CHAPTER FORTY-SEVEN

Conflict Resolution in Schools

David W. Johnson
Roger T. Johnson

The constructive resolution of conflict lies at the heart of preventing and resolving destructive conflicts, discipline problems, and bullying in schools. Conflicts may be among students or between students and the teacher or other staff members. The way in which conflicts are managed has profound influences on the effectiveness with which teachers instruct and socialize students and manage the class. When conflicts are resolved constructively, teacher effectiveness increases. When conflicts are managed destructively, the teacher's ability to instruct students and manage the classroom is obstructed.

Schools are the setting in which many conflicts are created, occur, and are managed and resolved. Many of these conflicts are quite constructive and add to the quality of life within the school. Others are quite destructive and impair that quality of life. Through much of the world, schools are characterized by destructively managed conflicts, reflected in discipline problems, physical and verbal violence, bullying, and various states of student distress such as depression, anxiety, fear, rejection, and alienation. It should be emphasized, however, that it is not the occurrence of conflict in schools that is the core issue. A conflict-free school would be a boring and dysfunctional place. It is how the conflicts are managed that is the issue. In order for conflicts to be managed constructively, schools must be conflict-positive organizations.

CONFLICT-POSITIVE SCHOOLS

Conflicts are inevitable and pervasive throughout school life. Educators might as well try to stop the earth from turning on its axis as to try to eliminate conflicts from their classes and schools. The inevitability of conflicts, however, need not be a cause for despair. Conflicts have many positive outcomes if they are managed constructively. When conflicts are encouraged and managed constructively, a *conflict-positive school* exists (D. W. Johnson

1

and R. Johnson, 2005a). The occurrence of conflicts usually indicates that people have goals they care about and are involved in relationships they value. The occurrence of conflicts is not the issue. The issue is whether the conflicts are managed constructively or destructively. A conflict has been resolved constructively when (1) all parties involved are satisfied with the outcomes (i.e., joint benefits are maximized), (2) the relationship among disputants is strengthened or improved, and (3) the disputants' ability to resolve future conflicts in a constructive manner with each other has been improved. If one or more of these conditions is not met, the resolution of the conflict is destructive.

In contrast to a conflict-positive school, a *conflict-negative school* exists when conflicts are suppressed and avoided and, when they occur, are managed in destructive ways. The attempt is to try to eliminate all conflicts from the school by suppressing, avoiding, and denying their existence and try to minimize the impact of any conflicts that do take place. Procedures are established to avoid conflict, such as isolating any person who seems likely to engage in a conflict and separating potential disputants from each other.

This chapter discusses the need to teach students to resolve conflict constructively. It describes the nature of violence prevention and conflict resolution programs; examines the potential positive benefits of conflict resolution for individuals, the school, and society; and presents the Teaching Students to Be Peacemakers program, including its theoretical foundation and the research validating its effectiveness.

WHY TEACH STUDENTS TO RESOLVE CONFLICTS CONSTRUCTIVELY

Poorly managed conflicts result in numerous negative outcomes for individual students, including stress, lower achievement, and challenges to self-esteem and self-efficacy. A sizable proportion of students in many countries report feeling unsafe and fearful and believe that their school has a violence problem (D. W. Johnson and R. Johnson, 2005a). And according to international surveys, a sizable percentage of elementary and secondary students rate their schools as unsafe places. Providing students with an orderly environment in which to learn and guaranteeing their safety are becoming more and more difficult in many schools. Improving the quality of life within schools depends on decreasing the frequency of harm-intended aggression and increasing the frequency of prosocial behavior.

The reasons for teaching students how to resolve conflicts constructively include making schools safer, more positive places for learning to take

place; socializing students into the competencies and attitudes they need to be effective adults in our society; and eventually creating a more peaceful world. We go into greater detail about the benefits of teaching students to constructively resolve conflict later in the chapter. For now, in addressing these three overarching reasons, we briefly touch on the topics of classroom management and bullying. We then turn to creating a cooperative context in the schools as a foundation for establishing conflict resolution training and violence prevention programs.

Classroom Management

Discipline problems are by definition disruptions to the overall cooperative nature of the school (D. W. Johnson and R. Johnson, 2005a). Typically most discipline problems involve either conflicts among students or conflicts between students and teachers or standards concerning appropriate and acceptable conduct. Approaches to manage such disruptions may be placed on a continuum. At one end are discipline programs based on teacher-administered external rewards and punishments aimed at controlling and managing student behavior. At the other end are programs based on teaching students the competencies and skills required to regulate their own and their schoolmates' behavior. Peer mediation programs anchor the self-regulation end of the continuum.

Most discipline programs are clustered at the adult regulation of external rewards and punishments end of the continuum (see figure 47.1). Thus, it is up to the staff to monitor student behavior, determine whether it is or is not within the bounds of acceptability, and force students to terminate inappropriate actions. When the infractions are minor, the staff often arbitrate ("The pencil belongs to Mary; Jane, be quiet and sit down") or cajole students to end hostilities ("Let's forgive and forget"). If that does not work, students may be sent to the principal's office for a stern but cursory lecture about the value of getting along and a threat that if the conflict continues, more drastic action will ensue. Eventually some students may be expelled from school. Such programs convey to students that authority figures are needed to resolve conflicts. The programs tend to cost a great deal in instructional and administrative time and work only as long as students are under surveillance.

At the other end of the continuum are programs aimed at teaching students self-responsibility and self-regulation, significant hallmarks of cognitive and social development. *Self-regulation* is the ability to act in socially approved ways in the absence of external monitors and initiate and cease activities according to situational demands. To regulate their behavior, students monitor their behavior, assess situations (including taking other

Adult Regulation	Student Self-Regulation
Instruction emphasizes direct teaching, lecturing.	Instruction emphasizes learning groups, active engagement, social construction.
Management programs emphasize faculty administrated external rewards and punishments.	Management programs emphasize teaching students the competencies they need to regulate own and schoolmates' behavior.

High Adult Regulation 1—2—3—4—5—6—7—8—9—10 High Self-Regulation

Disciplinary interventions include faculty being a police officer, judge, jury, and executioner; faculty monitor student behavior, judge its appropriateness, decide which consequence to administer, and give the reward or punishment.	Disciplinary interventions include teaching students the competencies and attitudes they need to regulate their own behavior and structuring conflict resolution and peer mediation programs; also include strengthening five basic elements of cooperation. Students monitor the appropriateness of their own and their groupmates' behavior, assess its effectiveness, and decide how to behave.

Figure 47.1 Continuum of Classroom Management Program

people's perspectives) to make judgments as to which behaviors are appropriate, and engage in the desired behavior. If students are to learn how to regulate their behavior, they must have opportunities to make decisions regarding how to behave and follow through on the decisions made. Doing so tends to result in feelings of control and autonomy. To be self-regulating, students need to learn the competencies and attitudes required to resolve their conflicts constructively and participate in activities such as cooperative learning that provide the opportunities to make decisions about appropriate behavior and engage in a variety of actions.

Bullying

Many schools are greatly concerned about the frequency of bullying and victimization among their students. Bullying involves an individual who engages in repeated harm-intended aggression (i.e., aggressive behavior aimed at inflicting physical, relational, or psychological harm) and a victim, who is usually a vulnerable or weaker person. When we include

bystanders in the equation, almost every student plays a role in a bullying situation. The opposite of bullying is prosocial behavior; therefore, bullying cannot occur when students are engaged in prosocial behaviors. *Prosocial behaviors* are actions that benefit other people by helping, supporting, and encouraging their goal accomplishment or well-being. Reducing bullying and thereby improving the quality of life within schools depends on decreasing the frequency of harm-intended aggression and increasing the frequency of prosocial behavior.

A recent study (Choi, Johnson, and Johnson, 2011) tested the contrasting predictions of social interdependence theory (Deutsch, 1949, 1962; D. W. Johnson and R. Johnson, 1989, 2005b) and the theories related to social dominance (e.g., Hawley, 1999; LaFreniere and Charlesworth, 1983; Pellegrini and Long, 2002; Strayer, 1980); about the relationship between cooperative experiences and harm-intended aggression, victimization, and prosocial actions; and the relationship between predispositions to engage in cooperative, competitive, and individualistic behavior and harm-intended aggression, victimization, and prosocial actions. The results indicated that cooperative experiences predicted cooperative predispositions, the absence of individualistic predispositions, and prosocial behaviors. Cooperative predisposition predicted prosocial behaviors and the absence of harm-intended aggression (i.e., no bullying). Competitive predisposition predicted harm-intended aggression (i.e., bullying). These findings validate social interdependence theory and partially support theories related to social dominance. Providing frequent cooperative learning experiences may be an important tool to increase students' cooperativeness and thereby increase the frequency of prosocial behaviors and reduce the frequency of harm-intended aggression.

Creating Cooperative Context

The first step in creating classroom management programs that are based on student responsibility and self-regulation is to establish a cooperative context. There are two possible contexts for conflict: cooperative and competitive (in individualistic situations, individuals do not interact, so no conflict occurs). Schooling must be predominantly a cooperative experience of working together to achieve mutual goals. Scholarship and learning do not exist in isolation; they are products of a community and a culture characterized by mutual respect and trust. A *community* is a group of people who live in the same locality and share common goals and a common culture. The school community is made up of the faculty and staff, the students and their parents, and members of the neighborhood. Broadly, the school community includes all stakeholders, including central administrators, college admission officers,

and future employers. The degree to which the learning community reflects cooperation largely determines whether conflict is managed constructively or destructively (Deutsch, 1973; D. W. Johnson and R. Johnson, 1989).

Conflicts usually go well in a cooperative context. In a cooperative situation, students work together to accomplish shared goals, that is, they seek outcomes that are beneficial to everyone involved. Within cooperative situations (Deutsch, 1973; D. W. Johnson and R. Johnson, 1989)

- Individuals focus on mutual goals and shared interests
- Individuals are concerned with both self and others' well-being
- Individuals adopt a long-term time orientation where they focus their energies on both achieving goals and building good working relationships with others
- Effective and continued communication is of vital importance in resolving a conflict
- Communication of relevant information tends to be frequent, open, accurate, and honest, with each person interested in informing the other as well as being informed
- Perceptions of the other person and the other person's actions are far more accurate and constructive
- Individuals trust and like each other and therefore are willing to respond helpfully to others' wants, needs, and requests
- Individuals recognize the legitimacy of others' interests and search for a solution accommodating the needs of both sides

Conflicts usually do not go well in a competitive context. For competition to exist, there must be scarcity: I must defeat you to get what I want. Rewards are restricted to the few who perform the best. In a competitive situation, individuals work against each other to achieve a goal that only one or a few can attain: you can attain your goal if and only if the other people involved cannot attain their goals. Thus, competitors seek outcomes that are personally beneficial but detrimental to all others in the situation. Within competitive situations (Deutsch, 1973; D. W. Johnson and R. Johnson, 1989)

- Individuals focus on differential benefit (i.e., doing better than anyone else in the situation)
- Individuals focus on their own well-being and the deprivation of the other participants
- Individuals adopt a short-term time orientation where they focus all of their energies on winning (they pay little or no attention to maintaining a good relationship)

- Communication tends to be avoided; when it does take place, it tends to contain misleading information and threats
- There are frequent and common misperceptions and distortions of the other person's position and motivations that are difficult to correct
- Individuals have a suspicious, hostile attitude toward each other that increases their readiness to exploit others' wants and needs and refuse others' requests
- Individuals tend to deny the legitimacy of others' wants, needs, and feelings and consider only their own interests

All of these together make for a very destructive context for conflicts.

A cooperative context is most easily established through the use of cooperative learning over the majority of the school day. (For a thorough discussion of cooperative learning, see Johnson, Johnson, and Holubec, 2008.) Once a cooperative context has been established, the next steps are to establish conflict resolution training and violence prevention programs.

CONFLICT RESOLUTION AND VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAMS

Conflicts inevitably occur in schools, among students, between students and faculty, and among faculty members. The issue is not the occurrence of conflicts, but rather whether they are managed in constructive ways or destructive ways. A conflict exists when the actions of one person prevent, block, or interfere with the other's efforts to achieve his or her goal (Deutsch, 1973). Two types of conflicts are important for schools (D. W. Johnson and R. Johnson, 2005a, 2007). One type of conflict is *constructive controversy*, which occurs when one person's ideas, information, conclusions, theories, and opinions are incompatible with those of another and the two seek to decide on a conclusion or course of action. (Controversy is discussed in Chapter 4 of this Handbook.) Another type is a *conflict of interests*, which occurs when the actions of one person attempting to reach his or her goals prevent, block, or interfere with the actions of another person attempting to reach his or her goals. Faculty and students at times may have different interests that must be reconciled if they are to cooperate to achieve mutual goals. There are also times when the interests of different students need to be reconciled. For such conflicts to be solved constructively, disputants need to engage in integrative (i.e., problem-solving) negotiations and have a mediator available when negotiations fail. In extreme cases, a conflict of interests may result in violence. While violence prevention and conflict resolution programs

are interrelated and often complementary, they may be distinguished from each other.

Violence Prevention Programs

Violence is behavior that violates another individual or group physically or emotionally (D. W. Johnson and R. Johnson, 2005a). In many countries, there tends to be more physical and verbal aggression in urban than in suburban or rural schools. In some (mostly urban) schools, violence prevention programs may be needed. Violence prevention programs are procedures aimed at reducing the frequency of violence committed by members of the school. These programs have the following components:

- Implementing surveillance systems such as metal detectors and random searches of lockers to reduce the number of weapons brought into the school.
- Suppressing violence by having the city police patrol the school.
- Concentrating school resources on students who commit the most serious acts of violence and are involved most often in violent incidents in the school (such as bullies) so that their behavior is modified.
- Instituting a threat management policy so that anyone who believes he or she is in danger in the school can talk to a counselor or psychologist and receive adult protection.
- Training faculty and staff in how to intervene in violent situations so that deescalation rather than escalation takes place. The training includes how to recognize the stages leading to a student's violent actions so faculty and staff intervene before the student becomes physically violent.
- Training faculty and staff in how to identify students who have mental disorders (those who are paranoid, depressed, isolated, or picked on) and see that they are provided with appropriate therapy.

Generally violence prevention programs are regulated by adults and aimed at suppressing and controlling extreme student behaviors. They provide teachers with skills but do not focus on the skill development of students. Conflict resolution programs, in contrast, focus on training students to regulate their own behavior in conflict situations; as a result, they help prevent violence over the long term.

Conflict Resolution Programs

The history of mediation as a means of resolving conflicts constructively goes back to the beginnings of human existence. Historically, in many

cultures, members of the extended family served as mediators. In parts of ancient Africa, disputes were resolved informally by assembling a "moot" or neighborhood meeting, where a respected community member served as a mediator to help the disputants resolve their conflict cooperatively without involving a judge or arbitrator and without using sanctions. In ancient China, mediators were used in order to follow the Confucian way of resolving disputes by moral persuasion and agreement. In ancient Japan, the village leader was expected to use mediation and conciliation to help community members settle their disputes. For centuries, all over the world, local religious leaders served as mediators to resolve conflicts among community members. The history of the modern field of conflict resolution is brief, spanning the past 150 years or so, and the history of school-based mediation programs spans about three decades.

In the past fifty years, conflict resolution and peer mediation programs have been generated by researchers in the field of conflict resolution, groups committed to nonviolence such as the Quakers, antinuclear war groups, and lawyers. While there are dozens and dozens of programs, some of the most historic and important are discussed below.

Research Theory–Based Programs. The school program at the International Center for Cooperation and Conflict Resolution (ICCCR) at Columbia University consists of five parts (Coleman and Fisher-Yoshida, 2004). The program, which trains student mediators, attempts to integrate conflict resolution concepts and skills in the school curriculum. It uses cooperative learning and constructive controversy as pedagogical methods. It attempts to change the school culture from competitive to cooperative. Finally, it tries to involve the broader community (such as parents) in resolving conflicts within the school.

The conflict resolution model (Wertheim, Love, Peck, and Littlefield, 1992), developed in Australia, consists of four components that represent different stages in successful problem solving: teaching that cooperation is the most effective means of managing conflict because it leads to better-quality outcomes for all concerned, identifying each party's interests, brainstorming creative options, and combining options into win-win solutions. This model has been field-tested in Australia, and a series of research studies has been conducted on its effectiveness (Davidson and Wood, 2004).

The Constructive Controversy Program, first taught in the early 1970s, consists of teaching students how to engage in intellectual conflict in either academic or group decision-making situations (D. W. Johnson and R. Johnson, 1979, 2007). It is based on a theory, has considerable validating research, and has been implemented in classrooms throughout North America, Europe, and many other parts of the world.

The Teaching Students to Be Peacemakers program was developed in the mid-1960s at the University of Minnesota by researchers in the field of conflict resolution (Johnson, 1970, 1971a, 1971b; D. W. Johnson and R. Johnson, 2005a; Johnson, Johnson, and Johnson, 1976). Beginning in 1966, teachers were trained to teach students how to resolve conflicts constructively. The program

1. Trains all students in the school to engage in integrative, problem-solving negotiations and mediate schoolmates' conflicts

2. Integrates the training into academic curriculum units

3. Repeats the training each year at an increasingly higher level of sophistication as a twelve-year spiral curriculum

4. Ensures that school norms, values, and culture support the use of the negotiation and mediation procedures

5. Ensures that all students serve as peer mediators an equal amount of time so that everyone experiences the benefits for doing so

The Peacemaker Program has been implemented in schools throughout North America, and in several countries in Europe, the Middle East, Africa, Asia, and Central and South America. We present the program in greater detail later in the chapter.

Nonviolence Advocacy Groups. A second source of school-based conflict resolution programs is from groups committed to nonviolence. In the early 1970s, a few Quaker teachers in New York City became interested in teaching nonviolence training to children. Their efforts, known as the New York Quaker Project on Community Conflict, resulted in the founding of the Children's Creative Response to Conflict in 1972. Priscilla Prutzman was named its first director. Weekly workshops in public schools were given. The power of nonviolence lies in the force of justice, the power of love and caring, and the desire for personal integrity. Its modern roots lie in the teachings of the examples of Gandhi and Martin Luther King Jr.

Anti–Nuclear War Groups. A third source of school-based conflict resolution programs are groups committed to the prevention of nuclear war. In the early 1980s, Educators for Social Responsibility was formed to address a number of school issues, including the roots of violence in schools (Selfridge, 2004). In 1985, in partnership with the New York City public schools, the Educators for Social Responsibility began the Resolving Conflict Creatively Program (RCCP). The program is aimed at implementing a ten-unit curriculum with lessons on intergroup relations, cooperative learning, and dispute resolution procedures for students; twenty hours of training in how to be a peer mediator for students; and ten four-hour workshops for parents.

Lawyers. A fourth source of conflict resolution programs in schools comes from the legal profession. As a response to President Carter's Neighborhood Justice Centers, in 1977 trial lawyer Ray Shonholtz established the Community Boards in San Francisco to mediate conflicts in neighborhoods. In mediating conflicts among adults, the mediators had to teach conflict resolution skills. Turning some attention to prevention, the group approached local schools with the idea of beginning a peer mediation program in schools. In 1982 Helena Davis wrote a conflict manager curriculum for elementary schools that was piloted in 1984. In 1985–1986, middle and high school curricula were developed and implemented. The curriculum has been extended and modified by Gail Sadalla.

BENEFITS OF TEACHING STUDENTS TO RESOLVE CONFLICTS CONSTRUCTIVELY

From all the research on conflict resolution, it may be concluded that when conflicts are resolved constructively, benefits result for individual students, the school, and the society as a whole (D. W. Johnson and F. Johnson, 2013; D. W. Johnson and R. Johnson, 1996b, 2005a, 2007; R. Johnson and D. W. Johnson, 2002).

Benefits for Students

There are so many personal and societal benefits for teaching students how to manage conflicts constructively that only a few can be discussed here. Individuals who resolve their conflicts constructively tend to (D. W. Johnson and R. Johnson, 1989, 2005a)

- Be healthier psychologically. They tend to cope with stress and adversity more positively, be more optimistic, have higher self-esteem, be more prosocially oriented, have greater social competencies, and have a greater sense of efficacy.
- Develop socially and cognitively in healthy ways. At every stage of social and cognitive development, there are conflicts that must be resolved constructively if the person is to move on to the next stage.
- Be happier more of the time. (Destructively managed conflicts tend to result in long periods of anger, regret, desire for revenge, shame, guilt, and other negative emotions.) Constructive conflicts are a source of fun, excitement, energy, curiosity, and motivation.
- Have more positive and supportive interpersonal and intergroup relationships. Resolving conflicts constructively strengthens relationships

by increasing individuals' confidence that they can resolve their disagreements, as well as keep the relationship clear of irritations and resentments so that positive feelings can be experienced fully.

- Have a greater sense of meaning and purpose in life. Mediating the conflicts of schoolmates tends to give students a sense of purpose and meaning that is unavailable in most of school life (D. W. Johnson and R. Johnson, 1996b). Engaging in conflicts also clarifies their own and others' identity, commitments, and values.

- Be more engaged with the school and its academic program. When quiet conflicts characterized by withdrawal and disengagement (reflected in tardiness, class cutting, and truancy) are managed constructively, students often become more engaged.

- Achieve more academically. Students who manage conflicts constructively tend to increase their academic achievement, retention, insight, creativity, problem solving, and synthesizing. When conflicts are managed destructively, the other schoolmates will tend to try to sabotage, obstruct, and interfere with students' attempts to achieve their goals.

- Have a developmental advantage. Learning how to resolve conflicts constructively and being skilled in doing so gives students a developmental advance over those who never learned how to do so. Individuals skilled in resolving conflicts constructively tend to make and keep more friends, are more liked by and popular with peers, and generally experience more happiness and less stress. They tend to be more assertive, have more self-control, are better able to communicate effectively, and are better able to cooperate with others. They tend to engage in more prosocial behavior and less antisocial, inappropriate behavior such as bullying, teasing, excluding others, and challenging the authority of teachers and administrators. Teaching students to be peacemakers may be one of the most valuable competencies that can be given to students, benefiting them throughout their lives.

- Have more successful careers. Learning how to engage in problem-solving negotiations and peer mediation may especially have an impact on students' later employability and career success. The American Management Association reported that about 24 percent of a manager's time is spent dealing with conflict. School and hospital administrators, mayors, and city managers report that conflict resolution commands nearly 49 percent of their attention. The higher the position in the organization, the more skillful the person needs to be.

Benefits for the School

The benefits for the school of students who have learned to resolve conflicts constructively include decreases in bullying, social rejection, social withdrawal, number of discipline referrals, and school dropouts (D. W. Johnson and F. Johnson, 2013; D. W. Johnson and R. Johnson, 1996b, 2005a; R. Johnson and D. W. Johnson, 2002). As a result, the quality of life within the school is enhanced. In addition, when students manage their conflicts constructively, their achievement and liking for school tend to go up and the school is successful. The costs to the school when students resolve conflicts destructively (i.e., the occurrence of discipline problems, general incivility, lack of motivation to learn, property damage, depression and anxiety, and even violence) is considerable in terms of faculty and staff time and energy. The attention paid to instruction and socialization is significantly reduced. These costs are avoided when students learn how to manage conflicts constructively. Finally, as a result of teaching students the procedures for managing conflicts, teachers themselves will master the procedures. As the Roman philosopher Seneca was fond of saying, "He who teaches, learns twice." A faculty skilled in resolving conflicts with students and with each other and other staff members is an important resource of any school.

Benefits for Society

There are numerous advantages for our society if all children, adolescents, and young adults are trained in how to resolve conflicts constructively. Society will be more cohesive, and the relations among citizens and groups will be more cooperative when citizens are skilled in resolving conflicts constructively. Organizations will function more smoothly and effectively. Families will be more cohesive and caring. Fewer citizens will be involved in legal disputes. There are so many benefits to society that teaching students how to manage conflicts constructively should be a major priority in all schools.

TEACHING STUDENTS TO BE PEACEMAKERS

An important aspect of creating a safer and more effective school is teaching students how to manage their conflicts of interests constructively. While numerous conflict resolution programs are being implemented in the schools, the one that perhaps has been most thoroughly researched and evaluated (as well as most widely implemented) is Teaching Students to Be Peacemakers.

The types of conflicts of interest that students typically deal with in school include dating and other relationship issues, control of resources,

playground conflicts, access and possession conflicts, preferences, verbal harassments (name-calling, insults, put-downs, teasing), verbal arguments, rumors and gossip, things damaged or stolen, and physical aggression (D. W. Johnson and R. Johnson, 1996b). In dealing with these and other conflicts (Johnson and Johnson, 2005a), untrained students tend to either avoid the conflict by withdrawing or try to overpower the opposition by forcing a win-lose negotiation, and when teachers and administrators become involved, they tend to impose a resolution the majority of the time through arbitration. Thus, students need to learn more constructive procedures for managing their conflicts and teachers need to learn how to mediate and encourage constructive student procedures. The Teaching Students to Be Peacemakers program is a procedure for doing so.

Peacemaker Procedure

The heart of the Teaching Students to Be Peacemakers program is integrative negotiation. There are six parts to the program (D. W. Johnson and R. Johnson, 2005a), organized into twenty thirty-minute lessons. Students then receive additional training sessions once a week or so for the rest of the school year.

Part One: Understanding the Nature of Conflict. Students are taught how to recognize when a conflict is and is not occurring and its potential constructive consequences. Generally students have a negativity bias in which they see conflicts as always involving anger, hostility, and violence, so they must learn to recognize conflicts that lead to laughter, insight, learning, and problem solving. Students learn that as long as conflicts are managed constructively, they should occur frequently.

Part Two: Choosing an Appropriate Conflict Strategy. The second part of the training focuses on the two concerns in conflicts: achieving one's goals and maintaining a good relationship with the other person. The importance of the goals and relationship determines whether a person should withdraw (giving up both one's goal and the relationship), force (achieve one's goal at the other person's expense thereby giving up the relationship—sometimes known as win-lose negotiations), smooth (give up one's goal in order to enhance the relationship), compromise (give up part of one's goal at some damage to the relationship), or negotiate to solve the problem (achieve one's goal and maintain the relationship).

Part Three: Negotiating to Solve the Problem. Conflicts of interests are resolved through negotiation (when negotiation does not work, mediation

is required). There are two ways to negotiate: *distributive*, "win-lose," or forcing (where one person benefits only if the opponent agrees to make a concession), and *integrative* or problem solving (where disputants work together to create an agreement that benefits everyone involved). In ongoing relationships, it is integrative negotiations that lead to all disputants' achieving their goals while maintaining or even improving the quality of their relationship. The problem-solving, integrative negotiation procedure consists of six steps (D. W. Johnson and R. Johnson, 1996a):

1. *Describing what you want:* "I want to use the book now." This includes using good communication skills and defining the conflict as a small and specific mutual problem.

2. *Describing how you feel:* "I'm frustrated." Disputants must understand how they feel and communicate it openly and clearly.

3. *Describing the reasons for your wants and feelings:* "You have been using the book for the past hour. If I don't get to use the book soon, my report will not be done on time. It's frustrating to have to wait so long." This includes expressing cooperative intentions, listening carefully, separating interests from positions, and exploring the differences between positions before trying to integrate the two sets of interests.

4. *Taking the other's perspective and summarizing your understanding of what the other person wants, how the other person feels, and the reasons underlying both:* "My understanding of you is . . ." This includes understanding the perspective of the opposing disputant and being able to see the problem from both perspectives simultaneously.

5. *Coming up with three optional plans to resolve the conflict in ways that maximize joint benefits:* "Plan A is . . . , plan B is . . . , plan C is . . ." This includes inventing creative options to solve the problem and maximize joint benefit.

6. *Choosing one option and formalizing the agreement with a handshake:* "Let's agree on plan B!" A wise agreement maximizes joint benefit, strengthens disputants' ability to work together cooperatively, and improves their ability to resolve conflicts constructively in the future. It specifies how each disputant should act in the future and how the agreement will be reviewed and renegotiated if it does not work.

An important aspect of problem-solving negotiation is reaching an agreement that repairs any harm done to disputants during the conflict (D. W. Johnson and R. Johnson, 2012). Justice needs to be restored if the agreement is going to last and result in a stable, ongoing relationship. Restorative justice

deals with at least two issues. The first is resolving the conflict in a way that restores justice among disputants and within the community as a whole. The second is to create the conditions for maintaining long-term, ongoing cooperation among the parties in the future. Three important aspects of restorative justice are reconciliation, remorse, and forgiveness. The agreement needs to

- Reconcile the disputants so that they improve their ongoing relationship
- Include an emotional expression of personal regret for how disputants have treated each other
- Include disputants' pardoning each other and letting go of any grudge, desire for revenge, or resentment toward the other for the wrongdoing that took place during the conflict

The shadow of the future is almost always present in negotiations among students. They will see each other again day after day. An effective, wise agreement must provide the means for restoring and maintaining justice in the disputants' dealings with each other.

Part Four: Mediating Others' Conflicts. When students are unable to negotiate a resolution to their conflict, they may request help from a mediator. *Mediation* exists when a neutral and impartial third party actively assists two or more people to negotiate a constructive resolution to their conflict. In contrast, *arbitration* is the submission of a dispute to a disinterested third party (such as a teacher or principal) who makes a final and binding judgment as to how the conflict will be resolved. Mediation consists of four steps (D. W. Johnson and R. Johnson, 1996a):

1. *Ending hostilities:* Break up hostile encounters and cool off students.
2. *Ensuring disputants are committed to the mediation process:* To ensure that disputants are committed to the mediation process and are ready to negotiate in good faith, the mediator introduces the process of mediation and sets the ground rules. The mediator first introduces himself or herself. The mediator asks the students if they want to solve the problem and does not proceed until both answer yes. Then the mediator explains that mediation is voluntary, the mediator is neutral and will not take sides, each person will have the chance to state his or her view of the conflict without interruption, and disputants must follow these rules:

   Agreeing to solve the problem

   No name-calling

   No interrupting

> Being as honest as they can
>
> Abiding by the agreement made
>
> Keeping anything said in mediation confidential (the mediator especially will not tell anyone what is said)

3. *Helping disputants successfully negotiate with each other:* The disputants are carefully taken through the problem-solving negotiation sequence.

4. *Formalizing the agreement:* The mediator formalizes the agreement by completing a mediation report form and having disputants sign it and shake hands as a commitment to implement the agreement and abide by its conditions. The mediator becomes the keeper of the contract and checks back with the disputants a day or so later to see if the agreement is working.

Part Five: Implementing the Program. Once students understand how to negotiate and mediate, the peacemaker program is implemented. Each day the teacher selects two class members to serve as official mediators. Any conflicts students cannot resolve themselves are referred to the mediators. The mediators wear official T-shirts, patrol the playground and lunchroom, and are available to mediate any conflicts that occur in the classroom or school. An example follows:

> During lunch on the playground, a student kicks the ball out of bounds during a lively game of soccer. A student walking by is hit by the ball. An argument ensues. A pair of peer mediators with clipboards in hand quickly approaches the two disputants. "Would you like some help resolving your conflict?" So begins the mediation process through which the disputants arrive at a mutually agreeable solution that makes both happy. They shake hands as friends and return to their activities while the peer mediators make a note of the resolution, then continue to be available for other schoolmates who may need help resolving conflicts.

The role of mediator is rotated so that all students serve as mediators an equal amount of time. Initially students mediate in pairs. This ensures that shy or nonverbal students get the same amount of experience as more extroverted and verbally fluent students. Mediating classmates' conflicts is perhaps the most effective way of teaching students the need for the skillful use of each step of the negotiation procedure.

If peer mediation fails, the teacher mediates the conflict. If teacher mediation fails, the teacher arbitrates by deciding who is right and who is wrong. If that fails, the principal mediates the conflict. If that fails, the principal arbitrates. Teaching all students to mediate properly results in a schoolwide discipline program where students are empowered to regulate

and control their own and their classmates' actions. Teachers and administrators are then freed to spend more of their energies on instruction.

Part Six: Teaching Continuing Lessons to Refine and Upgrade Students' Skills. Students do not learn to be competent in resolving conflicts after ten hours of training. Gaining real expertise in resolving conflicts constructively takes years of training and practice. Additional lessons are needed to refine and upgrade students' skills in using the negotiation and mediation procedures. Ideally these procedures are practiced by integrating them into academic lessons. Literature, history, and science units typically involve conflict. Almost any lesson in these subject areas can be modified to include role-playing situations in which negotiation or mediation procedures are used. In our research, for example, we have focused on integrating the peacemaker training into history units and English literature units. Each of the major conflicts in the curriculum materials was used to teach the negotiation or mediation procedures.

Spiral Curriculum, Grades 1–12

The Teaching Students to Be Peacemakers program is a twelve-year spiral program that is retaught each year in an increasingly sophisticated and complex way. Twelve years of training and practice will result in a person with considerable expertise in resolving conflicts constructively.

Whole Student Body Approach. Two of the central purposes for incorporating conflict resolution programs in schools are to make schools safe places where students relate to each other in constructive ways and can learn and to socialize children, adolescents, and young adults into the competencies and attitudes they need to resolve conflicts constructively for the rest of their lives. The two purposes are complementary. For both purposes, children, adolescents, and young adults must be exposed to positive models for constructive conflict management and taught directly the procedures and skills required to manage conflicts constructively.

On the basis of the two purposes, there are two approaches to establishing conflict resolution and peer mediation programs in schools: cadre and total student body. Primarily to accomplish the first objective, the cadre approach emphasizes training a small number of students to serve as peer mediators. It is based on the assumption that a few specially trained students can defuse and resolve constructively the interpersonal conflicts taking place among members of the student body. The training of a cadre of mediators may consist of a one- or two-day workshop or a semester-long class.

To accomplish both objectives, the total student body approach emphasizes training every student in the school to manage conflicts constructively

(D. W. Johnson and R. Johnson, 2005a, 2007). It is based on the assumption that every student in the school needs to learn how to manage conflicts constructively and help schoolmates do likewise. This approach requires the training of every teacher, staff member, and administrator, as well as every student. The Teaching Students to Be Peacemakers program is an example of this approach.

In discussing the Peacemaker Program, the three most pertinent issues are whether it has a theoretical foundation, validating research, and successful implementation.

Theoretical Foundation of the Peacemakers Program. Both distributive and integrative negotiations may be viewed as processes of social interdependence. Distributive negotiations may be seen as a competitive situation (i.e., negative interdependence) in which individuals seek to "win" by reaching an agreement that is favorable to them and unfavorable to the other. The assumption is that the issue is a zero-sum conflict in which individuals' goals are negatively correlated. The objective of distributive negotiations is the maximization of differential gains, where each person is trying to maximize self-gain and minimize the opponent's gains. Negotiators engage in such tactics as withholding information (e.g., the party's bottom line), misleading communication, making firm commitments to positions ("power positioning"), and making overt threats. Negotiators interact with each other as though they had no past history or future relationship.

Integrative negotiations may be seen as a cooperative situation in which individuals seek an agreement that benefits everyone involved. The assumptions are that the issue allows for joint gain, and individuals' goals are positively correlated. The objective of integrative negotiations is to maximize joint benefits, with each person trying to expand the pie to ensure everyone's goals will be met to the greatest extent possible. Negotiators engage in such tactics as sharing all relevant information, open and accurate communication, focusing on interests rather than positions, seeing the issue from all perspectives, and creativity in identifying possible agreements. Negotiators interact with each other as though there is an ongoing relationship that has a past and a future and must be maintained in good working order.

Social interdependence theory thus can provide the underlying theory for integrative and distributive negotiations. Social interdependence theory focuses on two types of social interdependence: positive and negative (Deutsch, 1949, 1962; D. W. Johnson and R. Johnson, 1989, 2005b). *Positive interdependence* (cooperation) exists when there is a positive correlation among individuals' goal attainments; individuals perceive that they can attain their goals if and only if the other individuals with whom they are cooperatively linked attain their goals. *Negative interdependence* (competition) exists

when there is a negative correlation among individuals' goal achievements; individuals perceive that they can obtain their goals only if the other individuals with whom they are competitively linked fail to obtain their goals. *No interdependence* (individualistic efforts) exists when there is no correlation among individuals' goal achievements; individuals perceive that the achievement of their goals is unrelated to the goal achievement of others. Thus, by definition, distributive negotiation is competitive activity, and integrative negotiation is a cooperative activity. The two types of negotiation may be best understood through the lens of social interdependence theory.

The basic premise of social interdependence theory is that the way participants' goals are structured determines how they interact, and the interaction pattern determines the outcomes of the situation. Positive interdependence results in *promotive interaction* (individuals encouraging and facilitating each other's efforts to achieve the group's goals, which includes prosocial behaviors), and negative interdependence results in *oppositional interaction* (individuals obstructing each other's efforts to achieve their goals, which may include harm-intended aggression). No interdependence results in no interaction. Promotive interaction is characterized first and foremost by prosocial behavior. Competition tends to be characterized by antisocial actions. Correspondingly, integrative negotiation is aimed at maximizing joint outcomes and improving the relationship among disputants. Cooperation promotes mutual productivity and positive relationships among cooperators. Distributive negotiation is aimed at maximizing differential benefit with a clear winner and loser, which results in antagonism and dislike among disputants. Competition promotes differential benefit and negative relationships among competitors. Thus, in terms of definitions, the processes generated, and the resulting outcomes, integrative negotiations may be seen as a cooperative enterprise based on positive interdependence, and distributive negotiations may be seen as a competitive enterprise based on negative interdependence.

The importance of making negotiation theory a subset of social interdependence theory includes that it moves negotiation theory from a dichotomy (integrative versus distributive negotiations) to a broader theory that explains the processes underlying the types of negotiation. In addition, it avoids the tendency in psychology to promote one's own theories while avoiding everyone else's (i.e., making it seem as if integrative negotiations is a new theory separate and apart from previous theories). The integration of the two theories enhances the validity of both, with the hope that it will lead to new insights into both cooperation-competition and integrative-distributive negotiations.

Validating Research: Benefits of Teaching Students to Be Peacemakers Program. A meta-analysis has been reported on sixteen studies conducted

between 1988 and 2000 on the effectiveness of the Peacemaker program in eight schools in two countries (R. Johnson and D. W. Johnson, 2002). A meta-analysis involves combining results from multiple studies to identify patterns in their results. This is usually done by identifying a common measure reflecting the results of each study and an effect size (a measure of the strength of the effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable found in the study), which are then combined into a weighted average of the effect sizes of all the studies included. In this meta-analysis, the studies included students from kindergarten through ninth grade and were conducted in rural, suburban, and urban settings in the United States and Canada. In most of the studies, students were randomly assigned to conditions, and teachers were rotated across conditions. These carefully controlled field experimental studies addressed a series of questions:

1. *"How often do conflicts among students occur and what are the most commonly occurring conflicts?"* The results indicate that students engage in conflicts multiple times a day. While in the suburban schools studied, the majority of conflicts reported were over the possession and access to resources, preferences about what to do, playground issues, and turn-taking, in the urban elementary school studied, the vast majority of conflicts referred to mediation involved physical and verbal aggression. Students described more different types of conflicts at school than at home. The conflicts at home tended to be over preferences, possessions, and access; few conflicts were reported over beliefs and relationships or involved physical fights and verbal insults. In either setting, very few conflicts occurred over academic work or basic values.

2. *"What strategies did students use to manage their conflicts before training?"* Before training, students tended to manage their conflicts through trying to win by forcing the other to concede (either by overpowering the other disputant or by asking the teacher to force the other to give in) or withdrawing from the conflict and the other person. The possibility of problem-solving, integrative negotiations seemed never to occur to most students. One of the teachers stated in her log, "Before training, students viewed conflict as fights that always resulted in a winner and a loser. To avoid such an unpleasant situation, they usually placed the responsibility for resolving conflicts on me, the teacher."

3. *"Was the Peacemaker training successful in teaching students the negotiation and mediation procedures?"* Following training, over 90 percent of the students accurately recalled 100 percent of the negotiation and the mediation procedures. Up to a year after the training,

over 75 percent of students were still able to write out all the negotiation and mediation steps. The average effect size for the studies was 2.25 for the immediate posttest and 3.34 for the retention measures (see table 47.1).

4. *"Could students apply the negotiation and mediation procedures to conflicts?"* Learning the negotiation and mediation procedures does not necessarily mean that students will use them in actual conflict situations. Immediately after training, students applied the procedures almost perfectly (effect size = 2.16) and were still applying the procedures months after the training was over (effect size = 0.46).

5. *"Do students transfer the negotiation and mediation procedures to nonclassroom and nonschool situations?"* Our studies demonstrated that students did in fact use the negotiation and mediation procedures in the hallways, lunchroom, and playground. In addition, they used the procedures in family settings.

6. *"What strategies did the students use to resolve their conflicts?"* Two scales were used to classify the strategies students called on to resolve their conflicts. For the Strategy Constructiveness Scale (a continuum from destructive actions—physical and verbal aggression and avoidance—to constructive actions—invoking norms for appropriate behavior, proposing alternatives, and engaging in problem-solving

Table 47.1   Mean Weighted Effect Sizes for Peacemaker Studies

Dependent Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Number of Effects
Learned procedure	2.25	1.98	13
Learned procedure—retention	3.34	4.16	9
Applied procedure	2.16	1.31	4
Application—retention	0.46	0.16	3
Strategy constructiveness	1.60	1.70	21
Constructiveness—retention	1.10	0.53	10
Strategy two-concerns	1.10	0.46	5
Two-concerns—retention	0.45	0.20	2
Integrative negotiation	0.98	0.36	5
Quality of solutions	0.73	0	1
Positive attitude	1.07	0.25	5
Negative attitude	-0.61	0.37	2
Academic achievement	0.88	0.09	5
Academic retention	0.70	0.31	4

Reprinted with permission from Johnson, D. W., and Johnson, R. T. (2005a). *Teaching students to be peacemakers* (4th ed.). Edina, MN: Interaction Book Company.

negotiations), the average effect size was 1.60 on the posttest and 1.10 for the retention tests. For the Two-Concerns Scale (five strategies of withdrawing, forcing smoothing, compromising, and negotiating to solve the problem), the posttest effect size was 1.10 and the retention effect size was 0.45. Trained students tended to use the integrative negotiation and mediation procedures in resolving the conflicts. There were no significant differences between males and females in the strategies used to manage conflicts. There were no significant differences between the strategies used in school and at home; students used the strategies learned in school just as frequently in the home as they did in the school.

7. "*When given the option, would students engage in win-lose or problem-solving negotiations?*" Following the Teaching Students to Be Peacemakers training, students were placed in a negotiation situation in which they could either try to win or maximize joint outcomes. Untrained students almost always tried to win, while the majority of trained students focused on maximizing joint outcomes (effect size = 0.98).

8. "*How would the conflicts be resolved? Very few of the conflicts were arbitrated by adults or resolved through forgiveness in either the control or experimental groups.*" Untrained students left many conflicts unresolved. The number of integrative solutions that resulted in both sides achieving their goals was much higher in conflicts among trained (rather than untrained) students. There was no significant difference between the solutions arrived at for conflicts in school or at home. Only one study had the necessary statistics to determine an effect size (ES = 0.73), indicating that trained students tended to find more constructive resolutions than did untrained students.

9. "*Does the Peacemaker training increase students' academic achievement?*" The Peacemaker training was integrated into both English literature and history academic units to determine its impact on academic achievement. The basic design for these studies was to randomly assign students to classes in which the Peacemaker training was integrated into the academic unit studied or to classes in which the academic unit was studied without any conflict training. Students who received the Peacemaker training as part of the academic unit tended to score significantly higher on achievement (effect size = 0.88) and retention (effect size = 0.70) tests than did students who studied the academic unit only. Students not only learned the factual information contained in the academic unit better, they were better able to interpret the information in insightful ways.

10. *"Does the Peacemaker training result in more positive attitudes toward conflict?"* Attitudes toward conflict were measured by a word association task. Before training, the students overwhelmingly held negative attitudes toward conflict, seeing almost no potential positive outcomes. While still perceiving conflict more negatively than positively, the attitudes of trained students became markedly more positive (effect size = 1.07) and less negative (effect size = -0.61), while the attitudes of untrained students stayed essentially the same. Students generally liked to engage in the procedures. A teacher stated, "They never refuse to negotiate or mediate. When there's a conflict and you say it's time for conflict resolution, you never have either one say, 'I won't do it.' There are no refusals." Teachers and administrators and parents tended to perceive the peacemaker program as constructive and helpful. Many parents whose children were not part of the project requested that their children receive the training the following year, and a number of parents requested that they too receive the training, so they could use the procedures to improve conflict management within the family.

11. *"Does the Peacemaker training result in fewer discipline problems that have to be managed by the teacher and the administration?"* Students tended to resolve their conflicts without the involvement of faculty and administrators, significantly reducing classroom management problems. The number of discipline problems teachers had to deal with decreased by about 60 percent, and referrals to administrators dropped about 90 percent. A teacher commented, "Classroom management problems are nil as far as I'm concerned. We don't do a lot of disciplining per se. A lot of times, when a conflict occurs on the playground, they resolve it there and do not bring it back to the classroom. So there is a lot less I have to deal with in the classroom."

Implementation of Program

The Teaching Students to be Peacemakers program has been implemented in preschools, elementary schools, middle schools, and secondary schools in numerous countries. In addition, it has been used in other settings, such as marital therapy sessions. The training manual (D. W. Johnson and R. Johnson, 2005a) is in its fourth edition and has been translated into Spanish, Korean, Arabic, and Chinese. Thus, the program is taught around the world by interested teachers. The Teaching Students to Be Peacemakers program was a winner in the 2003 Awards for Program Excellence given by the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration's Center for Substance Abuse Prevention (SAMHSA/CSAP). It was further selected as a SAMHSA Model Program.

CIVIC VALUES

The conflict resolution and violence prevention programs implemented in schools will teach a set of values as well the instructional procedures used and the classroom management system. Value development is a hidden curriculum beneath the ebb-and-flow of daily life in the school (D. W. Johnson and R. Johnson, 1996b, 1999). The use of cooperative learning, integrative negotiations, and peer mediation will teach a different set of values than will the use of competitive or individualistic learning, distributive negotiations, and faculty and staff arbitration. Cooperation and integrative negotiations inherently emphasize the values of being committed to the other's well-being as well as to one's own, being honest and accurate in describing one's position and interests, seeking to maximize joint outcomes, and being responsive and compassionate when others are in need.

Competition and distributive negotiations inherently emphasize the values of seeking to gain more than others, deprive others of benefits in order to increase one's own benefits, mislead and manipulate others in order to increase one's benefits, and defeat others rather than seek the most effective agreement. Ideally, educators should use instructional and socialization procedures, classroom management systems, and disciplinary interventions that teach values that assume a positive view of human nature, are aimed at developing individuals who are active advocates for democracy and social justice, and focus students beyond selfishness toward improving the quality of life for all students and the common good. The Peacemaker procedures implicitly teach such values.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

To ensure that schools are conflict-positive organizations where discipline problems are minimized, bullying is infrequent or nonexistent, and the positive consequences of conflicts are maximized, schools must have violence prevention programs and programs to teach students how to manage conflicts of interests constructively. Discipline problems may be placed on a continuum: on one end are programs characterized by adults administering external rewards and punishment, and at the other end are programs characterized by teaching students self-responsibility and self-regulation. Violence prevention programs are by and large adult regulated, while conflict resolution training programs are by and large focused on students' self-regulation.

Violence prevention programs are typically aimed at suppressing conflict and reducing the availability of weapons so that violence cannot occur. Conflict resolution programs are aimed at teaching students the

competencies they need to regulate their own and their classmates' behavior within conflict situations. There are numerous benefits to teaching conflict resolution procedures to individual students, the school, and society as a whole. The origins of modern conflict resolution programs include not only conflict theorists, but also nonviolence advocates, anti–nuclear war advocates, and lawyers.

While numerous conflict resolution programs are being implemented in the schools, the one that perhaps has been most thoroughly researched and evaluated (as well as most widely implemented) is the Teaching Students to Be Peacemakers program. It trains students in the use of integrative, problem-solving negotiations and peer mediation. It rests on the foundation of social interdependence theory and has been validated by a systematic program of research. Reaching an agreement that maximizes joint benefits involves repairing any harm done to disputants during the conflict (i.e., restore justice). The need to repair harm is one of the most fundamental issues of managing conflicts and is a natural and complementary aspect of the program. Finally, engaging in integrative, problem-solving negotiations and peer mediation inherently teaches a set of prosocial values.

In order to ensure that the potential positive outcomes of conflict are used to achieve the goals involving instruction and socialization, all students and faculty need to be trained so that everyone uses the same procedures. Teaching all students negotiation and mediation procedures and the constructive controversy procedure results in a schoolwide discipline program focused on empowering students to regulate their own and their schoolmates' behavior in order to achieve class and school goals. In addition, all students need to learn how to manage conflicts constructively as part of their socialization into society. Conflict resolution training ensures that future generations are prepared to manage conflicts constructively in career, family, community, national, and international settings.

References

Choi, J., Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (2011). Relationships among cooperative learning experiences, social interdependence, children's aggression, victimization, and prosocial behaviors. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 41*(4), 976–1003.

Coleman, P., & Fisher-Yoshida, B. (2004). Conflict resolution at multiple levels across the lifespan: The work of the ICCCR. *Theory into Practice*, *43*(1), 31–38.

Davidson, J., & Wood, C. (2004). A conflict resolution model. *Theory into Practice, 43*(1), 6–13.

Deutsch, M. (1949). A theory of cooperation and competition. *Human Relations, 2*, 129–152.

Deutsch, M. (1962). Cooperation and trust: Some theoretical notes. In M. R. Jones (Ed.), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation* (pp. 275–319). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Deutsch, M. (1973). *The resolution of conflict*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Hawley, P. H. (1999). The ontogenesis of social dominance: A strategy-based evolutionary perspective. *Developmental Review*, *19*, 97–132.

Johnson, D. W. (1970). *Social psychology of education*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Johnson, D. W. (1971a). Role reversal: A summary and review of the research. *International Journal of Group Tensions, 1*, 318–334.

Johnson, D. W. (1971b). Students against the school establishment: Crisis intervention in school conflicts and organizational change. *Journal of School Psychology, 9*, 84–92.

Johnson, D. W. (in press). *Reaching out: Interpersonal effectiveness and self-actualization* (11th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Johnson D. W., & Johnson, F. (2013). *Joining together: Group theory and group skills* (11th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. (1979). Conflict in the classroom: Controversy and learning. *Review of Educational Research, 49*, 51–61.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. (1989). *Cooperation and competition: Theory and research*. Edina, MN: Interaction Book Company.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. (1996a). Conflict resolution and peer mediation programs in elementary and secondary schools: A review of the research. *Review of Educational Research, 66*(4), 459–506.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. (1996b). Cooperative learning and traditional American values: An appreciation. *NASSP Bulletin, 80*(579), 63–65.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. (1999). The three Cs of school and classroom management. In H. Freiberg (Ed.), *Beyond behaviorism: Changing the classroom management paradigm* (pp. 119–144). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (2005a). *Teaching students to be peacemakers* (4th ed.). Edina, MN: Interaction Book Company.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (2005b). New developments in social interdependence theory. *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs, 131*(4), 285–358.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. (2007). *Creative controversy: Intellectual challenge in the classroom*. Edina, MN: Interaction Book Company.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (2012). Restorative justice in the classroom: Necessary roles of cooperative context, constructive conflict, and civic values. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research Journal, 5*(1), 4–28.

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R., & Holubec, E. (2008). *Cooperation in the classroom* (6th ed.). Edina, MN: Interaction Book Company.

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R., & Johnson, F. (1976). Promoting constructive conflict in the classroom. *Notre Dame Journal of Education, 7,* 163–168.

Johnson, R., & Johnson, D. W. (2002). Teaching students to be peacemakers: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Research in Education, 12*(1), 25–39.

La Freniere, P., & Charlesworth, W. R. (1983). Dominance, attention, and affiliation in a preschool group: A nine-month longitudinal study. *Ethology and Sociobiology, 4*(1), 55–67.

Pellegrini, A. D., & Long, J. D. (2002). A longitudinal study of bullying, dominance, and victimization during the transition from primary school through secondary school. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 20*(2), 259–280.

Selfridge, J. (2004). The Resolving Conflict Creatively Program: How we know it works. *Theory Into Practice, 43*(1), 59–67.

Strayer, F. F. (1980). Child ethology and the study of preschool social relations. In H. C. Foot, A. J. Chapman, & J. R. Smith (eds.), *Friendship and social relations in children*, (pp. 235–265). Piscataway, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Wertheim, E., Love, A., Peck., C., & Littlefield, L. (1992). *I win: You win*. Melbourne: Penguin.