DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 381 834 CS 508 900

AUTHOR Rancer, Andrew S.; Kosberg, Roberta L.
TITLE Violence Prevention: A Communication-Based Curriculum.
PUB DATE 21 Nov 94
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (80th, New Orleans, LA, November 19-22, 1994).
PUB TYPE Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Communication Research; Curriculum Development; Elementary Secondary Education; *Interpersonal Communication; Models; *Persuasive Discourse; *Prevention; *Skill Development; Student Attitudes; Student Behavior; Training Methods; *Violence
IDENTIFIERS Communication Context; *Communication Strategies; *Conflict Management; Educational Issues

ABSTRACT

This paper first outlines the objectives of programs which focus on conflict management and violence prevention. The paper then describes the application of a model of aggressive communication as a potential component in conflict management and violence prevention programs. The model presented in the paper incorporates training in argument and cognitive learning about the destructive nature of verbal aggression. With the day-to-day escalation of violence in public schools in mind, the paper notes that conflict management skills can be taught: (1) by offering a specific course on the subject, (2) by incorporating conflict management concepts and exercises into the core curricula, or (3) by offering specialized training outside the classroom. As part of the conflict management curriculum, the model on constructive argumentation offered in the paper proposes verbal aggressiveness as a catalyst to physical violence, with the focus on discussion of the nature and scope of interpersonal conflict and training in constructive argumentation. The model described in the paper offers a full range of training in practical skills in developing arguments, and upon its conclusion the participants/students should know what constitutes constructive and destructive behavior, and possibly, they could experience a change to a more positive attitude and behavior. (Contains 28 references and 7 notes.) (NKA)

VIOLENCE PREVENTION: A COMMUNICATION-BASED CURRICULUM

Andrew S. Rancer
School of Communication
University of Akron
Leigh Hall 111
Akron, OH 44325-1003

Roberta L. Kosberg
Department of Communication
Curry College
1071 Blue Hill Avenue
Milton, MA 02186

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, New Orleans, LA, November 21, 1994

VIOLENCE PREVENTION: A COMMUNICATION-BASED CURRICULUM

On November 20, 1984 a lunch-time crowd of high school students emerged from the red brick building known as Neal F. Simeon Vocational High School. It was there that Benjy Wilson, widely considered the best high school basketball player in the country, was shot. As it happened, Wilson had bumped into a sixteen year old boy from another school who turned to his sixteen year old companion and said, "He pushed me; pop him." The other teenager took out a .22-caliber pistol and fired it at Wilson.[1]

Ben Wilson's death made national headlines. This random, senseless act of killing a young man of such potential touched people everywhere, and seemed to symbolize the direction in which the country, and particularly the inner cities, was moving. Police statistics in 1984 revealed that 119 people between the ages of 11 and 20 had been murdered in Chicago by the end of October. Ben Wilson's death added one more number to that figure. Similar statistics were recorded in other cities across the country.

This paper will outline briefly the objectives of programs which focus on conflict management and violence prevention. The secon part of the paper describes the application of a model of aggressive communication as a potential component in conflict management and violence prevention programs. This model incorporates training in argument, and cognitive learning about

the destructive nature of verbal aggression.

In 1994 the problem of violence among adolescents and teens remains critical. In 1991, 229 people between 10 and 19 were killed in Chicago. Nationally, there were 2992 murder victims in that age group during that year. According to USA Today (November 11, 1994)[2], a survey conducted by the National League of Cities finds that in the past five years, (school) violence has increased in almost 40% of the communities surveyed. The survey found that 1 in 4 schools reported serious injuries or death. Homicide is mentioned as one of the leading causes of death of young people in the inner cities. The report states that school violence is not confined to central city schools. Suburban, non-metro, and rural city schools are also reporting significant incidents of violence.

According to James Alan Fox, professor and dean of the College of Criminal Justice at Northeastern University, who recently completed a study of national trends in juvenile homicide, there are two major changes to explain why this generation of youth is more violent than any other. First, "as compared with their parents when they were young, this generation has more dangerous drugs in their bodies, behavior-altering stimulants rather than mind-altering hallucinogens, and more deadly weapons in their hands, high-powered firearms and assault rifles." A teenager with a gun is far more menacing than a 40-year old with a gun. The teenager is probably less schooled in using a firearm, and is more willing to use it.[3]

Most significant, says Fox, has been the change in attitude. This generation of youngsters is more likely to resort to violence over seemingly trivial issues, such as a pair of basketball sneakers, a jacket, or an evocative challenging glance. "Desensitized by glorified depictions of violence in the mass media and popular videos, and encouraged by their peers, today's youth hold a disturbingly casual attitude about violence." After the brutal murder of a foreign student at MIT last year, one teenage bystander casually remarked: "What's the big deal...People die every day."[4]

These comments are commonplace as we read newspaper accounts daily of violence acts committed by young people. One example was cause for commentary in a piece written for the Boston Globe by Mike Barnicle. This article again illustrates the casual attitude referred to by Professor Fox. The article mentions this scenario in which a 15 year old and his 20 year old friend Preston were sitting in the front room of a house in a Boston neighborhood when Preston saw a young man down the street wearing a hoodie that he wanted. Preston walked down the street, "dissed" the young man wearing the hoodie, and told him to take it off. The young man refused and surprised Preston with a knife. "I sat on the porch, watched the show," Preston's friend said. "I couldn't hear Preston, but I see his arms go up in the air and then he fell back. I went over to him and he said, 'He cut me. It burns bad.' Then they came and took him to the hospital and he died. Got stabbed in the heart." "That ever

scare you?" he is asked. "Dying?" "Me?" he responds. "No. I'm not scared to die." Later he adds: [I]n the end, it don't matter 'cause everyone dies sooner or later."[5]

For James Fox the answer is education. "We must focus our attention on children in the primary grades, when they are still impressionable and interested in what a teacher has to say. We must reinvest in our youth, and strive to make legitimate activity more attractive than criminal activity."

Concurring remarks were heard from Robert V. Antonucci, Commissioner of the Massachusetts Department of Education. "I am concerned about reports of violent acts by and toward young people in several Massachusetts communities. Whether it's the New Bedford high school student found with a loaded pistol in September or the nurse shot in Acushnet last spring, . . . there are too many reports of violence for anyone to remain silent." In response, Antonucci wrote to the three hundred school superintendents in Massachusetts to outline violence-prevention initiatives, which included funds for schools to offer conflict resolution and mediation programs.[6]

In this effort, Massachusetts is not alone in recognizing the need to deal with the problems of violence and the urgency of dealing with it in the schools. According to recent studies, the risk of violence to teenagers is greater in school than anywhere else. Each month, according to one estimate, over 200,000 students are physically attacked in America's secondary schools.

In late 1989 the Boston Globe reported that "When you go

into a Boston high school and [ask] how many kids know if someone has died of homicide, nearly all the hands go up in the room." Boston is not unique, as the question could have been answered in a similar manner in most of America's urban areas and increasingly, in many of America's suburban areas as well.[7]

Schools are no longer considered the safe haven. In one study, nearly half of the boys and one-quarter of the girls surveyed reported having been in at least one violent altercation during the past year -- 34% reported having been threatened, 41% of boys and 24% of girls said they could easily obtain a handgun, 23% of the boys reported carrying a knife, and 3% reported carrying a gun to school. In fact, one estimate is that 135,000 children bring guns to school each day.

In a resource paper entitled Safe Schools Overview published in March 1989, the National School Safety Center report focused on the fact that the "quality of the child's education can be severely affected if the child is not in a safe and welcoming learning environment." The National School Safety Center paper suggested several possible solutions, including the effort to teach students skills in conflict management, empathy, impulse control, and anger management.

The urgency to address school violence and aggressive behavior has intensified over the years. An increasing number of school administrators are finding themselves in situations that involve serious violence in the schools or surrounding neighborhoods. In their analysis of a midsize urban school

district, Lieber and Rogers (1994) observed that the urban public school often serves as the only available forum in which "citizens can give voice to their despair about the violence that saturates dai'v life." As a consequence, school officials are frequently in the "unenviable position of listening to urgent pleas . . .to solve systematic problems that are completely beyond the capacity and resources of any single institution" (Leiber & Rogers, 1994, p. 66). Often school administrators respond to these exigencies by adding programs in conflict resolution and violence prevention to the curriculum.

According to Davis and Porter (1985), taken collectively, school-based conflict resolution programs have the following overall objectives:

1. Promote an understanding of conflict as a normal and natural part of human relationships, personal growth, and institutional change.

2. Develop a more in-depth understanding of oneself and others through improved communication.

3. Develop an understanding of conflict resolutions skills (including listening, critical thinking, and problem-solving) as life skills.

4. Encourage the development of citizenship skills, including the understanding and promotion of world peace.

5. Understand the competence of students to participate in the resolution of their own disputes, thereby allowing teachers and administrators the opportunity to focus on teaching rather

than classroom management and discipline.

6. Focus on preventive methods of dispute resolution rather than crisis intervention methods, such as expulsion, suspension, detention, or court intervention.

In their effort to find an appropriate conflict resolution training program that will attempt to ameliorate the problems they are facing, school administrators often bring to the search a series of misunderstandings that could negatively impact on their curricular choice. Lieber and Rogers (1994) address four specific cautionary concerns:

1. Conflict resolution training is sometimes viewed as an opportunity to gain compliance from children. Under these circumstances, teachers and administrators do not see that conflict resolution skills are life skills and that children will make the necessary attitudinal and behavioral changes when they see them modeled throughout the educational institution.

2. Few teachers and administrators connect conflict resolution training and the development of a peaceable, nonadversarial classroom and school.

3. The planning stage in determining the appropriate conflict resolution program usually reveals that what most schools want to establish are community-based violence intervention programs. Unfortunately, there are few funds and few resources available for these kind of programs.

4. There is considerable confusion between violence prevention programs and violence intervention programs. Although

too late, school administrators often search for violence prevention programs when dealing with students who have already been suspended or already identified by the teacher or school psychologist as aggressive or at-risk.

With a realistic understanding of the short-term and long-term goals to be achieved by any conflict resolution program delivered to teachers, staff, and students, the next decision is to select an approach. There are three basic approaches to conflict resolution training. The first model is the school-based student skill development model. These programs focus on skill building for selected students, either in mediation, conflict resolution, or communication skills. One example of a successful program under this general model is the Philadelphia Peer Mediation Project (Jones & Carlin, 1994).

The second model is the school-based development of peaceable classrooms. An example of this is the program developed by the Boston area Educators for Social Responsibility. BAESR offers specially designed programs to enable schools to become peaceful and productive learning environments. The peaceable classroom has five qualities including cooperation, communication, emotional expression, appreciation for diversity, and conflict resolution, and training is done in each category. BAESR distributes a myriad of conflict resolution material for teachers of all grades, including the standard text by Kreidler (1984).

The third model is the school and community based violence

prevention/intervention model. An example of this is the Boston Violence Prevention Project. Affiliated with the Department of Public Health, Boston Department of Health and Hospitals, the program is a community-based primary and secondary prevention and education program aimed at decreasing interpersonal violence among adolescents. The primary focus of the program is on reduction of homicide, identification of risk factors for homicide, anger management, and nonviolent conflict resolution. In achieving its goals, the activities of the program include coalition development and advocacy, secondary service referral network, mass media campaign, clinical treatment services for adolescents hospitalized with intentional injuries, criminal justice programs, and education and training. The foundation of the program was developed by Dr. Deborah Prothrow-Stith and is articulated in her manual (1987). The curriculum focuses on homicide and its risk factors, managing anger, consequences of fighting, and identifying alternative dispute methods.

Conflict management skills can be taught by offering a specific course on conflict management, or by incorporating conflict management concepts and exercises into the core curricula, or by offering specialized training <u>outside</u> the classroom. Defined narrowly, conflict management may be limited to curricular materials labeled conflict resolution, peer negotiation programs, or peer mediation programs. Defined broadly, conflict management includes materials and programs focused on peer listening, multicultural sensitivity, anger

management, listening, empathy, and violence prevention. As part of the conflict management curriculum, we propose the inclusion of a component on constructive argumentation. The program makes use of the extensive research in the area of aggressive communication predispositions.

Aggressive Communication Predispositions

Argumentativeness and verbal aggressiveness are aggressive forms of communication. A model of aggressive communication has been posited which provides a framework for discussion of these forms of communication (Infante, 1987). The model posits that aggressive communication is controlled mainly by a cluster of four communication traits which interact with factors in the environment to energize message behavior (Infante, 1987). Some of these factors include inhibitors (e.g., a penalty for certain aggressive behaviors), and disinhibitors (e.g., alcoholic consumption). Two of the aggressive traits are constructive, while two are considered destructive. Thus, according to Infante (1987), aggression can be good or bad, or both good and bad.

Assertiveness and argumentativeness are the constructive traits. The constructive aggressive trait which will be described in this paper is argumentativeness. The two destructive traits in the model of aggressive communication are hostility and verbal aggressiveness. The destructive trait which will be described in this paper is verbal aggressiveness.

Argumentativeness is the trait to advocate and defend positions on controversial issues while attempting to refute the

positions which other people take on those issues (Infante & Rancer, 1982). Argumentativeness is a subset of assertiveness because all argument is assertive, but not all assertiveness involves argument, e.g., a request. Verbal aggression is the trait to attack the self-concepts of other people in order to inflict psychological pain such as humiliation, embarrassment, depression, and other negative feelings about self (Infante & Wigley, 1986). The model of verbal aggressiveness specifies that there are several types of verbally aggressive messages including: character, competence, background, and physical appearance attacks, ridicule, threats profanity, maledictions, teasing, and nonverbal emblems. Four causes of verbal aggression have been posited: psychopathology, disdain, social learning, and argumentative skill deficiencies (Infante & Wigley, 1986).

Infante, Riddle, Horvath, & Tumlin (1992) studied the verbal message behavior of individuals high in verbal aggressiveness. A profile of verbal aggressiveness emerged which suggests that high verbal aggressives can be distinguished from low verbal aggressives by their more frequent use of competence attacks, teasing, nonverbal emblems (e.g., the use of facial expressions, gestures, and eye behavior to attack an adversary's self-concept), and the use of profanity/swearing. Infante, et al. (1992) suggest that verbal aggressiveness may be more likely when the situation involves: anger, persons in a bad mood, a desire from reciprocity, or feigned humor. Verbal aggressiveness is also likely to increase when the high verbal aggressive wants

to appear tough, when they want to be mean to someone who they disdain, and when the discussion turns from an "argument" into a verbal fight.

Verbal Aggressiveness and Physical Violence

Verbal aggression has been examined mainly as one of many types of aggression (see esp., Bandura, 1973; Berkowitz, 1962; Buss, 1961; Geen & Donnerstein, 1983; Zillman, 1979). A more recent analysis suggests that verbal aggression should be studied in its own right, and that it may be valuable to conceptualize verbal aggression as a central factor in the "cycle of violence" (Infante, 1987).

Early research by Berkowitz (1973) suggested that hostile language can trigger the release of spontaneous aggressive responses. For example, one scenario suggests that individuals disagree over some issue, either major or trivial; insults are exchanged; as the verbal aggression escalates, anger and rage consume one or more of the individuals until physical violence emerges (Berkowitz, 1983; Infante, Chandler, & Rudd, 1989). Berkowitz (1962) suggests that this pattern of violence is higher when the individuals have latent predispositions toward violence. In this case, aggression-arousing cues, such as verbally aggressive messages, can clearly instigate the physical violence (Berkowitz, 1962, pp. 298-299).

This analysis is consistent with other research. Toch's (1969) research revealed that insults, teasing, and other attacks on the self-concept (especially an adversary's masculinity)

stimulated violent behavior. Toch (1969) suggested that men convicted of violent crimes did not have the verbal skills for dealing with interpersonal conflict, and thus viewed violence as their only alternative (Infante, et al., 1992). Zillman (1979) suggested that verbal aggression is the most frequent antecedent of murder, even more so than revenge. Bandura (1973a) also suggested a link between verbal aggression and physical aggression by suggesting that some people may respond with physical force because they lack alternative social skills such as assertiveness. Gelles' (1974) study on intrafamily violence also mentions the role of verbal aggression by suggesting a relationship exists between verbal aggressiveness and domestic violence.

Felson (1978, 1982, 1984) has posited the impression management theory of violence. According to this theory, individuals are strongly motivated to maintain a favorable image in social situations and will go to extreme lengths to restore a damaged image. Verbal aggression, especially insults, portray a person in a very negative light, which stimulate the receiver to retaliation in order to save face and to prevent future attacks. If the verbal aggression was perceived as intentional, illegitimate, and observed by a third party, the probability of retaliation is higher (Infante, Chandler, & Rudd, 1989).

Argumentative Skill Deficiency and Aggressive Behavior

The aforementioned research suggests that individuals who lack motivation and skill in arguing may be predisposed to engage

in verbally aggressive behavior. An "argumentative skill deficiency" explanation for verbal aggression has been posited which suggests that individuals low in general tendency to argue (ARGgt) have great difficulty generating arguments when engaged in conflict. Individuals who are low in motivation to argue, and who lack skill in arguing, very quickly "run out of things to say" (arguments) when they are engaged in interpersonal conflict episodes.

In a conflict episode, an "attack - and - defend" mode is operational. Attention is focused on attacking the positions others' hold on controversial issues, and in defending one's own position on issues. Individuals unskilled in arguing, and low in motivation to argue, rather quickly exhaust their already meager store of arguments. However, during conflict episodes, individuals may still feel the need to defend themselves and to verbally attack their adversary even if they have exhausted their supply of "arguments." If they cannot attack their adversary's position on the issue with arguments (i.e., engage in argumentative behavior), they tend to redirect attacks to the adversary's self-concept, and thus engage in verbal aggressiveness.

The argumentative skill deficiency explanation suggests that during a conflict episode, the need to defend oneself is similarly corrupted. The individual unskilled and unmotivated in argument is unable to defend his or her position. Because the desire to protect and defend their position never-the-less

exists, the unskilled arguer sets up a defense around the closest thing to their position, the self. The opponent's attacks on positions are then perceived as personal attacks (i.e., the arguments are taken "personally"), and the individual feels justified in responding with verbal aggression (Infante, 1987). This cycle occurs because the norm of reciprocity seems to operate when individuals communicate aggressively (Infante, 1988). One act leads to another with increasing intensity, until physical aggression becomes likely (Infante, Chandler, & Rudd, 1989, 167).

As mentioned, verbal aggressiveness has been suggested as a catalyst to physical violence. If an individual lacks motivation and skill in argument, s/he may be more predisposed to engage in verbal aggression. Since verbal aggression can be catalytic to violence, less verbal aggression could result in less physical aggression and violence. This relationship is mediated by the factor of a latent hostile disposition by at least one of the individuals in the conflict episode. The latent hostile disposition may be due to undissipated anger from societal, personal, and situational sources. Infante, Chandler, and Rudd (1989) suggest, for example, that in marital violence, "When one spouse has a latent hostile disposition, verbal aggression can serve as a catalyst for that person's becoming an abuser and the other spouse a victim. If both spouses suffer from latent hostile dispositions, then verbal aggression can be catalytic to both spouses' becoming abusers and victims" (p. 167).

That an argumentative skill deficiency is a major cause of verbal aggression is consistent with the conclusions drawn by Toch (1969), Bandura (1973a), and Gelles (1974). These studies argue that when individuals do not have the verbal skills to engage in constructive conflict management, the tendency to engage in verbally aggressive behavior is heightened, which also heightens the probability of physical aggression.

Training in Argumentativeness

As mentioned, possible causes of verbal aggression other than an argumentative skill deficiency have been suggested (Infante & Wigley, 1986; Infante, et al., 1984). Psychopathology (verbal manifestation of repressed hostility) and disdain (verbally expressed severe dislike for another individual) are two causes which "probably explain little of the verbal aggression in argumentative situations" (Infante, et al., 1984, p. 77). Psychopathologies while not rare, are not pervasive among individuals. Disdain does not appear to explain much verbal aggression during interpersonal communication because we try to communicate as little as possible with those we disdain. Social learning while probably an important cause of verbal aggression seems to apply more to males than to females. Thus, if these three causes do not explain most of the variance in verbally aggressive behavior, the argumentative skill deficiency explanation (i.e., lack of argumentative skill and motivation) may be a major cause.

The results of research by Infante, et al. (1992) suggest

that high verbal aggressives are less aware of the psychological pain produced by verbal aggression. They speculate that verbal aggression may be reduced by making high verbal aggressives aware of the undesirable consequences of this type of behavior through training and treatment models.

A Training Program to Reduce Verbal Aggressiveness and Enhance Argumentative Motivation and Skill

The argumentative skill deficiency explanation for verbal aggressiveness presents a raison d'etre for the development of training programs on constructive argument. In essence, training efforts would attempt to reduce high levels of verbal aggression while helping to establish and maintain high levels of argumentativeness.

The next section of the paper describes an application of the theory and research on aggressive communication in the form of a training program called "Arguing Is Good For You." This program has been designed incorporating both aggressive communication predispositions, and attempts to illustrate the positive aspects of "arguing constructively."

Program Objectives, Sequence, and Content

Objectives of the program are to have trainees: (1) Understand how the aggressive predispositions influence conflict management; (2) Discover their own predispositions and motivations to engage in argumentativeness and verbal aggressiveness; (3) Distinguish between constructive and destructive aggressive communication; and (4) Enhance their

motivation and skill in arguing and conflict management by learning and using a system designed to help them generate more, and better quality, arguments.

In brief, a discussion of the nature and scope of interpersonal conflict as it is exhibited in informal conflict episodes is presented. Misconceptions concerning the term "argument" are highlighted. Participants are asked to describe a recent "argument" they have had with a friend or stranger. These examples are then presented to the entire group by the program participants who volunteer to share their experiences.

The Argumentativeness Scale (Infante & Rancer, 1982) and the Verbal Aggressiveness Scale (Infante & Wigley, 1986) are employed as the diagnostic tools which provide trainees with a conscious awareness of their underlying trait predispositions. Participants discover where they are placed on the continuum of high to low in both predispositions. Research reveals that training can modify an individual's score in a relatively short period of time (see especially, Anderson, Schultz, & Courtney-Staley 1987; Infante 1985; Schultz & Anderson 1982).

The program distinguishes arguing and argumentativeness from verbal aggressiveness. Definitions of argumentativeness and verbal aggressiveness are presented. Examples of verbal aggressiveness are highlighted, e.g., "You're so stupid," "F-You," "You never do anything right," and nonverbal examples of verbal aggression are also presented (e.g., rolling the eyes, looks of disgust, smirks, nonverbal emblems such as raising the

middle finger, etc.). Probable causes of verbal aggression are discussed, and the argumentative skill deficiency explanation is highlighted. Participants are informed that developing skill in argument can reduce the chances that individuals will resort to verbal aggression in social conflict and argumentative situations.

The program allows both the trainer and trainee to get a benchmark of their argumentative ability by having them argue a case (involving a dispute between two roommates over the financial obligations of a long-term guest and other interpersonal conflict issues). Trainees engage in the "argument" with their adversary. It is not atypical for participants to reveal that it was quite difficult for them to generate many arguments, that a great deal of verbally aggressive behavior was exhibited during the discussion (e.g., character attacks, competence attacks, maledictions, profanity), and the mock conflict episode actually escalated rather than diminished.

Participants are informed that just like any other skill, an argumentative skill can be taught. During the program, trainees receive actual instruction in the use of the Inventional System, the method for generating arguments. The content for this part of the training follows the presentation of the material in the participant manual, Arguing Constructively (Infante, 1988). The first skill involved in arguing constructively involves having the parties decide exactly what they are arguing about. In this program, arguments are viewed as controversies over proposals. A

key concept presented in this part of the training is, according to this model of argumentative competence, that people must recognize propositions as they emerge during argumentative communication. Trainees must learn to recognize propositions by what their adversary claims.

The Infante (1988) Inventional System for the generation of arguments is presented. Participants are supplied with a handout containing the inventional system. This system prompts users with a series of major issues (PROBLEM, BLAME, SOLUTION, CONSEQUENCES) and sub-issues (e.g., What are the signs of the problem?, What causes the problem?, What are some possible solutions to the problem?, What good and bad outcomes will result from adopting the solution?).

Participants are able to test out their newly acquired skill in developing arguments and arguing constructively by arguing another case. The trainer reviews the skills learned: stating the nature of the controversy in propositional form, and the use of the problem-blame-solution-consequences topical system of generating arguments. Participants are permitted to refer to a cue (review) sheet which contains the inventional system, and are given some time to prepare a list of arguments they plan to use. Then, they use these arguments and actually engage in an argumentative encounter with their "adversary."

Outcomes of the Training

A number of positive outcomes may result as a consequence of this training. Upon completion of this program, participants

possess some knowledge of what constitutes constructive and destructive behavior during an argument. In addition, they have used a system that can help them generate more, and better quality, arguments. Participants also have knowledge as to how motivation and skill in arguing can enhance their personal and professional lives.

Challenges of this type of training

It is gratifying to observe the changes in attitudes toward conflict in general, and arguing in particular, as participants progress through the training program. Of particular note is their recognition that verbal aggression is a destructive form of communication behavior, and that argumentativeness is not the same as "fighting." This new orientation to arguing, however, is still difficult for many participants to internalize.

Still, motivating people to engage in argumentative behavior is a challenge. This is especially true of those participants who score on the lower end of the trait argumentativeness distribution. However, by pointing out the advantages to be gained by high motivation and skill in arguing, it is hoped that individuals who go through this type of training will slowly and systematically gain more confidence during argumentative encounters. Hopefully, these skills will translate into more productive conflict management episodes in the organization. Rancer, Kosberg, and Baukus (1992) suggest that the enhancement of skill in conflict management should develop from two directions: (1) enhancing the self-concept so that the individual

chooses to confront the other in an effort to resolve the conflict (increase motivation to argue); and (2) provide skill development techniques to enhance actual behavior during arguments. The content of this training program is designed to accomplish both objectives.

End Notes

1. "A dead friend, a living memory." (February 14, 1993). New York Times.
2. "Violence up in 38% of schools." (November 2, 1994). USA Today.
3. Fox, J.A. (January 31, 1993). Murder most common. Boston Globe.
4. Fox, J.A., & Pierce, G. (January 31, 1994). American killers are getting younger. USA Today.
5. Barnicle, M. (November 14, 1993). At 15, words to live and die by. Boston Globe.
6. Antonucci, R.V. (November 14, 1993). Commentary: Our children deserve safe schools. Boston Globe.
7. (October 31, 1989). Boston Globe, p. 22.

References

Anderson, J., Schultz, B., & Courtney-Staley, C. (1987). Training in argumentativeness: New hope for non-assertive women. Women's Studies in Communication, 10, 58-66.

Bandura, A. (1973). Aggression: A social learning analysis. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Berkowitz, L. (1962). Aggression: A social psychological analysis. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Berkowitz, L. (1973). Words and symbols as stimuli to aggressive responses. In J.F. Knutson (Ed.), The control of aggression: Implications from basic research (pp. 113-143). Chicago: Aldine.

Berkowitz, L. (1983). The experience of anger as a parallel process in the display of impulsive, "angry" aggression. In R.G. Geen & E.I. Donnerstein (Eds.), Aggression: Theoretical and empirical reviews (Vol. 1, pp. 103-133). New York: Academic Press.

Buss, A.H. (1961). The psychology of aggression. New York: John Wiley.

Davis, A., & Porter, K. (1985). Dispute resolution: The fourth R. Missouri Journal of Dispute Resolution, 1, 123-129.

Felson, R.B. (1978). Aggression as impression management. Social Psychology, 41, 205-213.

Felson, R.B. (1982). Impression management and the escalation of aggression and violence. Social Psychology Quarterly, 45, 245-254.

Felson, R.B. (1984). Patterns of aggressive social interaction. In A. Mummendey (Ed.), Social psychology of aggression: From individual behavior to social interaction (pp. 109-126). Berlin: Springer-Verlag.

Geen, R.G., & Donnerstein, E.I. (Eds.) (1983a). Aggression: Theoretical and empirical reviews, Vol. 1. New York: Academic Press.

Gelles, R.J. (1974). The violent home. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Infante, D.A. (1985). Influencing women to be more argumentative: Source credibility effects. Journal of Applied Communication Research, 13, 33-44.

Infante, D.A. (1987). Aggressiveness. In J.C. McCroskey & J.A. Daly (Eds.), Personality and interpersonal communication (pp. 157-192). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Infante, D.A. (1988). Arguing constructively. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Infante, D.A., Chandler, T.A., & Rudd, J.E. (1989). Test of an argumentative skill deficiency model of interspousal violence. Communication Monographs, 56, 163-177.

Infante, D.A., & Rancer, A.S. (1982). A conceptualization and measure of argumentativeness. Journal of Personality Assessment, 46, 72-80.

Infante, D.A., Riddle, B.L., Horvath, C.L., & Tumlin, S.A. (1992). Verbal aggressiveness: Messages and reasons. Communication Quarterly, 40, 116-126.

Infante, D.A., Trebing, J.D., Shepherd, P.E., & Seeds, D.E. (1984). The relationship of argumentativeness to verbal aggression. The Southern Speech Communication Journal, 50, 67-77.

Infante, D.A., & Wigley, C.J. (1986). Verbal aggressiveness: An interpersonal model and measure. Communication Monographs, 53, 61-69.

Jones, T.S., & Carlin, D. (1994, April). "You have to be taught to hate": Undoing destructive conflict patterns through peer mediation. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Communication Association, Washington, D.C.

Kreidler, W.J. (1984). Creative conflict resolution. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Company.

Leiber, C.M., & Rogers, J. (1994). Challenging beliefs and bureaucracies in an urban school system. Education and Urban Society, 27, 60-70.

Prothrow-Stith, D. (1987). Violence prevention: Curriculum for adolescents. Newton, MA: Education Development Center, Inc.

Rancer, A.S., Kosberg, R.L., & Baukus, R.A. (1992). Beliefs about arguing as predictors of trait argumentativeness: Implications for training in argument and conflict management. Communication Education, 41, 375-387.

Schultz, B., & Anderson, J. (1982, May). Learning to negotiate: The role of argument. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Communication Association, Hartford, CT.

Toch, H. (1969). Violent men. Chicago: Aldine.

Zillman, D. (1979). Hostility and aggression. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.