RESOLVING CONFLICT CREATIVELY PROGRAM (RCCP)

The Resolving Conflict Creatively Program (RCCP) is a K-8 program in character education and social and emotional learning with a special focus on conflict resolution and intergroup relations. RCCP is characterized by a comprehensive, multi-year strategy for preventing violence and creating caring and peaceable communities of learning that improve school success for all children.

Program Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Population</th>
<th>K-8th grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distributor</td>
<td>Educators for Social Responsibility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goals/Mission/Target outcomes**

- Teach students social and emotional skills to deal positively with conflict and diversity.
- Teach educators to create collaborative and non-violent classrooms and schools.

**Delivery Agents**

- Classroom teachers

**Intervention Strategies**

- Curriculum includes conflict resolution, anger management, and intergroup relations through a selected venue of the school program.
- Activities include active listening, assertiveness, expressing feelings, perspective taking, cooperation, negotiation and ways of interrupting expressions of bias or prejudice.
- Peer mediation
- Cooperative learning

**Date of origin**

- 1985

**Developer**

- Educators for Social Responsibility Metropolitan Area and the New York City Board of Education

**Initial Mission**

- Professional development for educators

**Changes in mission**

- Added peer mediation, training for parents and administrators and interventions for high-risk youth.

**Staff development**

- Professional Development For Teachers: includes a twenty-four hour introductory course and ongoing support for implementation of the program through on-site classrooms visit. Peer Mediation: trains carefully selected groups of students to serve their schools as peer mediators. Training also provided for administrators and support staff.

**Duration**

- 28-51 lessons per year
# Research


## Study 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Comparison group</th>
<th>Longitudinal Change Assessment</th>
<th>Statistical test of Significance</th>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Scientific Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Partial or unclear basis for assignment</td>
<td>Pretest/posttest design but no delayed posttest</td>
<td>Statistical tests and significance reported</td>
<td>Peer reviewed</td>
<td>Implementation assessed</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Research Questions

- What is the short-term impact of the program on key developmental processes that place students at risk for aggression and violence?
- What is the robustness of the program’s impact on student subgroups defined by demographics and risk status?
- How do neighborhoods and classrooms influence developmental processes and program impact?

## Methods

- A total of 8,000 students in grades 2nd through 6th and 400 teachers in 15 elementary schools in New York City were studied.
- Data collected in fall and spring of both the 1994-95 and 1995-96 school years on the following variables:
  - Levels of teaching intervention:
    - High number of lessons
    - Low number of lessons
    - No lessons
  - Demographics (ethnicity, gender, age and school lunch status)
  - Risk status (depression and academic underachievement)
  - Classroom context (the classroom norm -- student’s belief -- about whether or not the use of aggression is acceptable in certain situations)
  - Neighborhood context (poverty and violence scales)
  - Social cognitions (student’s aggressive fantasies and student’s attributional biases about
aggression)

- Interpersonal negotiation strategies INS (strategies used in a proactive situation – INS competent -- and strategies used in a reactive situation – INS aggressive)
- Psychological symptomatology (conduct problems)

- Measured were the following:
  - Impact of program profiles (high lessons, low lessons and no lessons) on change in students’ developmental processes and outcome variables (social cognitions, interpersonal negotiation strategies and psychological symptomatology).
  - Differences in this relationship by child gender, grade and risk status.
  - Main effects of classroom and neighborhood context on development as well as on the impact of the program on development.

**Result**

- Impact of program profiles (high lessons, low lessons and no lessons) on change in students’ developmental processes and outcome variables (social cognitions, interpersonal negotiation strategies and psychological symptomatology): Students who received high-lesson intervention reported the following compared to low- and no-lesson groups between pre- and post-test:
  - Significantly lower rate of growth in hostile attributional bias (Low-lessons and no-lesson students showed significantly higher rates).
  - Significantly slower rate of decrease in INS competent strategies (Low-lesson and no-lesson students showed significantly higher rates of decrease).
  - Significantly slower rate of increase in INS aggressive strategies (low-lesson and no-lesson students showed significantly higher rates of increase).
  - Significantly slower rate of increase in aggressive fantasies (low-lesson and no-lesson students showed significantly higher rates of increase).
  - No significant findings in any group for conduct problems.

- Differences in this relationship by child gender, grade and risk status:
  - Boys and girls in low-lesson and no-lesson groups showed significant decreases in competent strategies compared to students who received high-level intervention.
  - No significant findings in any group for grade or risk status.

- Main effects of classroom context (the classroom norm -- student’s belief -- about whether or not the use of aggression is acceptable in certain situations) and neighborhood context (poverty and violence rates) on development as well as on the impact of the program on development:
  - Students in low-normative-beliefs classrooms (where aggression was more accepted) reported significantly higher rates of increase in attributional biases, INS aggressive strategies and aggressive fantasies than students in high-normative-beliefs classrooms between pre- and post-tests.
  - Students in low-normative-belief classrooms reported “lower average levels” of competent strategies than students in high-normative-belief classrooms between pre- and post-test.
  - No significant findings in any group for conduct problems.
  - No significant relationship reported between neighborhood context and either attributional bias or INS strategies.
  - Students who live in low-poverty, low-violent neighborhoods reported significantly lower levels of aggressive fantasies than students who lived in high-poverty, high-crime neighborhoods.
  - Students who live on low/medium poverty/crime neighborhoods who were in the high-lesson group did not report significant growth in aggressive fantasies between pre- and post-test (students in no-lesson and low-lesson groups showed significant increases).
  - Students who live in high poverty/crime neighborhoods and were in the high-lesson group...
reported significantly higher levels of aggressive fantasies than students in the other two groups between pre- and post-test.

Study 2.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Comparison group</th>
<th>Longitudinal Change Assessment</th>
<th>Statistical test of Significance</th>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Scientific Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Partial or unclear basis for assignment</td>
<td>Pretest/posttest design but no delayed posttest</td>
<td>Statistical tests and significance reported</td>
<td>Peer reviewed</td>
<td>Implementation assessed</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Research Questions | • What are the shapes of students’ socio-emotional development trajectories toward violence over the elementary school years? Do the shapes of the trajectories vary by domain of socio-emotional development and method of assessment?
| | • Do students’ developmental trajectories differ for demographic subgroups?
| | • Are students’ developmental trajectories modifiable by degree of exposure to school-based violence prevention? |

| Methods | • 11, 160 students and 375 teachers in 15 elementary schools across four school districts in New York City participated in the study.
| | • Schools were grouped as follows: nonintervention; in the beginning stage of intervention; integration of some program components; and, integration of all program components.
| | • Data was collected in four waves, in the spring and fall of the 1994-95 and 1995-96 school years.
| | • Constructs and variables:
| | o Levels of intervention
| | ▪ Teaching, training and coaching in program (0-4 scale)
| | ▪ Classroom instruction in program (0-5 scale)
| | o Social-cognitive process (self-reported by students)
| | ▪ Students’ hostile attributional biases |
- Competent interpersonal negotiation strategies
- Aggressive interpersonal negotiation strategies
  - Behavioral symptomatology (self-reported by students)
    - Conduct problems
    - Depressive symptoms
    - Aggressive fantasies
  - Teacher perceptions of child behavior
    - Students’ aggressive behavior
    - Students’ prosocial behavior

- This study uses developmental trajectories of the three domains – social cognitive process, behavioral symptomatology and teacher perceptions of child behavior – as measures of program influence because of their assessment at four points in time over two consecutive school years (1994-96) in a cross sequential design. Three parameters (intercept, linear change and curvilinear change).

### Results

- Levels of intervention
  - Students who experienced a high number of classroom instruction by teachers who experienced relatively lower levels of training and coaching demonstrated significantly slower rates of the following:
    - Growth attribution bias
    - Aggressive interpersonal negotiation strategies
    - Self-reported conduct problems
    - Depressive symptoms
    - Aggressive fantasies
    - Teacher-reported aggressive behavior
  - Students who experienced a high number of classroom instruction by teachers who experienced relatively lower levels of training and coaching demonstrated significantly faster rates of the following:
    - Teacher-reported prosocial behavior
  - Students whose teachers received relatively higher amounts of training and coaching in combination with relatively lower levels of classroom instruction demonstrated faster rates of growth in the following:
    - Hostile attribution bias
    - Aggressive interpersonal negotiation strategies
    - Self-reported aggressive fantasies
    - Conduct problems
    - Depressive symptoms
    - Teacher—reported aggressive behavior
  - Students whose teachers received relatively higher amounts of training and coaching in combination with relatively lower levels of classroom instruction demonstrated slower rates of growth in the following:
    - Competent interpersonal negotiation strategies
    - Teacher-reported pro-social behavior.

### Additional Information
Contact Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact ESR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educators for Social Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Garden Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge, MA 02138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>617-492-1764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800-370-2515 toll-free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>617-864-5164 fax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office hours: 8:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m. (Eastern)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://esrnational.org/professional-services/elementary-school/prevention/resolving-conflict-creatively-program-rccp/">http://esrnational.org/professional-services/elementary-school/prevention/resolving-conflict-creatively-program-rccp/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Outcomes

<p>| RCCP 2003 | Depression-- low level of instruction by teachers with high levels of training and coaching | Negative impact | General social-emotional | Coping |
| RCCP 2003 | Depression-- high levels of instruction by teachers with lower levels of training and coaching | Positive impact | General social-emotional | Coping |
| RCCP 1998 | Attributional biases about aggression | Positive impact | Risk behavior | Knowledge about risk behavior |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RCCP 2003</th>
<th>Hostile attributional bias -- low level of instruction by teachers with high levels of training and coaching</th>
<th>Negative impact</th>
<th>Risk Behavior</th>
<th>Knowledge about risk behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RCCP 2003</td>
<td>Hostile attributional bias -- high levels of instruction by teachers with lower levels of training and coaching</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Risk behavior</td>
<td>Knowledge about risk behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCCP 1998</td>
<td>Aggressive interpersonal negotiation strategies -- high levels of training versus low-levels of training</td>
<td>Positive impact</td>
<td>Pro-social competencies</td>
<td>Pro-social behaviors and attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCCP 1998</td>
<td>Competent Interpersonal negotiation strategies -- high levels of training versus low-levels of training</td>
<td>Positive impact</td>
<td>Pro-social competencies</td>
<td>Pro-social behaviors and attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCCP 2003</td>
<td>Aggressive interpersonal negotiation strategies-- low level of instruction by teachers with high levels of training and coaching</td>
<td>Negative impact</td>
<td>Pro-social competencies</td>
<td>Pro-social behaviors and attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCCP 2003</td>
<td>Competent interpersonal negotiation strategies-- low level of instruction by teachers with high levels of training and coaching</td>
<td>Negative impact</td>
<td>Pro-social competencies</td>
<td>Pro-social behaviors and attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCCP 2003</td>
<td>Prosocial behavior-- low level of instruction by teachers with high levels of impact training and coaching</td>
<td>Negative impact</td>
<td>Pro-social competencies</td>
<td>Pro-social behaviors and attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCCP</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Pro-social Competencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCCP</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Competent interpersonal negotiation strategies-- high levels of instruction by teachers with lower levels of training and coaching</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Pro-social competencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCCP</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Aggressive interpersonal negotiation strategies-- high levels of instruction by teachers with lower levels of training and coaching</td>
<td>Positive impact</td>
<td>Pro-social competencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCCP</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Prosocial behavior-- high levels of instruction by teachers with lower levels of training and coaching</td>
<td>Positive impact</td>
<td>Pro-social competencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCCP</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Conduct problems -- high levels of training versus low-levels of training</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>School-based Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCCP</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Conduct problems-- low level of instruction by teachers with high levels of impact training and coaching</td>
<td>Negative impact</td>
<td>School-based Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCCP</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Conduct problems-- high levels of instruction by teachers with lower levels of training and coaching</td>
<td>Positive impact</td>
<td>School-based Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCCP</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Aggressive fantasies -- high levels of training versus low-levels of training</td>
<td>Positive impact</td>
<td>Risk behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCCP</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Aggressive behavior-- low level of instruction by teachers with high levels of impact training and coaching</td>
<td>Negative impact</td>
<td>Risk Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCCP 2003</td>
<td>Aggressive fantasies -- low level of instruction by teachers with high levels of training and coaching</td>
<td>Negative impact</td>
<td>Risk Behavior</td>
<td>Violence/aggression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCCP 2003</td>
<td>Aggressive behavior -- high levels of instruction by teachers with lower levels of training and coaching</td>
<td>Positive impact</td>
<td>Risk Behavior</td>
<td>Violence/aggression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCCP 2003</td>
<td>Aggressive fantasies -- high levels of instruction by teachers with lower levels of training and coaching</td>
<td>Positive impact</td>
<td>Risk Behavior</td>
<td>Violence/aggression</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>