

MICHAEL JIMPFER

Educating for a Peaceful World

Morton Deutsch

This article outlines a program of what schools can do to encourage the values, attitudes, and knowledge that foster constructive rather than destructive relations, which prepare children to live in a peaceful world. It describes four key components of such programs: cooperative learning, conflict resolution training, the constructive use of controversy in teaching subject matters, and the creation of dispute resolution centers in schools.

Families and schools are the two most important institutions that influence developing children's predispositions to hate and to love. Although the influence of the family comes earlier and is often more profound, there is good reason to believe that children's subsequent experiences in schools can modify or strengthen their earlier acquired dispositions. In this article, I outline a program that schools can follow to encourage the development of the values, attitudes, and knowledge that foster constructive rather than destructive relations, which prepare children to live in a peaceful world.

Many schools do not provide much constructive social experience for students. Too often, schools are structured in ways that pit students against one another. They compete for teachers' attention, for grades, for status, and for admission to prestigious schools. Being put down and putting down others are pervasive occurrences. Many of us can recall classroom experiences of hoping that another student, who was called on by the teacher instead of us, would give the wrong answer so that we could get called on and give the right answer.

In recent years, it has been increasingly recognized that schools have to change in basic ways if we are to educate children so that they are for rather than against one another, so that they develop the ability to resolve their conflicts constructively rather than destructively and are prepared to live in a peaceful world. This recognition has been expressed in a number of interrelated movements: cooperative learning, conflict resolution, and education for peace. In my view, there are four key components in these overlapping movements: cooperative learning, conflict resolution training, the constructive use of controversy in teaching subject matters, and the creation of dispute resolution centers in the schools.¹ I discuss each briefly, with more emphasis on cooperative learning and conflict resolution because I have worked more extensively in these two areas and because they provide a valuable base for education in constructive controversy and mediation.

Cooperative Learning

Although cooperative learning has many ancestors and can be traced back for at least 2,000 years, it is only in this century that there has been development of a theoretical base, systematic research, and systematic teaching procedures for cooperative learning. There are five key elements of cooperative learning (Johnson, Johnson, & Holubec, 1986). The most important is *positive interdependence*. Students must perceive that it is to their advantage if other students learn well and that it is to their disadvantage if others do poorly. This can be achieved in many different ways: through mutual goals (goal interdependence); division of labor (task interdependence); dividing resources, materials, or information among group members (resource interdependence); and by giving joint rewards (reward interdependence).

In addition, cooperative learning requires *face-to-face interaction* in which students can express their positive interdependence in behavior. It also requires *individual accountability* of each member of the cooperative learning group to one another for mastering the material to be learned and for providing appropriate support and assistance to each other. Furthermore, it is necessary for the students to be trained in the *interpersonal and small group skills* needed for effective cooperative work in groups. Finally, cooperative learning also involves providing students with the time and procedures for *processing* or analyzing how well their learning groups are functioning and what can be done to improve how they work together. It is desirable to compose cooperative learning groups that are heterogeneous with regard to gender, academic ability, ethnic background, and physical disability.

Hundreds of research studies have been done on the relative effects of cooperative, competitive, and individualistic learning experiences (see Johnson & Johnson, 1983, 1989). The various studies of cooperative learning are quite consistent with one another and with initial

Lewis P. Lipsitt served as action editor for this article.

This article was presented as the presidential address to the Division of Peace Psychology at the 99th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association in San Francisco on August 8, 1991.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Morton Deutsch, International Center for Cooperation and Conflict Resolution, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027.

¹ By this emphasis, I do not mean to imply that students should not also acquire—at the appropriate age level—substantive knowledge in such fields as political science, international relations, arms control and disarmament, economic development, the global environment, and world trade, which are also important to world peace, and other substantive knowledge and skills necessary to function as responsible adults.

theoretical work and research on the effects of cooperation and competition (Deutsch, 1949a, 1949b) in indicating very favorable effects on students. Students develop a considerably greater commitment, helpfulness, and caring for each other regardless of differences in ability level, ethnic background, gender, social class, or physical disability. They develop more skill in taking the perspective of others, emotionally as well as cognitively. They develop greater self-esteem and a greater sense of being valued by their classmates. They develop more positive attitudes toward learning, school, and their teachers. They usually learn more in the subjects they study by cooperative learning, and they acquire more of the skills and attitudes that are conducive to effective collaboration with others.

It is evident that cooperative education fosters constructive relations. Moreover, when used by skillful teachers, it can help children overcome alienated or hostile orientations to others that they have developed from earlier experiences (see Johnson & Johnson, 1989, and Deutsch et al., 1992, for a more extensive discussion of mental health effects).

However, it is important to realize that, although the concept of cooperative learning is simple, its practice is not. Changing a classroom and school so that they emphasize cooperative learning requires that teachers learn many new skills—ways of teaching students cooperative skills, ways to monitor and intervene in student work groups to improve students' collaborative skills, methods of composing student groups and structuring cooperative learning goals so that groups are likely to work well together, ways of developing curriculum materials to promote positive interdependence, ways to create constructive academic controversies within the cooperative groups, and ways of integrating the cooperative learning with competitive and individualistic learning activities. It usually takes teachers about three or four years to become well skilled in the use of cooperative learning.

Sometimes parents and teachers have misconceptions about cooperative learning that make them resistant to it initially.² There are several myths that it is well to confront (see Johnson et al., 1986, for a more extensive discussion). The following are four common myths.

1. Cooperative learning does not prepare students for the adult world, which is highly competitive. There are two points to be made. (a) The ability of people to work cooperatively is crucial to building and maintaining stable marriages, families, communities, friendships, careers, and a peaceful world. Although competition has often been stressed as the key to success in the world of work, the reality is that individual as well as corporate success depends on effective cooperation and teamwork (Kohn, 1986). (b) Schools, even with extensive cooperative learning, would provide much experience with individual and group competition. The issue is not to eliminate competition and individualism from the schools but to provide a more appropriate balance with cooperation.³ Although children are exposed to much competition in schools, my impression is that schools rarely teach in a

systematic way generalizable skills for being effective competitors.

2. High-achieving students are penalized by working in heterogeneous cooperative learning groups. Research evidence clearly indicates that high-achieving students learn at least as much in cooperatively structured classrooms as they do in the more traditional ones (Johnson & Johnson, 1983, 1989). They frequently learn more: Teaching less able students often solidifies their own learning, they learn how to help others and to work collaboratively, and they learn how to be mutually respecting despite differences in ability. This is not to deny that some high achievers need help from their teachers and their classmates to appreciate the benefits they can obtain from cooperative learning. It should also be recognized that cooperative learning does not imply that high achievers must learn and work at the same pace as low achievers. Nor does it imply that high achievers will lack opportunities to work alone or to work cooperatively with other high achievers.

3. Grading is unfair in cooperative learning. There are many ways of creating positive interdependence in cooperative learning groups; group grading is one way but it is not necessary. Even when group grades are used, individual grades may also be used. Although students sometimes complain about grades, complaints appear to be less frequent in cooperative learning classrooms than in more traditional ones. Students are able to recognize that how well people do in life is affected not only by how well they perform as individuals but also by how well the groups, teams, corporations, and nations of which they are members perform.

4. The good students do all the work, the lazy students get a free ride. A central feature in cooperative learning is individual accountability. If a student is "goofing off," this becomes a problem for the group that, with encouragement and appropriate help from the teacher, the group can usually solve. In solving the problem, the group learns a great deal and the poorly motivated, alienated, withdrawn, or reclusive student often benefits enormously as he or she becomes an active participant in cooperative learning.

² There has been little research on factors affecting the acceptance of or resistance to cooperative learning (conflict resolution, constructive controversy, or mediation) programs by teachers, parents, or school systems. My impression is that the interest and demand for such programs have been increasing at an accelerating rate during the past 10 years and that the supply of well-trained experts to train teachers and administrators in these areas is insufficient to meet the demand. In the near future, I expect that schools of education will develop educational programs for new teachers and administrators in these areas.

³ Not enough research has been done yet to specify an appropriate balance among the different modes of teaching. It would undoubtedly vary as a function of such factors as the skills of the individual teacher, the type of subject matter to be learned, and the characteristics of the students. Nevertheless, the available research indicates that, in a wide variety of contexts and subject matters with diverse students, the use of cooperative learning is beneficial.

Conflict Resolution Training

Conflict is an inevitable feature of all social relations. Conflict can take a constructive or destructive course; it can take the form of enlivening controversy or deadly quarrel. There is much to suggest that there is a two-way relation between effective cooperation and constructive conflict resolution. Good cooperative relations facilitate the constructive management of conflict; the ability to handle constructively the inevitable conflicts that occur during cooperation facilitates the survival and deepening of cooperative relations.

In recent years, conflict resolution training programs have sprouted in a number of schools, industries, and community dispute-resolution centers. In this article, I focus on such programs in schools. Although I believe these programs are very promising, they are relatively new and little systematic research on their effectiveness has been done. There are many different programs, and their contents vary with the age and background of the students.

Nevertheless, there are some common elements running through most programs. They derive from the recognition that a constructive process of conflict resolution is similar to an effective, cooperative problem-solving process (in which the conflict is perceived as the mutual problem to be solved) whereas a destructive process is similar to a win-lose, competitive struggle (Deutsch, 1973). In effect, most conflict resolution training programs seek to instill attitudes, knowledge, and skills that are conducive to effective, cooperative problem solving and to discourage the attitudes and habitual responses that give rise to win-lose struggles. Below, I list the central elements included in many training programs, but I do not have the space to describe the ingenious techniques that are used in teaching them. The sequence in which they are taught varies as a function of the nature of the group being taught.

1. Know what type of conflict you are involved in. There are three major types of conflict: the zero-sum conflict (a pure win-lose conflict), the mixed-motive (both can win, both can lose, or one can win and the other lose), and the pure cooperative (both can win or both can lose). It is important to know what kind of conflict you are in because the different types require different types of strategies and tactics (see Lewicki & Litterer, 1985; Pruitt & Rubin, 1986; Walton & McKersie, 1965). The common tendency is for inexperienced parties to define their conflicts as win-lose even though it is a mixed-motive conflict. Very few conflicts are intrinsically win-lose conflicts, but if they are misperceived to be such, the parties involved are apt to engage in a competitive, destructive process of conflict resolution. This is so unless there are very strong accepted norms or rules regulating the nature of the competitive interaction (as in competitive games).

The strategies and tactics of the different types of conflict differ. In a zero-sum conflict one seeks to amass, mobilize, and use the various resources of power (Lasswell & Kaplan, 1950) in such a way that one can bring to bear

on the conflict more effective, relevant power than one's adversary. If this is not possible in the initial area of conflict, one seeks to transform the arena of conflict into one in which one's effective power is greater than one's adversary's. Thus, if a bully challenges you to a fight because you won't "lend" him or her money and he or she is stronger than you (and you cannot amass the power to deter, intimidate, or beat the bully), you might arrange to change the conflict from a physical confrontation (which you would lose) to a legal confrontation (which you would win) by involving the police or other legal authority. Other strategies and tactics in win-lose conflicts involve outwitting, misleading, seducing, blackmailing, and the various forms of the black arts that have been discussed by Machiavelli (1513/1950), Potter (1965), Schelling (1960), and Alinsky (1971), among others. The strategy and tactics involved in mixed-motive conflicts are discussed below. My emphasis is on the strategy of cooperative problem solving to find a mutually satisfactory solution to the conflict and on the development and application of mutually acceptable fair principles to handle situations in which the aspirations of both sides cannot be realized equally. The strategy and tactics of the resolution of cooperative conflicts involve primarily cooperative fact-finding and research as well as rational persuasion.

2. Become aware of the causes and consequences of violence and of the alternatives to violence, even when you are very angry. Become realistically aware of how much violence there is, how many young people die from violence, the role of weapons in leading to violence, how frequently homicides are precipitated by arguments, and how alcohol and drugs contribute to violence. Become aware of what makes you very angry; learn the healthy and unhealthy ways you have of expressing anger. Learn how to actively channel your anger in ways that are not violent and are not likely to provoke violence from the other. Understand that violence begets violence and that if you "win" an argument by violence, the other will try to get even in some other way. Learn alternatives to violence in dealing with conflict. Prothrow-Smith (1987) has developed a very helpful curriculum for adolescents on the prevention of violence.

3. Face conflict rather than avoid it. Recognize that conflict may make you anxious and that you may try to avoid it. Learn the typical defenses that you use to evade conflict (e.g., denial, suppression, becoming overly agreeable, rationalization, postponement, premature conflict resolution). Become aware of the negative consequences of evading a conflict, such as irritability, tension, and persistence of the problem. Learn what kinds of conflicts are best avoided rather than confronted—for example, conflicts that will evaporate shortly, those that are inherently unresolvable, and win-lose conflicts that you are unlikely to win.

4. Respect yourself and your interests, and respect the other and his or her interests. Personal insecurity and sense of vulnerability often lead people to define conflicts as life or death, win-lose struggles even when they are

relatively minor, mixed-motive conflicts. This definition may lead to conflict avoidance, premature conflict resolution, or obsessive involvement in the conflict. Helping students develop respect for themselves and their interests enables them to see their conflicts in reasonable proportion and facilitates their constructive confrontation. Helping students learn to respect the other and the other's interests inhibits the use of competitive tactics of power, coercion, deprecation, and deception that commonly escalate the issues and often lead to violence.

Valuing oneself and others, as well as respect for the differences between oneself and others, are rooted in the fundamental moral commitment to the principle of universal human dignity. This core value and its derivatives not only should be emphasized in the curricula of many subject matters (e.g., literature, geography, history, social studies) from kindergarten through the 12th grade, in addition to the conflict resolution curricula, but also should be learned by students from their observations of how teachers and school administrators treat students and other people in and around the schools.

5. Avoid ethnocentrism: Understand and accept the reality of cultural difference. Be aware that you live in a community, a nation, and a world with people from many different cultures. People from different cultures may differ from you in their appearance, dress, behavior, perceptions, beliefs, preferences, values, history, and ways of thinking about conflict and negotiation. What you take to be self-evident and right may not seem that way to people from different cultural backgrounds and, conversely, what they take as self-evident and right may not seem that way to you. Learn to understand and accept the reality of cultural differences; try to understand the other's culture and try to help the other to understand yours. Expect cultural misunderstandings, and use them as opportunities for learning rather than as a basis of estrangement.

6. Distinguish clearly between *interests* and *positions*. Positions may be opposed, but interests may not be (Fisher & Ury, 1981). The classic example from Follett (1940) is that of a brother and sister, each of whom wanted the only orange available. The sister wanted the peel of the orange to make marmalade; the brother wanted to eat the inner part. Their positions ("I want the orange") were opposed, but their interests were not. Often when conflicting parties reveal their underlying interests, it is possible to find a solution that suits them both.

7. Explore your interests and the other's interests to identify the common and compatible interests that you share. Identifying shared interests makes it easier to deal constructively with the interests that you perceive as being opposed. A full exploration of one another's interests increases empathy and facilitates subsequent problem solving. For an excellent discussion of how to develop empathy and a sense of shared interests, see Schulman and Mekler (1985).

When considerable distrust and hostility have developed between the conflicting parties, it may be useful to have third parties help in this process of exploration.

The third parties may serve one or more functions. They may serve as facilitators or as conciliators (or therapists) who help the parties control and reduce their distrust and hostility enough to permit them to engage in this process themselves. They may serve as mediators who directly assist the parties in this process or even undertake the exploration for the conflicting parties, doing what the parties are unable or unwilling to do. There has been considerable discussion of such third-party intervention (including the selection, training, and ethical requirements for third parties) in Folberg and Taylor (1984), Kelman (1979), Kressel (1985), Kressel, Pruitt, and Associates (1989), and Rubin (1980).

8. Define the conflicting interests between yourself and the other as a mutual problem to be solved cooperatively. Define the conflict in the smallest terms possible, as a "here-now-this" conflict rather than as a conflict between personalities or general principles—that is, as a conflict about a specific behavior rather than about who is a better person. Diagnose the problem clearly, and then seek creative new options that lead to mutual gain. If no option for mutual gain can be discovered, seek to agree on a fair rule or procedure for deciding how the conflict will be resolved. However, not all conflicts can be solved to mutual satisfaction even with the most creative thinking. In such cases, agreeing on a fair procedure to determine who gets his or her way, or seeking help from neutral third parties when such an agreement cannot be reached, may be the most constructive resolution possible (see Lewicki & Litterer, 1985, for an excellent discussion of the strategy and tactics of integrative bargaining). To the extent that the parties see the possibility of a mutually satisfying agreement, they will be more able to listen to one another in an understanding, empathic manner, and, of course, the converse is true too.

9. In communicating with the other, listen attentively and speak so as to be understood. This requires an active effort to take the perspective of the other and to check continually your success in doing so. You should listen to the other's meaning and emotion in such a way that the other *feels* understood as well as is understood. Similarly, you want to communicate to the other your thoughts and feelings in such a way that you have good evidence that he or she understands the way you think and feel. The feeling of being understood, as well as effective communication, facilitates constructive resolution.

Johnson and Johnson (1987), Lewicki and Litterer (1985), Prutzman, Stern, Burger, and Bodenhamer (1988), and many others have provided excellent discussions and practical exercises for developing effective communicating and listening skills. As a communicator, you want to be skilled in obtaining and holding the other's attention, in phrasing your communication so that it is readily comprehended and remembered, and in acquiring the credibility that facilitates acceptance of your message. Skills in taking others' perspectives and obtaining feedback about the effectiveness of your communications are important. Listening actively and effectively entails not only taking the perspective of the other so that you understand

the communicator's ideas and feelings but also communicating your desire to understand the other and indicating, through paraphrasing your understanding or through questions, what you do not understand. Role reversal seems to be helpful in developing an understanding of the other's perspective and providing checks on how effective the communication process has been.

10. Be alert to the natural tendencies to bias, misperceptions, misjudgments, and stereotyped thinking that commonly occur in yourself and the other during heated conflict. These errors in perception and thought interfere with communication, make empathy difficult, and impair problem solving. Psychologists can provide a checklist of the common forms of misperception and misjudgment that occur during intense conflict. These include black-white thinking, demonizing the other, shortening your time perspective, narrowing your range of perceived options, and the fundamental attribution error. The fundamental attribution error is illustrated in the tendency to attribute the aggressive actions of the other to the other's personality while attributing your own aggressive actions to external circumstances (such as the other's hostile actions). The ability to recognize and admit your misperceptions and misjudgments clears the air and facilitates similar acknowledgment by the other (see Jervis, 1976; Kahneman, Slovic, & Tversky, 1982; Nisbett & Ross, 1980.)

11. Develop skills for dealing with difficult conflicts so that you are not helpless when confronting those who are more powerful, who don't want to engage in constructive conflict resolution, or who use dirty tricks. Fisher and Ury (1981) have discussed these matters very helpfully in the final three chapters of their well-known book, *Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreements Without Giving In*. I shall not summarize their discussion but rather emphasize several basic principles. First, it is important to recognize that you become less vulnerable to intimidation by a more powerful other, to someone who refuses to cooperate except on his or her terms, or to someone who plays dirty tricks (deceives, welsches on an agreement, personally attacks you, etc.) if you realize that you usually have a choice: You don't have to stay in the relationship with the other. You are more likely to be aware of your freedom to choose between leaving or staying if you feel that there are alternatives to continuing the relationship that you can accept. The alternative may not be great, but it may be better than staying in the relationship. The freedom to choose prevents the other, if he or she benefits from the relationship, from making the relationship unacceptable to you.

Second, it is useful to be open and explicit to the other about what he or she is doing that is upsetting you and to indicate the effects that these actions are having on you. If the other asserts that you have misunderstood or denies doing what you have stated, and if you are not persuaded, be forthright in maintaining that this remains a problem for you. Discuss with the other what could be done to remove the problem (your misunderstanding of

the other, your need for reassurance, or the other's noxious behavior).

Third, it is wise to avoid reciprocating the other's behavior and to avoid attacking the other personally for his or her behavior (i.e., criticize the behavior and not the person); doing so often leads to an escalating vicious spiral. It is helpful to look behind the other's behavior with such questions as, "I wonder what you think my reaction is to what you have said?" or "I am really curious. What do you think this will gain for you?" It is also sometimes useful to suggest to the other more appropriate means for pursuing his or her interests than the ones that he or she is currently using.

A phrase that I have found useful in characterizing the stance one should take in difficult (as well as easy) conflicts is to be "firm, fair, and friendly." *Firm* in resisting intimidation, exploitation, and dirty tricks; *fair* in holding to one's moral principles and not reciprocating the other's immoral behavior despite his or her provocations; and *friendly* in the sense that one is willing to initiate and reciprocate cooperation.

12. Know yourself and how you typically respond in different sorts of conflict situations. As I have suggested earlier, conflict frequently evokes anxiety. In clinical work, I have found that the anxiety is often based on unconscious fantasies of being overwhelmed and helpless in the face of the other's aggression or of being so angry and aggressive that you will destroy the other. Different people deal with their anxieties about conflict in different ways. I have found it useful to emphasize six different dimensions of dealing with conflict that can be used to characterize a person's predispositions to respond to conflict. Being aware of one's predispositions may allow one to modify them when they are inappropriate in a given conflict. The six dimensions follow.

(a) *Avoiding conflict/excessively involved in conflict.* Conflict avoidance is expressed in denial, repression, suppression, avoidance, and continuing postponement of facing the conflict. Sometimes it is evidenced in premature conflict resolution, fleeing into an agreement before there is adequate exploration of the conflicting interests and the various options for resolving the conflict. Usually, the conflict that is avoided does not go away; rather, the tension associated with it is expressed in fatigue, irritability, muscular tension, and a sense of malaise. Excessive involvement in conflict is sometimes expressed in a "macho" attitude, a chip on one's shoulder, a tendency to seek out conflict to demonstrate that one is not afraid of conflict. It is also commonly expressed in a preoccupation with conflict—obsessive thoughts about fights, disputes, and quarrels, with much rehearsing of moves and counter-moves between oneself and one's adversaries. Presumably, a healthy predisposition involves the readiness to confront conflict when it arises without needing to seek it out or to be preoccupied with it.

(b) *Hard/soft.* Some people are prone to take a tough, aggressive, dominating, unyielding response to conflict, fearing that otherwise they will be taken advantage of and be considered soft. Others are afraid that they

will be considered mean, hostile, or presumptuous, and as a consequence, they are excessively gentle and unassertive. They often expect the other to read their minds and know what they want even though they are not open in expressing their interests. A more appropriate stance is a firm support of one's own interests combined with a ready responsiveness to the interests of the other.

(c) *Rigid/loose.* Some people immediately seek to organize and control the situation by setting the agenda and defining the rules. They feel anxious if things threaten to get out of control and feel threatened by the unexpected. As a consequence, they are apt to push for rigid arrangements and rules and get upset by even minor deviations. At the other extreme, there are some people who are averse to anything that seems formal, limiting, controlling, or constricting. They prefer a loose, improvisational, informal arrangement in which rules and procedures are implicit rather than overt. An approach that allows for both orderliness and flexibility in dealing with the conflict seems more constructive than one that is compulsive either in its organizing or in its rejection of orderliness.

(d) *Intellectual/emotional.* At one extreme, emotion is repressed, controlled, or isolated so that no relevant emotion is felt or expressed as one communicates one's thoughts. The appearance is of someone who is calm, rational, and detached. Frequently, beneath the calm surface is the fear that if one feels or expresses one's emotions, they will get out of control and one will do something destructive, foolish, or humiliating. However, the lack of appropriate emotional expressiveness may seriously impair communication. The other may take your lack of emotion as an indicator that you have no real commitment to your interests and that you lack genuine concern for the other's interests. At the other extreme, there are some people who believe that only feelings are real and that words and ideas are not to be taken seriously unless they are thoroughly soaked in emotion. The emotional intensity of such people also interferes with communication. It impairs the ability to explore ideas mutually and to develop creative solutions to impasses; it also makes it difficult to differentiate the significant from the insignificant, if even the trivial is accompanied with intense emotion. The ideal mode of communication combines thought and affect: The thought is supported by the affect, and the affect is explained by the thought.

(e) *Escalating/minimizing.* At one extreme, there are people who tend to experience any given conflict in the largest possible terms. The issues are cast so that what is at stake involves one's self, one's family, one's ethnic group, precedence for all time, or the like. The specifics of the conflict get lost as it escalates along the various dimensions of conflict: the size and number of the immediate issues involved; the number of motives and participants implicated on each side of the issue; the size and number of the principles and precedents that are perceived to be at stake; the cost that the participants are willing to bear in relation to the conflict; the number of norms of moral conduct from which behavior toward the

other side is exempted; and the intensity of negative attitudes toward the other side. Escalation of the conflict makes the conflict more difficult to resolve constructively except when the escalation proceeds so rapidly that its absurdity becomes even self-apparent. At the other extreme, there are people who tend to minimize their conflicts. They are similar to the conflict avoiders but, unlike the avoiders, they do recognize the existence of the conflict. However, by minimizing the seriousness of the differences between self and other and by not recognizing how important the matter is to self and to the other, one can produce serious misunderstandings. One may also restrict the effort needed to resolve the conflict constructively.

(f) *Compulsively revealing/compulsively concealing.* At one extreme, there are people who feel a compulsion to reveal whatever they think and feel about the other, including their suspicions, hostilities, and fears, in the most blunt, unrationalized, and unmodulated manner. They may feel they have to communicate every doubt, sense of inadequacy, or weakness they have about themselves. At the other extreme, there are people who feel that they cannot reveal any of their feelings or thoughts without seriously damaging their relationship to the other. Either extreme can impair the development of a constructive relationship. One, in effect, should be open and honest in communication but realistically take into account the consequences of what one says or does not say and the current state of the relationship.

13. Finally, throughout conflict, you should remain a moral person who is caring and just and should consider the other as a member of your moral community, entitled to care and justice. In the heat of conflict, there is often the tendency to shrink one's moral community and to exclude the other from it: This permits behavior toward the other that one would otherwise consider morally reprehensible. Such behavior escalates conflict and turns it in the direction of violence and destruction.

The foregoing elements could provide the basis for many different types of courses and workshops in conflict resolution in schools. My limited experience with such training suggests that, by itself, a simple course or workshop is not usually sufficient to produce lasting effects. Students must have repeated opportunities to practice their skills of constructive conflict resolution in a supportive atmosphere. The use of constructive controversy in teaching could provide such an atmosphere.

The Use of Constructive Controversy in Teaching Subject Matters

David Johnson and Roger Johnson (1987, 1992) of the University of Minnesota have suggested that teachers, no matter what subjects they teach, can stimulate and structure constructive controversy in the classroom that will promote academic learning and the development of conflict resolution skills. A cooperative context is established for a controversy, for example, by assigning students to groups of four, dividing each group into two pairs who are assigned positions on the topics to be discussed, and

requiring each group to reach a consensus on the issue and turn in a group report on which all members will be evaluated. There are five phases involved in the structured controversy. First, the paired students learn their respective positions; then each pair presents its position. Next, there is an open discussion in which students argue strongly and persuasively for their positions. After this, there is a perspective reversal, in which each pair presents the opposing pair's position as sincerely and persuasively as it can. In the last phase, they drop their advocacy of their assigned positions and seek to reach consensus on a position that is supported by the evidence. In this phase, they write a joint statement with the rationale and supporting evidence for the synthesis their group has agreed on.

The discussion rules that the students are instructed to follow during the controversy are (a) be critical of ideas, not people; (b) focus on making the best possible decision, not on winning; (c) encourage everyone to participate; (d) listen to everyone's ideas, even if you do not agree; (e) restate what someone has said if it is not clear; (f) bring out the ideas and facts supporting both sides and then try to put them together in a way that makes sense; (g) try to understand both sides of the issue; and (h) change your mind if the evidence clearly indicates that you should do so.

After the structured controversy, there is group processing and highlighting of the specific skills required for constructive controversy. There is good reason to believe that such structured controversy not only would make the classroom more interesting but would also promote the development of perspective taking, critical thinking, and other skills involved in constructive conflict resolution. However, as yet there has been little systematic research on structured controversy.

Mediation in the Schools

There are difficult conflicts that the disputing parties may not be able to resolve constructively without the help of third parties acting as mediators. In schools, such conflicts can occur between students, between students and teachers, between parents and teachers, and between teachers and administrators. To deal with such conflicts, mediation programs have been established in a number of schools. These programs vary, but typically students and teachers are given about 20 to 30 hours of training in the principles of constructive conflict resolution and specific training in how to serve as mediators. They are usually given a set of rules to apply during the mediation process. Students as young as 10 years old as well as high school and college students have been trained. Little systematic research on the effects of such programs has been done, but there is considerable anecdotal evidence to suggest that many student mediators have benefited enormously and that incidents of school violence have decreased.

In selecting to emphasize cooperative learning, conflict resolution, structured controversy, and school mediation as the core of any comprehensive program for a peaceful world, I have been guided by the view that stu-

dents need to have continuing experiences of constructive conflict resolution as they learn different subjects, as well as an immersion in a school environment that provides daily experiences (and a model) of cooperative relations and of constructive resolution of conflicts. This pervasive and extended experience, combined with tuition in the concepts and principles of cooperative work and of conflict resolution, should enable the students to develop generalizable attitudes and skills strong enough to resist the countervailing influences that are so prevalent in their nonschool environments. It is my hope that, by the time they become adults, they would have developed the attitudes, knowledge, and skills that would enable them to cooperate with others in resolving constructively the inevitable conflicts that will occur among and within nations, ethnic groups, communities, and families.

REFERENCES

- Alinsky, S. D. (1971). *Rules for radicals: A practical primer for realistic radicals*. New York: Random House.
- Deutsch, M. (1949a). A theory of cooperation and competition. *Human Relations*, 2, 129-151.
- Deutsch, M. (1949b). An experimental study of the effects of cooperation and competition upon group process. *Human Relations*, 2, 199-231.
- Deutsch, M. (1973). *The resolution of conflict: Constructive and destructive processes*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Deutsch, M. (1985). *Distributive justice: A social-psychological perspective*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Deutsch, M., Mitchell, V., Zhang, Q., Khattri, N., Tepavac, L., Weitzman, E. A., & Lynch, R. (1992). *The effects of training in cooperative learning and conflict resolution in an alternative high school*. New York: Columbia University, Teachers College, International Center for Cooperation and Conflict Resolution.
- Fisher, R., & Ury, W. (1981). *Getting to yes: Negotiating agreements without giving in*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Folberg, J., & Taylor, A. (1984). *Mediation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Follett, M. P. (1940). *Constructive conflict*. In H. C. Metcalf & I. L. Urwick (Eds.), *Dynamic administration: The collected papers of Mary Parker Follett* (pp. 30-49). New York: Harper.
- Jervis, R. (1976). *Perception and misperception in international politics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, F. P. (1987). *Joining together* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1983). The socialization and achievement crisis: Are cooperative learning experiences the solution? In L. Bickman (Ed.), *Applied social psychology annual 4* (pp. 119-164). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1987). *Creative conflict*. Edina, MN: Interaction Book.
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1989). *Cooperation and competition: Theory and research*. Edina, MN: Interaction Book.
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1992). *Creative controversy: Intellectual challenge in the classroom*. Edina, MN: Interaction Book.
- Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Holubec, E. J. (1986). *Circles of learning: Cooperation in the classroom*. Edina, MN: Interaction Book.
- Kahneman, D., Slovic, P., & Tversky, A. (Eds.). (1982). *Judgment under uncertainty: Heuristics and biases*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kelman, H. C. (1979). An interactional approach to conflict resolution. *International Interactions*, 6, 99-122.
- Kohn, A. (1986). *No contest: The case against competition*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Kressel, K. (1985). *The process of divorce: How professionals and couples negotiate settlements*. New York: Basic Books.
- Kressel, K., Pruitt, D. G., & Associates (1989). *Mediation research: The process and effectiveness of third-party intervention*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.