to see as rules in their school toward preventing violence and bullying. As

much as they felt that they required more freedom (e.g., no dress code, longer passing time between periods, less time on campus, etc.) almost all of the participants included some rules regarding zero tolerance for harassment, bullying and vandalism by their colleagues. Certainly some outlandish and ridiculous suggestions were also made (e.g., petting zoo, coming to class naked, etc.) to the “school rules” discussion, but these are not unexpected as they are age appropriate responses. That said the overriding theme of students who gathered in groups of five to write rules wrote about respect for oneself and respect for others. They also wrote about the importance of stopping incidents of bullying, violence and harassment that occur in their school. In some cases the rules generated by the students were stricter than any the administration might have already created. Their assertiveness indicates that this is a serious issue about which they are deeply concerned and eager to be heard.

This study suggests the importance of having clinical social workers at schools, working with groups of students as well as individuals, to raise awareness of what constitutes violence, harassment, bullying and vandalism, and to create an ongoing dialogue about the best strategies to prevent and arrest violence in schools. It also suggests two new directions for research, as well as an expansion of the existing study. As to new directions, I was surprised by two things in executing this intervention. First, I was surprised that the existing school social workers did not interact with me or show interest in the study that was occurring. It would be interesting to look further into why that occurred and to determine how to effectively add a module that would get them further engaged in what was occurring so that they could, over the long term, reinforce and support the positive change that the mythodrama method engenders in the short term.

Secondly, it was interesting to me how the teacher's input - both in sharing stories about her experience with bullying and in sharing her conscious understanding of how she addresses bullying among her students – fueled both discussion and recognition among the students throughout the intervention in ways that led to increased consciousness among the students. We were fortunate to have such a productive exchange, but I recognize it might not be thus. It would be interesting to incorporate a parallel introduction to the mythodrama method for teachers to reduce their anxiety about the intervention, help them identify ways to be catalysts for student discussion, and help identify and address instances in which their own colleagues are the ones doing the bullying.

Since certain aspects of this study suggest that a bottom up method of intervention can be successful, further study appears warranted. The duration of this study was short, thus a study that would follow a group of students in this intervention over a period of a year or several years is likely to reveal richer data. The effectiveness of this study stems from listening to those who are affected by violence and bullying on a daily basis to understand the genesis and impact of violence and bullying in schools. Clearly, a simple, “no tolerance” policy is not effective and top down approaches, wherein a small group of educators and administrators tries to regulate the behavior of a large group of students, are equally wanting. What we see is that the majority in schools, which is the students, are much more affected by their own peer interaction than they are by the behavior or rules of the adults in their midst. Thus, it is most effective to help the children and adolescents in schools understand how they affect and can help each other, in terms of violence prevention and bullying, and then augment that intervention with school rules and regulations.

In the school utilized in this study, the ratio of students to administrators and faculty is 15 to 1, (1500 students to 100 educators) including only 8th and 9th graders. In schools where three or more grade levels are present, the ratios are more commonly 30 to 1, or 60 to 1. Due to these ratios it is almost impossible to successfully implement top down intervention strategies. The only truly effective intervention involves empowering students to understand their own fantasies of violence, power and control toward other students. The Mythodrama method is successful in helping students understand their unconscious, how it affects others and how it affects oneself.

REFERENCES

- August, G. J., Realmuto, G.M., Hektner, J.M. Hektner, & Bloomquist, M.L. (2001). An integrated components preventive intervention for aggressive elementary school children: The Early Risers Program. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 69*: 614–26.
- Blomfield, O.H. (1991). Anna Freud: Creativity, compassion, discipline. *International Review of Psycho-Analysis, 18*:37-52
- Flannery, D.J., Vazsonyi, A.T., Liau, A.K., Guo, S., Powell, K.E., Atha, H., Vesterdal, W., & Embry, D. (2003). Initial behavior outcomes for the peace builders universal school-based violence prevention program. *Developmental Psychology, 39*(2):292-308
- Fonagy, P., Moran, G. S., & Target, M. (1993). Aggression and the psychological self. *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis, 74*: 471-485.
- Greenacre, P. (1970) Youth, growth, and violence. *Psychoanalytic Study of the Child, 25*: 340-350
- Guggenbühl, A. (1993). *Incredible fascination of violence: Dealing with aggression and brutality among children*. Spring Publications: Woodstock, CT.
- Guggenbühl, A. (1998). *Men, powers, myths*. Zurich: Raven row, IKM Guggenbühl AG.
- Guggenbühl, A. (1999). *Mythodrama*. Zurich: Edition IKM, Zurich.
- Hastings P.D., Zahn-Waxler, C., Robinson, J., Usher, B., Bridges, D. (2000). The development of concern for others in children with behavior problems. *Developmental Psychology, 36* (5), 531-546.
- Hübner, Kurt. (1985). *The truth of the myth*. Munich: Baker.
- Ialongo, N., Poduska, J., Werthamer, L., & Kellam, S. (2001). The distal impact of two first-grade preventive interventions on conduct problems and disorders in early adolescence, *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 9*, (3), 146-160.
- Jung, Carl. (1979.) On the psychology of the unconscious. In Carl Jung, *Collected works of C.G. Jung*, (Vol. 7, p. 187). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University. (Original work published in 1912.)

- Jung, Carl. (1979). The structure and dynamics of the psyche. In Carl Jung, *Collected works of C.G. Jung*, (Vol. 8). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University. (Original work published in 1912.)
- Jung, Carl. (1979). Psychology and religion, West and East. In Carl Jung, *Collected works of C.G. Jung*, (Vol. 11, p. 140. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University. (Original work published in 1938.)
- Jung, Carl (1979). Psychology and alchemy. In Carl Jung, *Collected works of C.G. Jung*, (Vol. 12). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University. (Original work published in 1944.)
- Jung, Carl. (1979) The psychology of the child archetype: The archetypes and the collective unconscious. In Carl Jung, *Collected works of C.G. Jung*, (Vol. 9, Part I, p. 187). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University. (Original work published in 1940.)
- Jung, Carl. (1981) The development of personality: Papers on child psychology, education and related subjects. In Carl Jung, *Collected works of C.G. Jung*, (Vol. 17). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University.
- Kokko, K., & Pulkkinen, L. (2000). Aggression in childhood and long-term unemployment in adulthood: A cycle of maladaptation and some protective factors. *Developmental Psychology*, 36(4), 463-472.
- Kruk, M.R., Meelis, W., Halasz, J. & Haller, J. (2004). Fast positive feedback: The adrenocortical stress response and a brain mechanism involved in aggressive behavior. *Behavioral Neuroscience*, 118(5), 1062-1070.
- Marohn, R.C. (1993). Rage without Content. *Progress in Self Psychology*, 9: 129-142.
- Miller, W.A. (1981). *Make friends with your shadow: How to accept and use positively the negative side of your personality*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House.
- Mitchell, S.A. (1993). Aggression and the endangered self. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, 62: 351-383.
- MSNBC.com. *Crime & courts: 10 myths about school shootings*. Retrieved from www.msnbc.msn.com/id/15111438/
- Rank, B. (1949). Aggression. *Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*, 3: 43-49.
- Rubin, A. & Babbie, E. (2001). *Research methods for social work*. (4th edition). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- School shootings, school violence*. Retrieved from www2.indystar.com/library/factfiles/crime/school_violence/school_shootings.html

- Shure, M.B., and Spivack, G. (1980). Interpersonal problem solving as a mediator of behavioral adjustment in preschool and kindergarten children. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 1*:29-43.
- Singer, T. (Ed). (2000). *The vision thing: Myths, politics and psyche in the word*. London: Routledge.
- Stein, M. (1998). *Jung's Map of the Soul*. Chicago: Open Court Publishing.
- Stevens, A. (1990). *On Jung*. London: Routledge.
- Stoolmiller, M., Eddy, M.J., & Reid, J.B. (2000). Detecting and Describing Preventive Intervention Effects in a Universal School-Based Randomized Trial Targeting Delinquent and Violent Behavior. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 68*(2), 296-306.
- Storr, A. (1983). *The Essential Jung*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Infoplease.com. Time Line of Worldwide School Shootings. Retrieved from www.infoplease.com/ipa/A0777958.html
- Twemlow, S.W. (1995). The psychoanalytical foundations of a dialectical approach to the victim/victimizer relationship. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychoanalysis, 23* (4), 545-562.
- Twemlow, S.W. (1995). Traumatic object relations configurations seen in victim/victimizer relationship. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychoanalysis, 23* (4), 563-577.
- Twemlow, S.W. (2000). The roots of violence: Converging psychoanalytic explanatory models for power struggles and violence. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly, 69* (4), 741-786.
- Twemlow, S. W., Fonagy, P., Sacco, F. C., Gies, M., Evans, R. & Ewbank, R. (2001). Creating a peaceful school learning environment: a controlled study of an elementary school intervention to reduce violence. *American Journal of Psychiatry, 158*: 808-810.
- Von Franz, M-L. (1993). *Psycho-therapy*. Boston: Shambhala Publications.

APPENDIX A

PRE-TEST

ID Number:

Conflict Management Study
Institute for Conflict Management

Pre-test A

Dear Student;

I am interested in certain situations that have occurred in your school or your class. In order to understand these situations better, I am inquiring about your personal experiences related to power and harassment. When I use the word power I believe it takes many different forms. Hitting is, of course, included, but I also include teasing, breaking or defacing things.

Your teacher will not be allowed to see this questionnaire and the researcher keeps all copies off school grounds in a locked cabinet. Your open and honest answers to the questions are important.

Your name is written with pencil in the small box "ID number." When you return the survey a number will be substituted for your name. No one, not even the researcher, can know, the identity of any student responding to the questionnaire.

Thanks so much for your assistance!

Information About You

School: Class: Today's date:Date of birth: I am a: Boy Girl *(please circle one)*

Look around the school room and look closely at your classmates. Then complete to the following questions.

When I look at my classmates, I think...

If someone from outer space came to our class, they would see...

Imagine a miracle happened and your three biggest wishes came true! Which three wishes would you have made?

How do you usually feel at school? Enter a number between 1 and 6, with 1 meaning terrible and 6 meaning fantastic.

Which of the following list of incidents have affected you most often?

Incidents (<i>check the most appropriate box below</i>)	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Never
1. You are insulted or offended by another student				
2. You are called by insulting nicknames				
3. You are laughed at by other students				
4. You are excluded				
5. Your objects are destroyed or defaced				
6. You are hit or attacked physically by other students				
7. You have injuries or pains from fights with other students				
8. You are threatened with weapons				
9. You are a target because of your nickname				
10. Your school or other place is vandalized				
11. You are blackmailed by other students				

What is the worst thing that has ever happened concerning you in or around the school?

How did you react?

- I did nothing
- I told a teacher
- I called someone else for help
- I physically defended myself
- I verbally defended myself
- I left
- other: _____
- I don't know
- I don't understand the question

How did your classmates react?

- They did nothing
- They told a teacher
- They helped
- They called someone else for help
- other: _____
- I don't know
- I don't understand the question

How did your teacher react?

- He/she did nothing
- He/she discussed it with me
- He/she got angry
- He/she distributed punishment
- other: _____
- I don't know
- I don't understand the question

Mood in your class

How do you judge the relationships or the cohesion in your class?

- no cohesion within the class
 little cohesion within the class
 rather good cohesion of the class
 very good cohesion of the class

Please circle the number that corresponds with your ranking for each question

The mood in our class is mostly...

cheerful, happy hearted	1	2	3	4	5	low-spirited, half-	hearted
----------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	------------------------	---------

without fear	1	2	3	4	5	fear-occupied
--------------	---	---	---	---	---	---------------

Our teachers are generally...

understanding	1	2	3	4	5	unfriendly
---------------	---	---	---	---	---	------------

tolerant	1	2	3	4	5	rigid
----------	---	---	---	---	---	-------

engaged	1	2	3	4	5	distant
---------	---	---	---	---	---	---------

As a student at our school...

We are included made in decisions input		1	2	3	4	5	Decisions are without my
--	--	---	---	---	---	---	-----------------------------

We may be are Asked our opinion		1	2	3	4	5	Our opinions unwelcome
---------------------------------------	--	---	---	---	---	---	---------------------------

11. Please mark the extent to which the statement applies to you!

Statement	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Sometimes, Sometimes Not	Agree	Strongly Agree
There is a good relationship between teachers and students in our school					
Parents often participate in school events					
We are allowed to give our ideas about school events like excursions and theatrical performances.					
At our school you can do something crazy as long as there are no one gets hurt.					
I like it at our school					
Teachers are not interested in the opinions of students.					
We are allowed to have our say at school					
Our school has a good reputation					

APPENDIX B**POST-TEST**

ID Number:

Conflict Management Study
Institute for Conflict Management

Post-test A

Dear Student;

I have been with you, in your classroom for two weeks. I am interested in how your opinions about the situation in your classroom have changed since we began. Therefore, I will repeat the same questions I did at the beginning of the intervention.

Once again, your teacher will not be permitted to see this questionnaire and the researcher keeps all copies off school grounds in a locked cabinet. We do this because your open and honest opinions are important to us.

Your name is written with pencil in the small box "ID number." When you return the survey we will substitute your name with a number so that even we do not know anymore who has filled this questionnaire.

Many thanks for your assistance!

Information About You

School:

Class:

Today's date:

Date of birth:

I am a: Boy Girl (please circle one)

Why do you think I came to visit your class?

Your Class

Look around the classroom and look closely at your classmates. Then complete the following questions.

Which three wishes have come true for you during these past two months?

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

How do you usually feel at school? Enter a number between 1 and 6, with 1 meaning terrible and 6 meaning fantastic.



Which of the following list of incidents have affected you and how often since the intervention began?

Incidents (<i>check the most appropriate box below</i>)	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Never
You are insulted or offended by another student				
You are called by insulting nicknames				
You are laughed at by other students				
You are excluded				
Your objects are destroyed or defaced				
You are hit or attacked physically by other students				
You have injuries or pains from fights with other students				
You are threatened with weapons				
You are the target because of your nickname				
Your school or other place is vandalized				
You are blackmailed by other students				

Where do these incidents occur?

Location	Often	Sometimes	Seldom	Never
In the classroom				
On the playground/break area				
In the bathroom, coatroom or other				
On the way to school				

11. Was the intervention helpful to you when were faced with a new incident?*(please circle your answer)*

Yes

No

If yes, what occurred?

12. How did you react?

- I did nothing
 I told a teacher
 I called someone else for help
 I physically defended myself
 I verbally defended myself
 I left
 other: _____
 I don't know I don't understand the question

13. How did your classmates react?

- They did nothing
 They told a teacher
 They helped
 They called someone else for help
 other: _____
 I don't know I don't understand the question

14. How did the teacher react?

- He/she did nothing
 He/she discussed it with me
 He/she got angry
 He/she distributed punishment
 other: _____
 I don't know I don't understand the question

Mood in your class

15. How do you judge the attitude or the cohesion in your class?

- no cohesion within the class
 little cohesion within the class
 rather good cohesion of the class
 very good cohesion of the class

Please circle the number that corresponds with your ranking for each question

16. The mood in our class is mostly...

cheerful, happy hearted	1	2	3	4	5	low-spirited, half-	hearted
----------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	------------------------	---------

without fear	1	2	3	4	5	fear-occupied
--------------	---	---	---	---	---	---------------

17. Our teachers are generally...

understanding	1	2	3	4	5	unfriendly
---------------	---	---	---	---	---	------------

tolerant	1	2	3	4	5	rigid
----------	---	---	---	---	---	-------

engaged	1	2	3	4	5	distant
---------	---	---	---	---	---	---------

18. As a student at our school...

We are excluded included in decisions							we are from decisions
		1	2	3	4	5	

We may be are Asked our opinion							Our opinions unwelcome
		1	2	3	4	5	

19. Please mark the extent to which the statement applies to you!

Statement	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Sometimes, Sometimes Not	Agree	Strongly Agree
There is a good relationship between teachers and students in our school.					
Parents often participate in school events.					
We are allowed to give our ideas about school events like excursions and theatrical performances.					
At our school you can do something crazy as long as no one gets hurt.					
I like it at our school.					
Teachers are not interested in the opinions of students.					
We are allowed to have our say at school					
Our school has a good reputation					

20. What changes did you decide you wanted to make for yourself during the intervention? In each case, indicate whether you have already made the change.

a) _____

already changed partially changed haven't changed

b) _____

already changed partially changed haven't changed

c) _____

already changed partially changed haven't changed

Are things different for you in class since the intervention?

- Yes very positive change
- Yes, some positive change
- No difference
- Some negative change
- Very negative change

How does the class run now?

- Clearly better
- Somewhat better
- No difference
- Somewhat worse
- Clearly worse

Has your teacher changed?

- Yes very positive change
- Yes, some positive change
- No difference
- Some negative change
- Very negative change

24. Has the attitude in your class changed during the last three months?

- Yes very positive change
- Yes, some positive change
- No difference
- Some negative change
- Very negative change

25. Would you like to tell us anything else?

APPENDIX C

CPI FORM

PART II:

For the following 40 items rate yourself (your child/student) based upon information from any reliable source (i.e. direct observation, interview, assessment data, etc.). Use the following scale to circle a number from 1 to 5 to the right of each item. Use "3" if uncertain.

Obvious Difficulty 1	Apparent Weakness 2	Average or Uncertain 3	Not a Problem 4	Obvious Strength 5
1. Ability to understand or remember questions, directions or verbal instructions. Like when at teacher is just lecturing without any charts or pictures		1 2 3 4 5	21. Verbal speed – ability to talk quickly and clearly	1 2 3 4 5
2. Ability to remember the names of new people that you (he/she) meet(s).		1 2 3 4 5	22. Verbal fluency without noticeable pauses or groping for words. Is it difficult to come up with the right words to express a thought?	1 2 3 4 5
3. Ability to remember new phone numbers and/or addresses		1 2 3 4 5	23. Ability to solve visual or mechanical puzzles or problems	1 2 3 4 5
4. Ability to remember the names of characters or other specific details in a story or movie		1 2 3 4 5	24. Ability to recognize voices (like on a telephone).	1 2 3 4 5
5. Ability to remember or understand the basic idea of what happened in a movie or story – general information rather than specific details		1 2 3 4 5	25. Ability to stay focused and recheck tasks without making careless mistakes	1 2 3 4 5
6. Ability to quickly think through a difficult problem or situation. Does a better answer come later in the day or even the next day?		1 2 3 4 5	26. Ability to be creative and come up with new ideas or new ways of doing something.	1 2 3 4 5
7. Ability to get or stay organized. Does organization come easily?		1 2 3 4 5	27. General sense of humor. Do you (does he/she) see humor in lots of situations or have difficulty understanding what others think is funny?	1 2 3 4 5
8. Ability to “plan” and to break large tasks into smaller parts or steps		1 2 3 4 5	28. Rhythmic or musical skills (even if an instrument is not played)	1 2 3 4 5
9. Ability to pay attention to instruction and lectures		1 2 3 4 5	29. Arts and crafts skills (drawing, painting, sculpture, etc.).	1 2 3 4 5
10. Ability to remember or follow complex directions or request (involving 3 or more steps). Does the request need to be repeated?		1 2 3 4 5	30. Ability to visualize and imagine things in your (his/her) head (pictures, faces, words, numbers, etc.)	1 2 3 4 5
11. Ability to read quickly and fluently		1 2 3 4 5	31. Ability to accomplish long-term goals or projects	1 2 3 4 5
12. Ability to quickly sound out new words		1 2 3 4 5	32. Directional skills (left/right, north/south, etc.)	1 2 3 4 5
13. Ability to understand what is read just using the “context” (without pictures).		1 2 3 4 5	33. Ability to complete jigsaw puzzles	1 2 3 4 5

14. Ability to understand what is read when there are pictures for clues	1 2 3 4 5	34. Ability to remember the words of new popular songs	1 2 3 4 5
15. Handwriting neatness	1 2 3 4 5	35. Ability to remember the tunes to new popular songs.	1 2 3 4 5
16. Writing mechanics (spelling, punctuation, capitalization, etc.)	1 2 3 4 5	36. Ability to go someplace new (city, mall, school, etc.) without getting lost	1 2 3 4 5
17. Writing content. Ability to express ideas in writing when mechanics don't matter	1 2 3 4 5	37. Athletic abilities/coordination	1 2 3 4 5
18. Letter/word orientation. This is a "difficulty" if letters are ever reversed (B/D, etc.) out of order in words or starting words with the wrong letter.	1 2 3 4 5	38. Ability to remember the rules to games	1 2 3 4 5
19. Ability to remember specific formulas for solving math problems	1 2 3 4 5	39. Ability to keep up with activities. Are you (is he/she) the first to start and/or finish something (4 or 5) or are others kept waiting (1 or 2)?	1 2 3 4 5
20. Ability to estimate or figure out the answer to math problems without using a specific formula	1 2 3 4 5	40. Ability to sit still for long periods of time in school	1 2 3 4 5

APPENDIX D
CONSENT FORMS

Individual Consent for Participation in Research

INSTITUTE FOR CLINICAL SOCIAL WORK

I, _____, acting for myself (or for my child _____), agree to take part in the research entitled: Violence Prevention and Conflict Management Strategy at Chicago Science and Math Academy.

This work will be carried out by Lahab Al-Samarrai (Principal Researcher) under the supervision of Barbara Berger (Dissertation Chair or Sponsoring Faculty)

This work is being conducted under the auspices of the Institute for Clinical Social Work; 200 N. Michigan Ave., Suite 407; Chicago, IL 60601; (312) 726-8480).

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to find out if one is less likely to use violence to resolve conflicts after participating in a Violence Prevention program. The program will measure how you think about violence and conflict, look at how you have experienced violence and conflict and teach you appropriate ways to deal with them. It is expected that you will be better equipped to positively deal with violence and conflict.

PROCEDURES USED IN THE STUDY AND THE DURATION

A six week program starting this Spring will be conducted that focuses on teaching you appropriate responses to violence and conflict. A survey will be given to you at the beginning and end of the program. The surveys will be compared to see if the program helped you improve (such as changed beliefs about how to deal with conflict). The survey is a 2-page document that includes demographic questions and questions about managing violence and conflict. The form will take you about 60 minutes to complete and will be collected over a period of 1-week (so you don't have to fill out all the questions at the same time). No personal information, such as your CPS grades or test scores will be collected. The program will be offered in two separate Community School programs at the Chicago Math and Science Academy.

Benefits

There is no direct benefit to you for participating in this study. The program may help you better manage violence and conflict. In addition, the results of this study may lead to better social outcomes for participating students in the future. This information may also help the Chicago Math and Science Academy provide information to organizations that give money to your Community Schools Program.

Costs

There are no costs to you for participating in the program.

Possible Risks and/or Side Effects

Being in this study does not involve any known risks beyond what you would encounter in daily life. However, it is possible but unlikely that you may feel uncomfortable or embarrassed about answering certain questions. There is a very small risk that your records will not remain confidential, but security practices make this highly unlikely.

Privacy and Confidentiality

The records of this study will be kept private. In any report I might publish, I will not include any information that will identify you. I expect that a report will be published and will be made available to you, school staff, and possibly organizations that give money for the programs. I also expect that the results of this study will be published as my doctoral dissertation and in an academic journal at some point in time. Research records will be stored securely and are protected by passwords.

All research data will be destroyed two years from the conclusion of this study. This includes all completed surveys.

Subject Assurances

By signing this consent form, I agree to take part in this study. I have not given up any of my rights (my child's rights) or released this institution from responsibility for carelessness.

I may cancel my consent and refuse to continue in this study (or take my child out of this study) at any time without penalty or loss of benefits. My relationship with the staff of the ICSW will not be affected in any way, now or in the future, if I (or my child) refuse to take part, or if I begin the study and then withdraw.

If I (or my child) have any questions about the research methods, I can contact Lahab Al-Samarrai (Principal Researcher) or Barbara Berger (Dissertation Chair/Sponsoring Faculty), at this phone number _____ (day), _____ (evening).

If I have any questions about my rights – or my child's rights – as a research subject, I may contact Daniel Rosenfeld, Chair of Institutional Review Board; ICSW; 200 N. Michigan Ave., Suite 407; Chicago, IL 60601; (312) 726-8480.

Signatures

I have read this consent form and I agree to take part (or, to have my child take part) in this study as it is explained in this consent form.

Signature of Participant

Date

Signature of child (if over 10 years)

Date

I certify that I have explained the research to _____ (Name of subject or child) and believe that they understand and that they have agreed to participate freely. I agree to answer any additional questions when they arise during the research or afterward.

Signature of Researcher

Date

Revised 6 Oct 2009

Parental Permission for Participation in Research Study

INSTITUTE FOR CLINICAL SOCIAL WORK

The Effectiveness of Conflict Management and Violence Prevention Strategies Among Middle School Students: An International Perspective

What is the purpose of this research?

I am asking your child to be in a research study because we are trying to learn more about students' experience of and response to conflict. Your child is invited to participate in this study because she or he is a student at MidHigh School where the study will be conducted. This study is being conducted by Lahab Al-Samarrai, MA, LCPC, from the Institute for Clinical Social Work in Chicago.

How much time will this take?

This study will take a few hours of your child's time over the course of two months.

What will my child be asked to do if I allow him/her to participate in this study?

If you allow your child to be in this study, he or she will be asked to participate in a school-based seminar about non-violent methods of conflict resolution and to fill out questionnaires before and after the seminar.

What are the risks involved in participating in this study?

Being in this study does not involve any risks other than what your child would encounter in daily life. Your child may feel uncomfortable about answering certain questions. The most common risks with these types of studies are breaches of confidentiality, but the questionnaires will be kept under lock and key in the researcher's office and no students will be identified by name in the study results.

What are the benefits of my child's participation in this study?

Your child will not personally benefit from being in this study. However, we hope that what we learn will help provide new conflict management strategies that will help reduce violence in schools.

Can I decide not to allow my child to participate? If so, are there other options? Yes, you can choose not to allow your child to participate. Even if you allow your child to be in the study now, you can change your mind later, and your child can leave the study. There will be no negative consequences if you decide not to allow your child to participate or change your mind later. "Also, even if you give your permission, your child may decide not to be in this study."

How will my child's privacy be protected?

The records of this study will be kept private. In any report we might publish, we will not include any information that will identify your child. Research records will be stored securely, and only researchers will have access to the records.

Whom can I contact for more information?

If you have questions about this study, please contact Lahab Al-Samarrai at 312.343.1967. If you have questions about your child's rights as a research subject, you may contact: Lahab Al-Samarrai (researcher) or Barbara Berger (chair), (312) 346-7757.

You will be given a copy of this information to keep for your records.

Statement of Consent:

I have read the above information. I have all my questions answered. I permit my child to be in this study.

Child's Name: _____ Grade in School: _____

Parent/Guardian Signature: _____ Date: _____

APPENDIX E

STUDENTS' WRITTEN THOUGHTS ON VIOLENCE AND MOVIES

Students' Written Thoughts on Violence and Movies, April 12, 2010

I think that people do it because they like to do it. They like to jump up and down. I like to watch the fights that go on. They like to watch people get hurt.

I think that people do this kind of stuff because they enjoy the feeling. They also probably feel excited and charged up while they are doing what they are doing. They also may do this because it is a way to release lots of energy. They also may do this to get charged up for a fight or something like that.

When I see someone bashing someone's head in...I watch it and think it's cool to watch because I get a thrill for watching it. People go into Mosh Pits because they have that adrenalin to bounce around and push/hit people. I think people like watching Movies with the explosions because they get a thrill out of watching it and they get really excited. Most people just like watching this stuff. But, others like getting hurt or watching others get hurt because they get a kick out of it.

People like violence because of the rush. That's why I watch movies like Terminator. I get excited when I see that. I get pumped & giddy. It feels good; like having adrenalin put in you.

People are interested in violence because my adrenalin starts pumping. You get jittery and your heart starts pumping. You might get goose bumps. It's one of the most addictive feelings in the world. The adrenalin is just like heroin.

I think people enjoy violence because it is exciting and gets people pumped. Plus people get to watch a fight that they want to have a certain person win. Violence is interesting because you get a rush of energy and you feel the pain people suffer. Plus some people just watch fights to gain some new moves for future fights. I like to watch UFC Fights because it's funny to see somebody knocked on the ground and to compete: for example our family picks side to see who wins.

A. bullies people or persons by saying "Fuck you man," and he cried. Then A. licked that person's tears off the carpet, and then he apologized but still wasn't forgiven and punched in the face. Then this guy comes out with the getaway car and told Aaron to get in, then stabbed him with a Samurai sword then poured soy sauce on him, then the principal came and we got suspended. So the guy stabbed loved that we put soy sauce and we became friends.

When I see a explosion on T.V. it gives me an adrenalin rush because it's cool. It is loud and big. Also when I watch UFC, it gives me one too. I get one because when people fight it pumps me up. If I am around a fight, I get an adrenalin rush; also if I'm in one.

When I see someone on T.V. or a Marine blow something up, I really don't care. I don't get why people get so excited when they see an explosion or someone getting beat up. Maybe they want to do that to someone or they want to blow something up. I think that people do this because it gives them a rush. Why would seeing those things make you feel that way?

People are fascinated with violence because it seems cool to just be like "ugh...I'm going to punch her in the face." Violence makes you feel tough and strong. When you see an explosion or somebody holding a gun to another person's head, you think, "WOW"...that was cool or bad ass or WOW! They're tough. They must be cool if they could blow something up or shoot somebody.

I think it's because they like the way it sounds, and how you move to the song. And people like to try different things with music, just like some people like to fight and some don't. Some like to watch it and some don't.

People like to dance and listen to crazy music because they want a rush. They like the way they can act crazy and hit each other. A lot of people love the really top points of a scary movie like when something jumps out and scares you. They like waiting for the exciting parts.

I am fascinated with violence because I think it looks awesome! That's really the only reason I like violence. I don't even watch movies that much! Most movies I watch don't even have a lot of violence. Besides, it's a good way to pass time.

I don't really have a fascination with violence. I mean, I like my share of action movies, but it doesn't mean I approve of someone shooting people or blowing up something. Yet, I like action movies because they're interesting to watch. A fascination of violence from my point of view is someone who takes the violence & action in movies a little too far or is too serious. Just because I like watching action movies, some of the time and not all the time doesn't mean it's a fascination or does it?

I am not very fascinated with violence because when you grow up in a State where there is lots of violence, you tend to just see it and not do anything. But I am not fascinated with it because I am not very interested in violent movies or fights. I mostly focus on school, friends, and sports. I am most focused with softball because I want to play for the Washington Huskies in college. I focus on school because I would like to get accepted into the college I want to go to.

I'm fascinated with violence because it makes me excited. I don't like to see kids ruthlessly picked on, but violence itself is fun to watch. Plus, our school makes it such a big deal, that when you see a fight, you feel like you are a lucky witness. Movies with violence are fun to watch because they give my boring school-filled life a little bit of excitement.

I am fascinated by violence and fighting because it makes me feel stronger. When someone has a weapon, they feel very secure. I also like the adrenaline rush when I am fighting or watching someone fight. It makes things interesting. Many times it makes you appear stronger in other people's eyes. I like fighting games because it gives that feeling of awareness and adrenaline.

I am fascinated by violence because it is an adrenaline rush and because it isn't an everyday thing, and because it looks awesome and I like to watch movies. That is why I like violence.

One reason I am fascinated with violence would be that it gets energy going. In my normal life, there is not much excitement, but watching violence makes it more exciting. Also in movies, it feels good to know that it isn't really happening, but you still get the same thrill as experiencing it in real life.

People are fascinated with violence because it has many actions that involve people getting hurt or many objectives throughout a story. In real life, it may be very serious, but if it is a joke or movie scene, people (including me) can get excited over what the characters or actors are doing. People are always getting hurt in violence and sometimes people can get a feeling of "whoa – that's so cool!" Or, it can get my heart pumping and thinking "what's going to happen next?" I can think "Wow! I wonder what the character is going to do about this." That is why I think I may be fascinated with violence. Violence has many things that involve action and maybe completing a "mission" or "goal" depending on the character.

I am fascinated by violence because we don't get to see it on a daily basis. In movies, I am fascinated by violence because of the effects, action and the adrenaline rush. At school, I don't usually see bullying and fighting on a daily basis and to see something new once-in-awhile is fascinating. From what I have heard & seen, I have noted 4 or 5 fights @ school. Seeing fights is very uncommon in the real world and that's why I'm fascinated about violence.

I think we are fascinated with violence because it excites us – all the exploding & shooting. I believe also because it's not every day that we see a nuclear explosion or hear a gunshot. Also maybe because it shows how bad someone else's life could be so boring that it makes our life seem better. That is why I think we are fascinated with violence.

People think movies are fascinating because they don't see violence in everyday life. If we see it in real life, people are really getting hurt. But, in the movies, people are really acting and NOT getting hurt.

I like violence because it gets my blood moving and, I think it is cool. Like in the movies, when the main character beats down the bad guy and I think it's cool. In *Taken* the dad kills a lot of guys then gets his daughter. Or, in army movies when there are like seven Navy Seals and they take out whole base.

When I'm at school if I see a fight I think it is cool because I don't see it every day. I also want to see how bad the other guy gets hurt. It makes me want to get in a fight myself. But, sometimes it is scary like in torture movies. I get a little scared because I hate torture. It gives me the chills.

The fascination with violence is the fact how a lot of people are too afraid to do it. Like they see it on movies and they claim they'll do those things when really, they won't. So, that's where the fascination is.

I enjoy violence in movies because it shows me something I never see. My house and family are peaceful and never fight. So, I enjoy seeing violence on the movie screen. This feeds my primal instinct I guess. Good Luck on getting your PHD, Mr. Al-Samarrai!

I think my fascination with violence is because it's fun to watch action movies and they keep you guessing. I wouldn't say I'm fascinated with violence but it's just there. I think as far as weapons go, tasers are the most fascinating to be because the people like spaz out. Like in the last movie I saw *The Bounty Hunter*, she shocked him with a taser and he had a big thing on his neck that looked like a hicky.

Personally I don't like being in fights, I don't think fighting solves anything. I still find fights very fun to watch. And weapons are just cool because one little thing can take a life. My favorite weapon is brass knuckles just because they're simple.

I'm really not that interested in fights or weapons. I do think the reason most people are is because it gives them sort of a rush. Also, because it gives people something to talk about. Most people like to feel they are lucky to see a fight because they saw everything and they know things people don't.

People like violence because they like the rush. They like that someone is getting hurt. They find the chase of the violence interesting to watch. Everyone finds it funny when it's in movies. I don't know why? They just do.

They like it because of the thrill of seeing it and the adrenaline and the excitement. They enjoy it and maybe even do it sometimes.

People are fascinated with violence because they like the adrenaline. Sometimes people get addicted to it. I like watching movies with suspense (like the movie *Taken*). I don't really know why I like it though. People may like violence because they are not very happy or are depressed or maybe have been abused themselves.

People are fascinated by explosions, violence and other things of that nature because it's out of the ordinary. It is not something you see everyday & it gives you an adrenalin rush. I went to a concert with my best friend once and we went in the Mosh Pit because you could feel the energy & excitement of other people. Also, it brought us closer to the stage. It gave me an excited feeling and got my adrenalin pumping! ☺

I feel excited because it's fun to watch someone get beat up. It makes me want to fight someone. I don't know why but it happens.

We enjoy watching MMA (Mixed Martial Arts) and UFC (Ultimate Fighting Championship) because it is a rush. It is cool to learn how to fight like a professional. People all around are joining MMA Fighting and UFC Gyms to learn how to fight. Then, those people end up beating up other people. That's why we watch MMA and UFC.

There are many reasons why people watch violent movies or TV shows. One reason why people watch violent shows is for the adrenaline rush. Another reason why people watch violent shows is because it makes them feel alive. Finally people watch violent shows is because of the endorphin rush. That is why people watch violent TV shows and movies.

I feel excited. I am not sure why. It's fun to watch I guess. It makes me wag my tail. I like to watch fights. It makes me pumped.

I think people are fascinated by violence because they're adrenalin is pumping and they like the feeling. It makes them feel good. They get very excited and want more of it. It is like a drug. They get addicted. Some people like it because it interests them.

I think the mosh pit is an adrenaline pump. That's what gives people the thrill to fight. To listen to punk music, while fighting and a crowd is just fueling the thrill. That's why people mosh pit.

When I see violence, I get all scared and I want to run away. But, when I see it on television I watch it because it is cool Dude! And I feel like the excitement I feel. I guess I feel like that when I see it in person too.

I get happy & I want to try that. I think it's sick. I like the feeling and attention you get from fighting, or it make me happy even if you lose or win. It's still fun for me.

I think we are fascinated with violence because it happens a lot because it is also generated very easy. You don't need T.V. or the movies, but now there are those things. Many people laugh and I am one of them and a lot of people get involved. I enjoy violence when it is in movies and people get shot or fall off a cliff.

We are interested in violence because it is amusing and intriguing to watch. Also, it keeps us entertained. Violence creates adrenaline and pumps people up. When we see violence, we become excited and want people to see more. For example, when we see an explosion, your heart starts pounding and you want to stand up and punch somebody. Also, when we see somebody shooting or blowing things, we are connected to it. We want to be the one in that film.

Violence and fighting fascinates me because it gets my heart pumping. Also, it is exciting and it's fun to be scared. Explosions are also exciting because it's destructive

and fire. Violence is fascinating to me because it's interesting to see other people fighting also.

I believe that I find it fascinating due to the action, the adrenaline, and the desire to mimic this action, to get away from the boringness of daily life. I need action, the blood pumping of action. That is why.

Once upon a time I am a Russian that lives in Lake Stevens. I don't know what to write about for Mr. Lahab so I wrote this.

I love violence because it gets my blood flowing. Fight or flight. It's an ancient art that people have done forever. Violence is just cool. It's really funny when someone gets tripped and falls down stairs, or off a cliff. When I slap a Babe it makes me laugh. I like it in *Rambo* where the guy gets sniped in the face and his whole head explodes. Then pigs eat him...So cool!

Violence is fascinating to me because I believe we all have a real fascination with pain and we are all in some way masochists. Violence is an example of physical and/or emotional pain and it's something we have all experienced and still will experience. The fascination comes with the fascination we have with death and the unknown, and it is cool to watch because pain is the unknown, even though we have all experienced it. Even though I say "we," I, of course, fall into the category of people everywhere. Violence is pain, pain is the unknown, and therefore a fascination is born. We are fascinated with life, and violence is a part of life.

Violence is fascinating to me because you don't see it in everyday life. But I don't like violence when it's getting bloody. I personally don't like scary movies.

People think violence is fascinating because you don't see it in everyday life. It's funny to see people's reactions to different situations.

We always pick on someone, named Daniel. We feel bad, but he leaves us no choice. He is annoying and bugs us. He stalked one of our friends once. We will stop if he stops being annoying.

One night it was me, my mom and my dad and we went to my aunt's house. He got so drunk, after we left, in the car he got all mad at my mom and started beating her and I was sitting in the back seat crying.

This kid was bullied in 3rd grade and every other year of his life because he was weird and was from a different state. He wasn't liked because he wasn't friends with anyone at that school. He had his stuff thrown around, taken and dropped on purpose. But one day a teacher saw him being bullied and kept the class in so they couldn't go to lunch. They waited there 'till someone confessed, everyone got upset so a couple other witnesses 'fessed up and the teacher kept the bullies in for their recess. Thereafter the bullies never

bullied him again because they hated missing recess. Then he was bullied again a week later.

I'm not much into fighting movies about violence. But it's alright. It's very fascinating because you never know what will happen next. It's adrenalin.

Why I'm fascinated with violence? I don't see it very often so when we watch it in movies, it's very cool.

Violence is important to me because in movies because I don't get to see it in everyday life. To me, it's very entertaining. But, when it happens in real life, it's not, because in movies it's real!

Rabbits have lots of little rabbits. They are cut and fuzzy. I used to have three. But, unfortunately they died. My neighbor has two rabbits but one died. My rabbits' names were Azteca, Princess and Zoe. One was all white – she was Princess. Another was black and white – he was Azteca. The last one was gray. Its name was Zoe.

I enjoy watching movies with violence because it sets the tone of the movie. It gives off the mood/tone of the whole movie. Like when I went and saw *Clash of the Titans* four men went to fight and take off Medusa's head. So they could use it to kill the Cracken, which gave the tone of that part and put you on your seat to see who would win in the end.

The Hangover is funny because the things they do in the movie. For example, the guy wakes up with his tooth missing and he ended up being married to this random girl when he was already married. Then they found a baby in the closet and a tiger in the bathroom. And throughout the whole movie they were trying to find their friend Doug. It turns out he is on their roof!

I think people like me would be fascinated by this kind of movie because it's cute. It's about this girl and her brother getting sent to her Dad's house for the summer. And while she was there, she met someone and they started going out & stuff & at the end the Dad dies.

Why is violence important to me? I love the fact that they make movies out of violence because not every day you get to see a car blow up!

APPENDIX F
STUDENT'S FAVORITE WEAPONS

Student's Favorite Weapons, April 12, 2010

My favorite weapon is a skateboard. It's transportation, it's light and it's hood. Skateboards are fun to ride and very deadly. They are legal and cannot get in trouble for having it.

Because guns can kill people, blow crap up, knives you can slit some guys throat - violence gives people an adrenaline rush and my family has plenty of guns, chain guns, M4A1, thumper, mini-uzi. As for fighting, I just love beating the shit out of the people.

Weapons are cool because they can do a lot of things. My favorite weapon is a gun because of how complicated their origins are. I also like guns because of the type of things they can shoot through brick wall.

The fascination is with weapons. Weapons kill people or hurt people. Almost everyone likes guns, and I don't know why. Well my favorite weapon is a gun too. Almost all movies that have violence include a gun in it. I'm a boy so I think that all boys and girls like guns. One time I was walking and I heard a gunshot in a forest and I kind of got scared because I don't want to get shot so I ran home. But that was somehow just hunting.

My favorite weapon is a tank because you can kill people with many different things on it. And tanks are easy to find. They are everywhere. It is a big piece of metal. If I was a girl I would be a tanker woman.

When a 9mm Pistol is shot off, it is really loud. The 9mm Pistol is not heavy and it is really small. The 9mm pistol has a lot of recoil and it mows the boy down. A 9mm pistol has almost dead-on accuracy when shot at a target. A 9mm pistol can get different types of bullets, like regular and ballistic tip bullets.

My favorite weapon is a sawed-off shot gun. So I can protect myself. When I wake up with someone in my house, I want to scare them or protect my family if there are 10 people or a lot of people. I can shoot one time and maybe six or seven people are done.

My favorite weapon is a lawn mower because it was in the movie *The Happening* and it has three blades spinning super fast, so it's three times better than a knife.

I think society is fascinated with weapons like guns, knives, etc. because they aren't always a part of our everyday lives. Or people see them in movies and think they're cool. I know I don't see guns in person very often, so I guess that's why people are so interested in them, because we aren't exposed to them often.

I am fascinated with weapons in video games because it looks cool and nobody gets hurt. I hate weapons in real life because people can get hurt by them. I want weapons destroyed. Not in video games though. That's what I like about weapons.

My favorite weapon in video games is C-4. I like it because I could set it anywhere and when my enemy gets close to the C-4, I can blow them up.

My favorite weapon is a knife. I think that knives are one of the most efficient weapons. You can stab people with them. They are close range and long range weapons because you can throw them and you can do a lot of damage.

Weapons hurt people. Sometimes it's fun to watch people get hurt. I don't know why it just is. My favorite weapon is a gun. It's fun to shoot objects with them. A year ago we were shooting paintball guns. It was a lot of fun because I got to shoot at my brother. I kept getting shot though. It hurt, but it was still fun.

I am fascinated with fake guns because little kids like to fake shoot each other. I like them because they aren't dangerous. It's also funny to watch little kids play with them. Fake guns can't hurt people.

My favorite weapon is the weapons that aren't real. I like watching little kids pretend to use swords to kill each other like pirates. I like them because they're not real. I also like them because they can't hurt anyone. Fake swords are less hurtful that's why I like them.

APPENDIX G
GROUP SUGGESTIONS

Group Suggestions

Each class was broken down into groups of four or five students. Comments that came from these groups regarding rules they would like to see instated in the school are included below:

CLASS 1

Group 1

1. No lunch detention...instead:
2. Wash tables
3. No sentences
4. Clean the hallways
5. Clean all graffiti
6. Scrape gum off tables
7. Say nice things to Teacher

Group 2

1. Group Therapy
2. Pick up after lunch

Group 3

1. Write a letter (apology)
2. Work and read during detention

3. Slips
4. Instead of detention – trade in phone or I-pod

Group 4

1. Lunch detention
2. No after school detention
3. No detention at all!
4. Take away socks
5. I can choose my own consequence (scrubbing tables).

Group 5

1. 300 word essay
2. No lunch
3. Pick up trash around the school
4. Paint over tags
5. Extra homework
6. Locked in a straight jacket

CLASS 2

Group 1

1. After school
2. Clean tables

3. Sentences
4. Group detention (with parents)
5. Have your parents go to school with you

Group 2

1. Rewards if done good – punished if bad
2. You get physically punished
3. Time out
4. Physical labor

Group 3

1. No harassment (No fighting/bullying)
2. No homework. (Only school work)
3. Open Campus
4. Recess
5. No racism/stereotyping
6. Cell phones and I-pods allowed.
7. More field trips
8. Sports for all grades.
9. Half days on Friday (teachers & students)
10. Respect yourself, others & property.
11. No drugs, alcohol or tobacco use.
12. Everyone should feel safe – No weapons/firearms

13. Self defense
14. Only punish person who made the mistake/problem, not everyone.
15. I-pods & phones allowed at work time.
16. Food & drink allowed.
17. Everyone stays in class
18. No profanity
19. No planners or hall passes required.
20. Public displays of affection to an extent
21. No writing on skin or clothing
22. No getting pregnant
23. No infliction on yourself or others.

Group 4

1. No lunch detention.
- 2.No calling home
3. I can choose my own punishments. (Scrubbing gum off tables, picking up garbage, washing tables).

Group 5

1. No drugs or alcohol
2. No weapons
3. Bigger variety of electives
4. Teachers can't take phones
5. No vandalizing

6. Skate boarding at 10:00
7. No homework
8. Kids are in charge

CLASS 3

Group 1

1. Self defense
2. No drugs
3. No vandalizing
4. Passing period 5 minutes long
5. Cell phones and music players allowed
6. Free lunch
7. Girls can only wear pants, no shirt, bra or underwear
8. Stealing
9. No homework

Group 2

1. Everybody gets cake
2. School starts at 9:15
3. Majority of girls for no sexual clothing
4. Defeated by majority half naked girls
5. I-pods & cell phones

6. Country music
7. Dress clothes
8. Majority vote for pep assemblies
9. Showering together
10. Tardy

Group 3

1. No rules
2. No rules
3. No grades
4. No teachers
5. No one in charge
6. Kids are in charge
7. Self defense
8. Buses aren't stupid
9. Everyone gets A's
10. Cake for everyone
11. Wear bandanas

Group 4

1. Skate boarding at 10:00
2. No fighting
3. Energy drinks are mandatory

4. Lunch – kids can leave class whenever
5. We can eat whenever
6. Everyone gets to go to a field trip
7. Allowed outside
8. You can be tardy
9. No dress codes

Group 5

1. Be able to defend yourself
2. No cameras (invasion of privacy)
3. Longer passing periods (1 or 2 minimum)
4. Better dress code
5. Can't share showers in locker room
6. Nicer teachers (pick our own teachers)
7. No drugs or alcohol
8. Not have to do the colt run (if you don't want to).
9. Don't take phones
10. Start school later.

CLASS 4

Group 1

1. Every student should at least get 1 field trip a month.
2. We're allowed to go outside at lunch...no matter what.
3. No weapons
4. No drugs/alcohol
5. Pep assembly once a month
6. Be able to have a study hall period
7. Longer passing periods. (6 minutes)
8. Have a bigger variety of electives
9. Start school later (9:15)
10. Cell phones and I-pods or mp3 players are allowed during school.

Group 2

1. No homework
2. Profanity allowed
3. \$1.00 lunch
4. Go outside during lunch and come back in
5. Defend yourself if somebody hits you first
6. Study hall
7. Choose your own electives all year
8. File complaints against teachers

9. No detention process
10. No after school detention
11. 7 period day/shorter classes
12. 14 day's extra with no repercussions
13. No dress code
14. Phones and I-pods in class – Emergency Only
15. Be respectful
16. No bullying
17. No hall pass
18. Leave early
19. Longer passing time
20. No weapons
21. No fights unless supervised
22. Lunch cost \$1.00
23. More lunch selections
24. No vandalism
25. Pick classes like when you have PE/History.
26. Have electronics
27. Collect credits to miss 1st period.

Group 3

1. No cameras
2. No weapons

3. Can hit back
4. No dress code
5. No vandalism in school
6. Have electronics
7. Pick your classes/choose when you want PE/History
8. A class where you can just study. Only study.
9. File complaints about teachers
10. Collect credits to miss 1st period
11. Vacation days
12. Not taking things out of school based on people's religions

Group 4

1. No fights unless at lunch (or supervised)
2. Food in class
3. No see-thru shirts
4. No shirts, no shoes, no service
5. \$1.00 lunch
6. Longer passing periods
7. Get to go outside at lunch
8. I-pods allowed in class
9. Break in middle of each period
10. 1 hour lunch
11. Shorter class periods

12. More lunch line selections
13. Better French fries
14. Study hall period
15. Committee of students who are average

Group 5

1. No dress code
2. Hit back rule
3. No sentences
4. No “no cell phone rule”
5. Longer passing time
6. A period just to hang out
7. Longer lunch
8. 7 periods
9. Allowed to listen to electronics
10. Allowed to chew gum
11. Freedom of speech
12. No video cameras
13. No processing
14. Freedom of what you study
15. No weapons

The following are rules that all groups of students agreed upon for their schools:

1. Defend yourself
2. No bullying tolerance
3. Longer passing periods
4. Accept late work
5. Go outside during lunch
6. Cell phones allowed
7. Prep period for students
8. Be respectful
9. No dress code
10. No hall pass is needed
11. No homework
12. Gum is allowed in all classes
13. Leave early
14. No talking
15. Backpack searches every day
16. Energy drinks
17. Walking only
18. Only talk when spoken to
19. Talk back to teachers encouraged
20. Respect property
21. Respect others

22. No yelling
23. Respect yourself
24. No gum
25. Recesses allowed
26. Make school start later
27. School is 3 days/week
28. Lunch should cost less
29. Activity bus
30. More field trips
31. No swearing
32. More elective classes
33. 8th graders should be able to play all sports
34. Respect yourself, others and property.
35. No drug, alcohol or tobacco. (Includes shirts)
36. Everyone must feel safe
37. No weapons.
38. No racism (Mexicans seem associated more with gangs, not fair).No punishing the whole class for one person's mistake/problem.
39. When it's instructional time, no I-pod's or phones, but when it's work time, let us be.
40. Food and drink allowed.
41. No skipping class or leaving for no reason! Everyone must be in class.
42. You could wear anything
43. Vote for food

44. Choose classes
45. 20 minute breaks
46. Choose subjects
47. Cell phones/I-pods allowed
48. Free lunch
49. No planners/hall passes
50. Public displays of affection allowed
51. Party Friday/different themes
52. Freely able to have medication (specific health reasons)
53. You can't write on your skin or clothing.
54. No getting pregnant
55. No cameras The school recycles
56. No vandalism
57. 45 minute lunch
58. Ability to fire teachers
59. Students paint walls of class rooms
60. No littering
61. Pay less for lunch
62. Be able to choose class order
63. No Art
64. You don't have to wear shoes
65. No police on duty.
66. No littering

67. No bullies
68. Ability to design class order
69. 8th and 9th have same class choices
70. No running in hall
71. Texting in class
72. Music in class
73. Designs on the walls
74. Teachers can have class pets
75. Turn in things late for full credit

APPENDIX H
STUDENTS' CONSTRUCTIVE CRITICISM

Students' Constructive Criticism. May 6, 20101-Male

1. More examples
2. Go outside
3. Play a few games
4. Stay on topic
5. Watch a few more movies

2-Female

1. Don't try to put people out of their comfort zone (Let them pick who is in their group. No boy-girl seating)
2. More activities not just talking
3. Shared more specific examples of what happens at our school.
4. Lahab. Find out more about the conflicts in our school before he talks to us (Maybe talk to the counselors).
5. Have students have more serious ideas about changing the school. (No petting zoo. Go carts) Also, more reasonable things (20 min. passing period is unreasonable)

3-Female

1. All though questions and topics were deep, I think to visually explain for example: more movies and clips would be even better.
2. Since the lessons were fast-paced and only lasted a day, I think more time for example take 10 (2 days a week) weeks so each lesson could last about 2 days.

3. I think if you set goals for your students each week like: Introduce new friends or be respectful to anybody who says hi to you. I think the goals would help emphasize no bullying.
4. There were very few activities or group discussion within the study and I think activities such as answering questions or word searches will help students stay on the bullying topic.
5. Divide students in groups at the end of discussion and talk about how each group takes in the information and how it impacts them. And that would keep students thinking about the topics.

4-Male

1. Talk about more ways to stop violence
2. More talking about ourselves
3. Ask fewer questions.
4. More activities "Games"
5. More group discussions
6. Field trips

5-Female

1. You could come in every day of the week for about 5 weeks.
2. You could teach us outside so we can learn better.
3. We should do more things like when we are the bully and victim.
4. We could talk about more ways to stop violence.
5. We could watch more movies that have bullying in it.

6-Male

1. You have good conversations, but you need to involve students more.
2. You need to have each student write individually, not in groups.
3. You had some scenarios, but you need more
4. You had too much circle time. They need to write more of their opinions.

7-Female

1. Have each student give opinions
2. Cover more topics
3. Give more examples
4. Have a new thing each day
5. Outside some days.

8-Female

1. I think we should have done more activities like in the beginning.
2. Share more specific examples at our school
3. I think Lahab could know more about our school like the kinds of bullying here.
4. Have more serious rules about the school.

9-Female

1. More activities. Fun!
2. Interesting examples
3. Get everyone involved more; call on randomly

4. Talk more about problems
5. More group work.

10-Female

1. More activities
2. Interesting examples
3. Get everyone involved more
4. Talk more
5. More group work

11-Male

1. More examples of problems
2. Have class outside where it's nice out
3. More group work.
4. Get more people to talk.
5. Field trips

12-Male

1. You could come in every day of the week for probably about a week and a half.
2. You could teach us outside.
3. You could ask us about more personal examples of ourselves.
4. Talk about more ways to stop violence.
5. Go into depth about why bullying occurs.

13-Male

1. Asking more questions
2. Dumb it down. Lots of big words
3. Less confusing questions.
4. A field trip to his college
5. More activities

14-Male

1. More activities
2. Something more than a circle
3. Interesting examples
4. Field trips
5. More movies

15-Female

1. There could have been more activities like the role playing.
2. There could have been more examples followed by a lesson like the movie.
3. There could have been more real life examples
4. Less lecturing
5. More student input. (written/verbal)

16-Male

1. More talk
2. Group discussions a little more.
3. More activities

17-Male

1. Group discussions a little more
2. More talk/examples
3. More activities
4. Don't ask confusing topics
5. A little more specific.

18-Male

1. Needs to ask more questions.
2. Dumb it down a bit. (Some of the words you use – I don't understand)
3. More activities
4. More discussion

19-Female

1. Although we all were together in your group meetings, not many people were participating. I think you should do more exercises to get people involved.
2. You asked lots of good questions, but they were confusing most of the time. Mrs. Ricketts had to explain them.
3. More examples on violence.

4. More movie example
5. Field trips.

20-Female

1. Do something else than the circle.
2. More activities
3. More examples on violence
4. Field trip
5. More movie examples.

21-Male

1. More days for study
2. More activities
3. Extra time to talk
4. More explanatory movies
5. Less talking out loud.

22-Female

1. Don't have too share
2. No interrupting
3. Little writing
4. Longer study
5. 3 days out of the week for the study

23-Male

1. A longer study
2. More groups
3. More movies
4. Talk more, less writing.

24-Male

1. I-pods
2. Movies
3. Activities
4. Games
5. Free time
6. Extra time

25-Female

1. Need more hugs
2. Need an emotional break downs
3. Pay attention
4. More fuzzy feelings
5. Smiles

26-Male

1. Give more time in talking circle
2. Sit by friends
3. More parties
4. More food
5. Everyone talks – no one sits out.

27-Female

1. Longer than 6 weeks.
2. Fun activities
3. More presentations
4. Less people interrupting
5. Always in a circle.

28-Male

1. More days to do the study
2. Class sat on topic more.
3. No fighting
4. Mr. Lahab could not be so sarcastic
5. More fun time

29-Male

1. How we got snacks

2. Pizza Party
3. How we got in a circle.
4. The study
5. How we showed an example of a bully in the study.
6. Should let us listen to I-Pods.
7. Have music
8. Have more snacks
9. More fun stuff
10. Watch more movies.

30-Female

1. More fun stuff
2. Always be in a circle
3. Don't make people do stuff they don't want to do.
4. Don't make people answer questions they don't want to answer.
5. No teacher in the room so it's not weird to say some things.

31-Female

1. More communication
2. Pay more attention
3. Stay on task
4. Don't let people interrupt other people
5. More group decisions

32-Male

1. No writing
2. Always in a circle
3. Every day was group
4. More food
5. Talk to people individually

33-Male

1. I liked it all so I have no suggestions.

34-Male

1. Snacks at the end of the study
2. Everything else is great.

35-Male

1. Would have had people be quieter.
2. Talk about more things
3. Help us understand it more.
4. Sit in a square.
5. More visual parts (or) points

36-Female

1. Less interrogating
2. More group sessions
3. More open instructor – close minded
4. Don't tell people that what they think is wrong (several people said things and you disagree)
5. Stop asking stupid questions. (you ask questions that everyone knows the answer to)

37-Male

1. No more writing
2. More food
3. Music
4. More talking

38-Female

1. Have more discussion
2. Don't make people do something they don't want to do.
3. Have us sitting boy-girl
4. More visual aids
5. No swearing
6. No teacher in the room
7. Longer than six weeks

39-Female

1. Don't let people yell at each other.
2. Don't let people interrupt other people.
3. Don't make people do things they don't want to do (the bully thing)
4. It was longer than six weeks
5. Shouldn't have teacher in class.

40-Female

1. Shouldn't have the teacher in rear.
2. Make everyone say something.
3. No swearing.
4. Not having it is uncomfortable.
5. Removing people who are becoming a problem.

41-Female

1. Some people in the study don't participate as much as others. Maybe you can get ideas from everyone by having them write it down.
2. Not everyone is comfortable talking in front of people and it would help if we got to know each other before the study.
3. There are a lot of side conversations going on and there should be a way to get everyone focused again.
4. There were a lot of interruptions when people share and it sometimes makes people feel they can't share what they have to say.

42-Female

1. You could listen to people's opinions more.
2. You could try to get everyone to say something not just certain people.
3. The survey was kind of stereotyped.
4. Sometimes the topics were not on subject and were boring.
5. You should do more interactive activities where we act out stuff and play games that have to do with bullying.

43-Male

1. I felt like when we would get into the groups, we would start to talk and then while we were talking you would stop whoever is talking and not let them continue.
2. A lot of the times you would have a subject on the board, but we would never focus on the subject 'till the end.
3. You usually only picked one person...the same time over and over again.
4. We also need to talk more about how other school's are also affected like us.
5. You also got (looks like "Pushy") some times.

44-Male

1. You could have listened to people's opinions and not interrupt us.
2. Call on more people.
3. You could have kept everyone on task.
4. Don't tell people they're wrong.
5. Use our ideas instead of changing them.

45-Male

1. I think that instead of saying that someone is wrong about a certain subject, you should try to understand where they are coming from.
2. Try to come up with more examples and acting out so that the students can get a good visualization of what you are trying to say.
3. Try to get everyone in the study to know about each other more so they can feel comfortable about sharing their ideas.
4. Try to have one person talking at a time and see if someone doesn't agree with their claim instead of yelling at each other.
5. Try to get everyone to share instead of four main people so that you can get the majority of opinions.

46-Male

1. I think that the decisions could have been better by letting everyone talk (going in a circle)
2. Different kinds of discussion situations
3. Listen to people more thoroughly.
4. Don't cut people off.
5. Keep people on task.

47-Male

1. Talk more about the subject.
2. More activities in the study
3. Don't interrupt people's group conversations.
4. Make more people talk
5. Not to make someone talk in the group.

6. Not get so many arguments with each other.
7. Not to get out of the subject.
8. If the whole class stays on talk, the whole period, give us something that we choose.

48-Male

1. Be more to the point.
2. Talk “More” about how to stop bullying.
3. Talk to everyone.
4. Listen to everyone.
5. Make sure everyone’s on task.

49-Female

1. You need to be more open about teen’s ideas because a lot of us were shut down.
2. I think that you need to really try to put yourself in other people’s shoes because I really do not believe you understand what being a teenager in America really involves.
3. We had a tendency to stray far from the topic – so learn to stay on topic.
4. You had a tendency to just argue whenever someone said something. So actually listening would be nice.
5. Telling someone they’re wrong just kind of defeated the point of the study.

50-Female

1. I think that you should try to stay on topic with the students.
2. I think that you should let the student’s talk and really listen.
3. I think that you shouldn’t give your opinion, and tell someone they’re wrong.

4. You should be more open about their ideas, so that they'd be more open too.
5. I think you should put yourself in the student's shoes.

51-Male

1. Call on people that aren't listening.
2. Less talking as a group gets really boring.
3. Say, "give you something if the whole class stays on task."
4. Do more group activities?
5. Spend more time on the subject.

52-Male

1. Use a "Talking Stick" or something.
2. Call on more people.
3. Allow time to calm down.
4. Use our ideas instead of changing them.
5. Don't interrupt people.

53-Male

1. Sometimes you were being pushy.
2. I think we should have more days for the study
3. Sometimes you could be rude to someone.
4. I couldn't think of anything else I thought it was good.

54-Male

1. You kind of trample over everyone when they try to talk.
2. Some of the questions in the packet are worded oddly?
3. We need to have some sort of way to limit who talks so no one tramples anyone's ideas.
4. Need to tighten group relations so everyone is more open.
5. You needed to let teachers join a lot more.

55-Female

1. Don't tell the kids that they're wrong.
2. I think there should be more order in the group. Less shouting out and getting off subject.
3. Try making the questionnaires relate to personal lives of the kids or past occurrences.
4. Make sure everyone gets their opinion in the discussion (Quiet kids NEED to speak up).
5. Get straight to the point and discuss from there one.

56-Male

1. You seem to take control of the discussions and not listen to what we say.
2. Try to get more people involved.
3. Structure to discussions.
4. Don't argue with us it's our opinions you want

57-Male

1. I think the study went well.
2. We could have talked more.
3. Everyone listens more
4. Never kept people on task.
5. Try to make stuff sound not that bad.

58-Male

1. I think if you kept all people involved it would be better.
2. To be more open to debate.
3. More group topic
4. More time actually focusing. (Or) More time activities
5. Let people feel comfortable and be able to share more

59-Male

1. Don't get off track so easily.
2. I really hated all the arguing back and forth.
3. Be a little more understanding
4. More surveys would be cool.
5. Make sure you get everyone's opinion.
6. Make sure you talk to all the quiet people.

60-Female

1. One thing is you need to let the group get to know each other better. Throughout the study I didn't share half as much as I would of if I knew and trusted people more.
2. Another thing is a lot of the time you would interrupt people when they were trying to explain things, and then that would make us not want to say anything.
3. A lot of the time you would call people out, and I found it very rude and embarrassing. You could have told the student and me outside of the circle that we were bugging you.
4. Everyone was shouting at each other, so you need some sense of direction or like "Talking Stick" because it got out of hand and stressed a lot of people out.
5. Lastly, I still don't get what you got out of this survey? Explain more...Just a couple packets we filled out? You can't stop bullying.

61-Male

1. I think that when we were doing the discussions, that we could have done more descriptions and making more fun out of it.
2. I think when we are doing the discussions; you could have listened to our ideas more. Not turned all our ideas down.
3. I think when we are getting ready to start that you could maybe give us 5-7 minutes just to talk.
4. I think giving us breaks in the middle of thing so we can stretch and pay attention better.
5. I think you could have gotten our trust more that way you could have given more examples.

62-Male

1. Listen to your peers.
2. Don't talk over. Allow them to finish their state of thought.
3. Don't leave anyone out, or tell anyone they are wrong.

4. Topic of discussion should be more constructive and planned out.

63-Male

1. You could do better by listening to all of what everyone has to say.
2. You could try and get everyone to talk.
3. You could try and make everyone feel safe with sharing.
4. I didn't like the survey because I didn't feel it was accurate.
5. You could keep everyone on task all the time.

64-Male

1. Less making us guess what something means with the proper definition, there were so many different opinions on it. I was really confused on what it really meant.
2. More explanation of how we could use these skills in the real world. I didn't really see the helpfulness of this program.
3. More group involvement. Not a lot of people were involved. There should be more.
4. More ways to actually resolve things (like fights). Not what if a fight happened.
5. No more circles. It took time out of the program to get the group in a circle, when it would be much easier to sit at your seat.

65-Male

1. Field trip
2. More involved
3. Group everyday
4. Group nap on Friday

5. Give us Baskin-Robbins on Fridays
6. Have a psychopath come out and talk to us

66-Female

1. More class involvement
2. (Crossed off) Better discussions with class (topics)
3. Visual examples (movies i.e.; *Mean Girls*)
4. Rewards for contributing ideas
5. More group discussions
6. Field trip instead of pizza party on the last day

67-Male

1. More informative movies like *Mean Girls*
2. We should have had more pizza days
3. There should be a reward for talking
4. Not sitting in big circle
5. Could have had a field trip

68-Female

1. The circle idea (boy-girl) combo
2. We should have had more movie times
3. Field trips
4. We didn't talk that much. (more discussions)

5. Movie time If we had it every day
6. Talking
7. Having fun
8. Candy
9. Fun to talk about

69-Female

1. More people sharing their thoughts about ideas
2. Telling more experiences from people in the classroom
3. Discussions had deeper thoughts
4. More strategies to deal with problems. (Such as bullying)
5. Making more solutions to a problem so people would feel more comfortable talking or sharing ideas

70-Female

1. Don't make people sit in a circle
2. Get everyone involved
3. No interruptions
4. Everyone should have a say
5. Tell us what stuff means instead of us guessing

71-Male

1. It would be better if [we] got rewarded for talking.
2. If group was every day
3. If we went on a field trip
4. If we had nap time
5. If we had more movies for demonstrations

72-Male

1. Involve others more
2. More small groups
3. Group more often
4. More videos and movies
5. No big circle

73-Female

1. The circle
2. The rude interruptions
3. How no one really got to say what they feel
4. The role play

74-Male

1. I believe that fewer outbursts would be tolerated
2. Nap time

3. Less circle time and more one on one time
4. More interactive discussions
5. Field trips as an example
6. More often

75-Male

1. More frequent meetings
2. More participation
3. Finish movie
4. Small groups
5. Nap time

76-Male

1. It would be better if we split up into a group.
2. Finish *Mean Girls*
3. Nap time
4. Food every Friday
5. More games

77-Male

1. More people could get or be involved.
2. Not be in a circle as much
3. More group work (not big group or class)

4. More movies that involved situation
5. More people talking

78-Male

1. I think that we should have been more involved as a group.
2. The class should have been more on topic with the study.
3. The study should have been longer to cover more stuff.
4. Should have had more real-life problems from students
5. More solutions to the problems we discussed

79-Female

1. Instead of one large circle, to get people involved, have many small discussion circles.
2. At the end of the discussion, have the large circle to discuss ideas.
3. Small incentive rewards for good suggestions/ideas
4. More informative movies/visuals/real life situations
5. A more confidential environment

80-Male

1. More people involved
2. Less time spent in a big circle (maybe call on individual students at the tables)
3. Finish *Mean Girls*
4. Meet more than twice a week
5. More people talking

81-Female

1. Having people wait when someone is talking instead of talking over them and being impatient.
2. More people getting involved because only 2, 3 or 4 people would respond
3. Keeping people on task more
4. Having the class be quiet instead of just letting them talk
5. Ask people who talk constantly to leave the room

82-Male

1. Everything was great
2. More than 2 days a week
3. Nap time

83-Female

1. Visit us more days a week
2. If we didn't have a big circle
3. If we talked less and moved around
4. More people in the group
5. Watch more movies

84-Male

1. I do not like the circle
2. I didn't like how you could never really talk.

3. I did like how he brought us treats and I think it is just about enough.
4. I do not like the role playing.
5. I didn't like being the bully in role play.

85-Female

1. I would have liked it if more people would've spoken up.
2. I would have liked it if we didn't sit in circles.
3. I liked how everyone participated, but I would've liked it if we had more people.
4. Make more rational ideas so people have a better secure feeling.
5. More people talking about ideas.

86-Male

1. Everyone should be involved.
2. A triangle instead of a circle
3. If we split up into groups
4. If we had group every day
5. If we had movies

87-Female

1. I think you should get more people involved by going around the circle.
2. I liked the circle because it's just more fun.
3. I liked how you used real life situations to discuss!
4. I think you could have discussed in deeper thought.
5. I like how you used movies to discuss what the bully is trying to do!

88-Male

1. I felt that it would have been more appropriate if we weren't in a circle.
2. I felt that there should be more group involvement.
3. I thought it would have been nicer if we stayed on task more.
4. It would have been a better group if we had more written things or objectives.
5. We should have had a field trip to a psych ward so we could have understood what a Sociopath is.
6. Nap time.

89-Male

1. I would like to have had this every day of the week for the whole year.
2. I would have liked to sit in the desks.
3. Food on Fridays
4. Go on a field trip on last Friday
5. More people involved
6. Nap time

90-Male

1. Every time you answer you get a treat
2. More games/movies/nap time
3. Food every Friday
4. Small groups
5. More than 2 days a week

91-Female

1. It would've been better if we didn't have to sit in circles.
2. It would be good if we just sat and talked.
3. It would be good if we finished *Mean Girls*.
4. It would be nice if we had group every day.
5. It would be nice if we got to do more things. (field trip)

The population that was sampled: The school had a total population of 1500 students.

Out of the 1500 students 106 were part of the study. Statistical findings of the study are as follows:

- A higher GPI score is correlated with a decrease in the incidence of students reporting that they have been insulted or offended by another student from pre to post test assessment ($R = -.231$, $p = .023$).
- A higher GPI score is correlated with a decrease in the incidence of students reporting that the school or other place has been vandalized from pre to post test assessment ($R = -.240$, $p = .019$).
- Cross-tabs with chi-square testing to look at the difference in scores from pre to post test, when grouped by GPI score, gender, and class period did not reveal any significant findings.
- Paired Sample T-tests comparing pre and post test data showed significant findings for:
 - "You are excluded" ($p = .018$)

- “Do you see your class as working well together in a group?”
($p=.035$)
- “As a student at our school... 1 is we may be asked our opinion and 5 is our opinions are unwelcome” ($p=.007$)
- “We are allowed to have a say in our school” ($p=.044$)

- The majority of students reported that there were very positive changes (9.5%) or some positive changes (53.3%) when asked “Are things different for you in class since the intervention?,” while the remaining 37.1% of students found no difference.
- When asked “Has your teacher changed?” at post-intervention, 46.2% of students reported that there were some positive changes, 8.5% with very positive changes, and 45.3% of students found no difference.
- Most students felt that there were some positive changes (64.1%) when asked “Has the attitude in your class changed during the last three months?”
- When asked “How does class run now?” at post-intervention, the majority of students responded that it was somewhat better (56.6%), followed by 32.1% reporting no difference, and 11.3% with clearly better.
- Post-intervention, 67.3% of students reported that the intervention was not helpful when faced with a new incident.

APPENDIX I

CONFLICT MANAGEMENT STUDY

Each item on the pre- and post-survey has been assigned to a subcategory.

Indirect physical violence

1. Your objects are destroyed or defaced
2. You are threatened with weapons
3. Your school or other place is vandalized

Direct physical violence

1. You are hit or attacked physically by other students
2. You have injuries or pains from fights with other students

Indirect non-physical violence

1. You are a target because of your nickname
2. You are blackmailed by other students
3. You are excluded

Direct non-physical violence

1. You are insulted or offended by another student
2. You are called by insulting nicknames
3. You are laughed at by other students

Disposition

1. How do you usually feel at school? (1 is terrible, 6 is fantastic)
2. The mood in our class is mostly... (1 is cheerful, happy, 5 is low-spirited, half-hearted)
3. The mood in our class is mostly... (1 is without fear, 5 is fear-occupied)
4. I like it at our school
5. Our school has a good reputation
6. Our teachers are generally... (1 is tolerant, 5 is rigid)
7. Our teachers are generally... (1 is understanding, 5 is unfriendly)

Relational

1. Our teachers are generally... (1 is engaged, 5 is rigid)
2. There is a good relationship between teachers and students in our school
3. Do you see your class as working well together in a group?

Participation

1. Parents often participate in school events
2. We are allowed to give our ideas about school events like excursions and theatrical performances
3. At our school, you can do something crazy as long as no one gets hurt
4. We are allowed to have a say in our school

Inclusion

1. As a student, at our school... (1 is we are included in decisions, 5 is decisions are made without my input)
2. As a student, at our school... (1 is we may be asked our opinion, 5 is our opinions are unwelcome)
3. Teachers are not interested in the opinions of students

APPENDIX J
ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aber, J. L., Brown, J.L., & Jones, S.M. (2003). Developmental trajectories toward violence in middle childhood: course, demographic differences and response to school-based intervention. *Developmental Psychology*, 39(2), 324-348.

This study showcases a school-based intervention program called the Resolving Conflict Creatively Program (RCCP) that works with children in grades 1-6 in New York City public elementary school. Across gender, race and economic categories, children whose teachers taught the program's conflict resolution methods exhibited fewer conduct problems, depressive symptoms and aggressive behaviors.

- Abrams, J. & Zweig, C. (1991). *Meeting the shadow: The hidden power of the dark side of human nature*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York.

The editors have compiled 65 essays on the shadow. The chapters cover everything from the development of the shadow to the culture shadow. The topics also cover the body as shadow and shadow in dreams. The writers are well known such as Joseph Campbell, C. C. Jung, Rollo May and James Hillman to name a few.

- Adler, G. (1979). *Dynamics of the self*. London, Boston: Coventure, Ltd.

The writer has brought together three essays on Analytical Psychology that summarizes and introduces the psychology of C. G. Jung. The first addresses the role of the self in the case of a child and adult. The second describes the intellectual activity of the unconscious and how there is an intelligent and purposive activity orchestrated by the self. The third and final essay is about remembering and forgetting philosophical and psychological issues as related to the culture motif of the time.

- Allan, J. (1988). *Inscapes of the child's world: Jungian counseling in schools and clinics*. Dallas: Spring Publications, Inc.

This book explores the work of counseling and psychotherapy from a Jungian perspective in school. Allan, a Jungian analyst, adapts and implants some Jungian approaches in both development and remedial ways with students, teachers and school counselors. The book is a collection of eleven papers written over ten years that articulate a Jungian approach to children and adolescents.

August, G.J., Realmuto, G.M., Hectner, J.M., & Bloomquist, M.L. (2001). An integrated components preventive intervention for aggressive elementary school children: The Early Risers Program. *Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology*, 69(4), 614-626.

This study evaluated the impact of a violence prevention program called Early Risers on young children who were identified as at high risk of aggression. Early Risers is a six-week initial program with 2 years of follow up support. The study found improvement in academic performance and behavioral self-regulation.

Brenner, C. (1971). The psychoanalytic concept of aggression. *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, 52, 137-145.

In this paper the author discusses the idea of aggression as an instinctual drive, aggression, pleasure principle and physical conflict. He explains the origin of aggression and its role to the maturation process and also explores the idea of aggression and ego development.

Flannery, D.J., Vazsonyi, A.T., Liao, A.K., Guo, S., Powell, K.E., Atha, H., Vesterdal, W. & Embry, D. (2003). Initial behavior outcomes for the Peace Builders Universal School-Based Violence Prevention Program. *Developmental Psychology*, 39(2), 292-308.

This study looks at a Peace Builder's program aimed at reducing aggressive behavior and improving social competence and positive behavior in K-5 children. The program teaches skills in positive reinforcement and peace-promoting behavior.

Fonagy, P., Moran, G.S., Target, M. (1993). Aggression and the psychological self. *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, 74, 471-486.

Investigates the ideas behind aggression as a defense to the “psychological self.” They do not explore the origins of aggression but the role of aggression in normal and abnormal development. They also state that some forms of aggression are not simply reaction formation but a breakdown of normal defense process.

Freud, A. (1972). Comments on aggression. *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, 53, 163-172.

This paper was given by Anna Freud regarding aggression. Anna believed that the origins of aggression are tied into the sexual drives. She elaborates that the source of aggressive drives is a primary, innate drive and not a defense against environmental intrusions as other have stated.

Greenacre, P. (1970). Youth, growth, and violence. *Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*, v. 25, 340-360.

This article discusses how and why youth are more likely to have symptoms of unrest leading to acts of violence. The author argues that during the maturational development there is a reawakening of problems left over from childhood. There is also a need of adapting and changing to host of external and internal changes that are occurring during this period of development.

Guggenbuhl, A. (1996). *Incredible fascination of violence: Dealing with aggression and brutality among children*. Continuum International Publishing Group.

Guggenbuhl writes from his experiences as a psychologist in Swiss canton schools and as a therapist and publisher of psychological works. He has gathered material analyzing what makes children behave violently toward each other. Guggenbuhl reexamines many assumptions about violence and childhood and puts forth a methodology for using mythodrama as a resource to find alternative strategies for violence prevention and dealing with violence among school children. Reviewed as “a powerful and compelling wake-up call to the English-speaking world, and especially to American society, racked as it is by fears of violence toward and among children”

Hastings, P. D., Zahn-Waxler C., Robinson, J., Usher B., & Bridges, D. (2000). The development of concern for others in children with behavior problems. *Developmental Psychology*, 36(5), 531-546.

This NIMH study at the University of Colorado Boulder looks at whether concern for others correlates to aggressive/disruptive behavior in pre-school children. Study found important links between parenting style and pro-social development as a factor in whether or not children retained concern for others as they matured.

Henderson, J.L. (1990). *Shadow and self: Selected papers in analytical psychology*. Wilmette, Illinois: Chiron Publications.

This book is a collection of essays written by Henderson from as early as 1938 to as late as 1984. He writes about how psychology and culture form and transform each other. The emphasis is on the shadow's effect on culture and the unconscious culture's effect on the shadow. The book addresses the need to understand the cultural dynamic in the shadow as well as several related topics concerning the shadow.

Ialongo, N., Poduska, J., Werthamer, L., & Kellam, S. (2001). The distal impact of two first-grade preventive interventions on conduct problems and disorders in early adolescence. *Journal of Emotional & Behavioral Disorders*, 9(3), 146-160.

The purpose of this study was to examine the long term impact of two preventive interventions used with first graders: one classroom centered and the other focused on parents' interaction with the school and good parenting skills. Children in a random sample that were exposed to these interventions in first grade were revisited five years later. The study found that later success correlated to early risk assessment and intervention.

Jacobi, J. (1942). *The psychology of C.G. Jung: An introduction with illustrations*. New Haven, Conn: Yale University Press.

In this book Jacobi tries to encapsulate Jungian theory and concept. He writes that Jung's theory can be divided into two parts, one theoretical and the other practical. The theoretical part breaks down into two main divisions the structure of the psyche and the laws of the psychic process. The practical part of Jung's work is the practice of psychotherapy and its applications.

Jung, C.G. (1959). *The archetypes and the collective unconscious*. (2nd edition). Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Talks substantially about what the shadow does and how it functions as an unconscious mechanism, made occasionally conscious through our projections and through our use of archetypes and myths that reference the collective.

Jung C.G. (1979). Analytical psychology and Weltanschauung. In Carl Jung, *Collected works of C.G. Jung*, (Vol. 8). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University. (Original work published in 1959.)

According to Jung, “weltanschauung” is a barely-translatable German word and as such an example of a particle of language that carries a particular view of the world that embraces a variety of attitudes including the idealistic, realistic, religious, romantic and aesthetic. Thus, it is an example of a word that carries with it a particular constellation of psychic content and orientation.

Jung, C.G. (1954). *The development of personality: Papers on child psychology, education and related subjects*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

A collection of papers on child psychology and education. In the book Jung writes about the importance of the psychology of parents and educators and their effect on child development and the expansion of consciousness in children. He emphasizes that disturbed psychological relationships between parents and children are major factors in causing pathological disturbances in children.

Jung C.G. (1979). General aspects of dream psychology. In Carl Jung, *Collected works of C.G. Jung*, (Vol. 8). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University. (Original work published in 1959.)

In this article Jung posits that dreams have an identifiable structure that can be understood and identified to help the dreamer understand the reasons behind the dream.

Jung, Carl. (1979). New paths in psychology. In Carl Jung, *Collected works of C.G. Jung*, (Vol. 7). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University. (Original work published in 1912.)

In this essay Jung talks about experimental psychology and when and how psychiatrists found ways to make these insights practical in treatment of patients.

It also discusses the evolution of the talking therapies as part of the psychological treatment process.

Jung, Carl. (1979). On the psychology of the unconscious. In Carl Jung, *Collected works of C.G. Jung*, (Vol. 7). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University. (Original work published in 1912.)

The two essays in this book talk about using the personal and collective meanings of dreams in the treatment of patients. He suggests that dreams and their archetypal symbolism are pathways to understanding our unconscious.

Jung, C. G. (1954). *The practice of psychotherapy: Essays on the psychology of the transference and other subjects*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Jung writes that psychotherapy has given rise to all types of different interpretations and psychological theories. The reason for this is that psychotherapy is a dialectic that occurs between two people. The dialectic is a term used by philosophers to explain the conversation that occurred among ancient philosophers. In this book Jung explains his views on psychotherapy and how it has evolved from the early beginnings of psychoanalysis.

Jung, C.G. (1979). Psychological aspects of the mother archetype. In Carl Jung, *Collected works of C.G. Jung*, (Vol. 9, Part 1). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University. (Original work published in 1939.)

In this article Jung talks about the different archetypes with which the mother figure is associated. He talks about how the mother archetype is associated with things that represent fruitfulness and life, as well as how it is the essence of our psychological evolution in our relational aspects.

Jung, C.G. (1953). *Psychology and alchemy*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Jung writes that there is a psychological process or a “dialectical discussion” that occurs between the conscious and the unconscious that has a goal or aim. Jung tries to explain why, even after analysis ends, the push towards this end continues. Jung believed that the psychological work is always present in the person and continues to unfold over lifetime. In this work Jung gives examples of

psychological symbols of development as well as the unconscious significances of these symbols.

Jung, C.G. (1979). Psychology and religion. In Carl Jung, *Collected works of C.G. Jung*, (Vol. 8). Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press. (Original work published in 1912.)

In this book Jung talks about the differences in the ways Western societies use religion and the psychological make-up that underpins how people worship. He suggests that in Eastern religions, psychology, philosophy and religion are integrated into the daily life of the individual whereas in Western societies these are more compartmentalized. He also indicates that Eastern religions appear to have a higher tolerance for the unknown that do Western religions, which, for example, view death on a binary scale of reward and punishment for one's life.

Kalsched, D. (1996). *The inner world of trauma: Archetypal defenses of the personal spirit*. London: Routledge.

The author writes on the topic of trauma from two different psychoanalytic theories Jungian and British Object Relations. He considers both theories as essential in understanding trauma and how to treat it. Kalsched explores fantasies and Grimm's fairytales to understand the psyche's transformation of external traumatic event to fantasy, dreams and stories.

Kokko, K., & Pulkkinen, L. (2000). Aggression in childhood and long-term unemployment in adulthood: A cycle of maladaptation and some protective factors. *Developmental Psychology*, 36(4), 463-472.

Drawing participants from the ongoing Jyväskylä Longitudinal Study of Personality and Social Development, this study looks at the relationship between childhood aggression and the long-term unemployment in adulthood. The study found that maladjustment in school begins a cycle of maladjustment in adulthood that correlates to problem drinking, limited occupational choices and long term unemployment.

Kruk, M.R., Meelis, W., Halasz, J., & Haller, J. (2004). Fast positive feedback the adrenocortical stress response and a brain mechanism involved in aggressive behavior. *Behavioral Neuroscience*, 118(5), 1062-1070.

This article discusses how stress and aggression reinforce each other at the biological level, creating a vicious cycle. It relates the findings of a study, which was conducted in Netherlands and Hungary by behavioral neuroscientists, looking at why it is so hard to stop the cycle of violence. The study shows that stress and aggression work in a mutually reinforcing feedback loop that is difficult to short circuit.

Marohn, R.C. (1993). Rage without content. *Progress in Self Psychology*, 9, 129-142.

This paper explores the idea of several psychoanalytic theorists on the idea and origin of aggression. The disagreements that these theorists had were about whether aggression was a self-protective mechanism that was innate or developed. The aggressive drives protect the ego a self-preservation instinct.

Miller, W.A. (1981). *Make friends with your shadow: How to accept and use positively the negative side of your personality*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing.

In this book the author explores the idea of shadow and personality development, the different aspects of the shadow; personal, collective and archetypal. The book analyzes the split between the shadow/ego and the effect it has on the development of the personality.

Mitchell, S.A. (1993). Aggression and the endangered self. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, 62, 351-383.

This paper explores a controversy that has divided psychoanalytic world: whether aggression is a human instinct or not. The paper argues that it is both an innate instinct and not innate. He writes aggression lies at both the core of the self and also on the periphery.

Rank, B. (1949). Aggression. *Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*, 3, 43-49.

This article is several case studies of children that explore the idea of aggression. In the article the writer explains that in atypical development the feelings of annihilation and disintegration are common amongst these children. It is rare in these children direct their rage and aggression against others. That type of behavior is more goal-directed for these children.

Shure, M.B., & Spivack, G. (1980). Interpersonal problem solving as a mediator of behavioral adjustment in preschool and kindergarten children. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 1*, 29-44.

This article focuses on a two-year study of preschool and kindergarten students shows that interpersonal cognitive problem-solving skills (ICPS), which are lacking in children exhibiting aggressive behavior, can be taught and mitigate maladjustment over a 5-year longitudinal study.

Stein, M. (1998). *Jung's map of the soul*. Carus Publishing Company.

This book is introduction to Jungian theory, ideas and concepts for those who are interested in Jungian theory and need an orientation into Jungian ideas. Stein writes that in reading Jung one must keep in mind that he was not mapping out a territory, but an experience of the deep psyche. At best understanding Jungian psychology gives a guide and orientation to explore this vast universe we call psyche. This book also gives very important explanations of concepts that are commonly used in Jungian theory.

Stevens, A. (1990). *On Jung*. London: Routledge.

To understand Jung's contribution to psychoanalysis one has to understand the origin and history of its development. It is with this idea in mind that Stevens begins to explore the development of Jung's theories ideas and concepts. In this book Stevens writes of Jung's personal and professional development. Stevens explores the biological basis of Jung's ideas, as well as the personal and professional relationship with Freud. He also writes of Jung's model of the psyche and the significance of concepts such as the self and the shadow.

Stoolmiller, M., Eddy, M. J., & Reid, J.B. (2000). Detecting and describing preventive intervention effects in a universal school-based randomized trial targeting delinquent and violent behavior. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 68*(2), 296-306.

The study looks at the efficacy of an intervention program called Linking the Interests of Families and Teachers (LIFT) in violence prevention among elementary school children. The study found that when parents participated in parent education classes, teachers learned better ways to manage inappropriate

student behavior and volunteer playground monitors learned better skills for supervising and rewarding children, children who were initially targeted as aggressive became virtually indistinguishable from average children.

Storr, A. (1983). *The essential Jung*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

This is a book that presents Jung's ideas in his own words. Storr writes about Jung by using extracts of his work and discussing them. He uses some of the most important ideas Jung is known for such as introversion and extroversion, individuation, complex and archetype, collective unconscious and integration as the main goal of the development of the personality.

Twemlow, S.W. (1995). The psychoanalytical foundations of a dialectical approach to the victim/victimizer relationship. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychoanalysis*, 23 (4), 545-562.

This paper explores the dialect between victim and victimizer relationship. Twemlow writes that passivity and activity are the basis of the struggle between victim and victimizer. His hypothesis suggests that like the transference and counter-transference that exists in psychoanalytic treatment, a similar dyadic relationship exists between victim/victimizer.

Twemlow, S.W. (1995). Traumatic object relations configurations seen in victim/victimizer relationship. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychoanalysis*, 23 (4), 563-577.

In this article the author states that politics and blame should not be the way as we understand the victim/victimizer dyad. Our understanding should come from interpretation and insight. The relationship between victim and victimizer contains both positive and negative energy. Thus the relationship feeds from the negative interaction that occurs between victim/victimizer

Twemlow, S.W. (2000). The roots of violence: converging psychoanalytic explanatory models for power struggles and violence. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, 69 (4), 741-786.

This article outlines the importance of community psychoanalysis and the importance of building peaceful school environment. The author outlines the model for a safe school environment and the rules that are needed for this type of school. The emphasis is on a group intervention by students, teacher, counselors, administrators and psychotherapist.

Von Franz, M-L. (1993). *Projection: Its relationship to illness and psychic maturation*. Boston: Shambhala Publications.

This book includes 12 essays by one of Carl Jung's protégé's about attitudes toward patients that analysts bring into psychotherapy. She also reviews Jungian personality types (the personality types reflected in the Myers-Briggs test) and how they manifest in psychotherapists and analysands. In the essay she discusses the similarities and differences between Jung's and Freud's definitions of projection. She also discusses transference and countertransference and the role of the shadow in both.