An Introduction to the Project

Rationale and Development

Charles Garvin
University of Michigan
David Bargal
The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

This introductory article begins with a presentation of the focus of this special issue: a participatory action research project titled "Enabling Adolescents in Culturally Diverse Environments to Peacefully Resolve Ethnic Group Conflicts." The rationale for the project as well as its conceptual and theoretical foundations are indicated. After this, the authors note the steps taken to develop the project. The article concludes with a description of the other articles included in this issue.

Keywords: action research; ethnic group conflict; groups for conflict reduction; project development

The intent of this special issue is to report the results of 5 years of work on a participatory action research project titled "Enabling Adolescents in Culturally Diverse Environments to Peacefully Resolve Ethnic Group Conflicts." This project uses the small group as the major vehicle for achieving its purposes. As we indicate in several of the subsequent articles in this issue, the small group is a highly effective means of helping individuals deal with their own identities as well as the identities of others, use this information to understand issues of intergroup relations, and plan activities to reduce intergroup conflict. In action research, also, the small group serves as one of the most important vehicles for democratic decision making and as a potent way to achieve change in people (Bargal, 2006; Coch & French, 1948; Forsyth, 1999; Lieberman, 1980).

This type of research is an appropriate one to report in this journal for several reasons. First, action research in recent years has not been used as frequently as we believe it should be to add to our knowledge of (a) group processes, (b) the group as an instrument of social change, and (c) effective means of group facilitation. Many of the articles in this journal, and appropriately so, report carefully conceived and executed quantitative studies of group phenomena (often conducted in the laboratory). As described by

3

Bargal later in this issue, action research follows different rules than those observed by such studies as dictated by different sets of epistemological assumptions, many related to the incorporation of qualitative methods into the design of the research.

This is also an especially important time to conduct such research. There are many arenas in which both the development of knowledge about small groups and how to use groups to improve the human condition will be of inestimable social value. Examples are groups for the treatment of physical and mental problems, groups to change what we are doing to harm our environment, groups to influence social policy, and groups to improve organizational functioning.

This introduction is divided into two sections. The first presents the theoretical rationale for our work. The second describes the development of the project. Thus, in this introduction, we present information that will enable the reader to place the other articles in this issue into an appropriate context by discussing the rationale for choosing this arena for our action research project, the theoretical basis for the design of our project, the opportunities that arose to make the project possible, and how we initiated our examination of this topic through a literature review and several case studies. We conclude with an indication of the articles we include in this issue and how they contribute to the reader's understanding of our project and its contribution to action research related to group interventions.

Choice of the Problem of Intergroup Conflict

The broad social problem that we chose for this project is intergroup conflict. The famous French philosopher Rene Descartes coined the well-known aphorism "*cogito ergo sum*" ("I think therefore I exist"). It seems evident to us today that although homo sapiens is a rational thinking animal, it is hard to believe that the same "rational animal" was able to commit the cruelest of crimes during the last century. This has been one of the bloodiest centuries in history. For example, World Wars I and II brought about millions of deaths, both of soldiers and of civilians. Two revolutions and their aftermaths—the Russian revolution and the Chinese cultural revolution—added many millions of murdered civilians.

The world of the closing years of the 20th century and the beginning of the 21st century, in contrast, is more globalized, more pluralistic and interdependent, and more open and sensitive than heretofore to the exercise of democratic values such as equality, freedom, and the welfare of the individual person. Nevertheless, despite these developments, human relations in many parts of the world, including Western societies, still show many manifestations of conflict related to prejudice and hatred.

Theoretical Rationale

Intergroup Relations and Intergroup Conflicts

A renowned scholar in the field of intergroup conflict, Sherif (1966), defined *intergroup relations* as follows:

> Whenever individuals belonging to one group interacts collectively or individually with another group or its members in terms of their group identification, we have an instance of intergroup behavior. (p. 12)

Tajfel (1982), who contributed significantly to research on intergroup relations, has described intergroup relations as "one of the most difficult and complex knots of problems that we confront in our times" (p. 1).

Theoretical Understanding of Intergroup Conflict

On the basis of their "in-group," individuals may develop stereotypes and prejudices and, as a result, discriminate against members of other groups. Moreover, conflictual intergroup relations may escalate toward violence. Numerous attempts to understand intergroup conflict and discrimination have focused on the following main factors: social cognitive processes (Fiske & Taylor, 1991; Howard, 2000), personality development (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswick, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950; Altmeyer, 1998), sociocultural influences (Ashmore & Delboca, 1976), social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1986), and competition for realistic resources (Campbell, 1965; Sherif, 1966).

The Democratic Personality and Intercultural Education

Allport (1954), in his exhaustive analysis of "the nature of prejudice," characterized the nature of the democratic personality, which should serve as the ideal to aspire toward through educational interventions. According to Allport,

> democracy, we now realize, places a heavy burden upon the personality, sometimes too great to bear. The maturely democratic personality must possess subtle virtues and capacities: an ability to think rationally about causes and effects, an ability to form properly differentiated categories in respect to ethnic groups and their traits, a willingness to award freedom to others, and a capacity to employ it constructively for oneself. All these qualities are difficult to achieve and maintain. It is easier to succumb to oversimplification and dogmatism, to repudiate the ambiguities inherent in a democratic society, to demand definiteness, to "escape from freedom." (p. 515)

In his book, dealing with prejudice, Allport (1954) focused on the school and its central role in combating discrimination and intolerance. It is, as he puts it, "easier to install remedial programs in the school than in the home" (p. 510). He explained that

> the school, like the church and the laws of the land, can set before the child a higher code than is learned at home and may create a conscience and a healthful conflict even if the prejudiced teachings of the home are not entirely overcome. (p. 511)

He then suggested principles that, according to the best psychological knowledge, will contribute to what he called "imperatives of intercultural education."

There are eight such imperatives. Each of them is introduced here briefly, as they are relevant for contemporary programs that deal with the reduction of intergroup conflicts, including the project portrayed in this volume.

According to Allport (1954), it is important that the students "learn [first] the confusion that occurs between genetic and social definitions of *race*" (p. 512); second, the importance of the significance of customs in various ethnic groups; third, the importance of nature of group differences; and fourth, the necessity of the rejection of simplistic categories of others. Allport called this "tabloid thinking." Fifth, Allport cited evidence that from 7 years old children can understand the scapegoating mechanism. They, when older, may even tie it to "the persecution of minority groups throughout the ages" (p. 512). Sixth, according to this imperative, students should be aware that certain ethnic group traits result from victimization. Examples are ambition among Jews or resentment among Blacks. Seven, the students should be exposed to "facts concerning discrimination and prejudice." They should realize how the social, economic, and political systems fail to achieve more justice and equality for all social groups. Eighth, students should be educated to pursue multiple loyalties. In Allport's own words, "The fact that loyalty to nation requires loyalty to all subgroups within the nation is seldom pointed out" (p. 513). All the "imperatives" mentioned here have been incorporated and applied in the manual for the project reported in this issue (see Garvin's later article in this issue).

Adolescents in High Schools: A Target Group

In contemporary Western societies, youth are at a stage of life that is important for the development of social and personal identities (Erickson,

1968). During this stage, young people are relatively open to educational influences and to a reformulation of their personal attitudes and their perceptions of the world. Stereotypes about intergroup relations, including prejudices and the notion of social justice, are likely to be changing, and an ability to participate in dialogues as a means of managing conflict may be acquired.

The peer culture plays a major role in shaping the attitudes and perceptions adolescents have of the social world (Brown, 1990). Peer culture enables the young person to practice new behaviors, to express new beliefs, and to emulate contemporaries and adults as their role models. The small group format, which is the main vehicle in the intervention we report here, is thus an excellent setting for an examination and exchange of views and feelings about various attitudes and behavior related to intergroup relations.

As will be shown further, according to the action research tradition, the participants as individuals can be involved in the program as well as the high schools as educational communities. Our intervention efforts, therefore, also were aimed at the creation of a school culture, which will promote an awareness of intergroup relations within the school.

Background of Project Personnel

Those of us who initiated this project had, in varying ways, been involved in relevant scholarly activities. Garvin (1997) has been concerned with the development of intervention theory in group work as well as with the use of groups to achieve social change. Bargal (2004) has written extensively on groups to improve intergroup relations, especially in work with Israeli Jewish and Palestinian youth (see also Bargal & Bar, 1992) and on the history and use of action research (Bargal, 2006); Spencer (Spencer & Nagda, 2002) has contributed substantially to the literature on intergroup dialogues; and Henry Meares (who was our major liaison with the schools) has conducted many intergroup activities, first as a school principal and then as the assistant dean of the School of Education of the University of Michigan.

Opportunity for Approaching This Issue

An opportunity to develop this project arose when the W. K. Kellogg Foundation funded a program at the School of Social Work of the University of Michigan titled the "Global Program on Youth." The intent of the program was to fund projects that met the following criteria:

- The program must contribute to the resolution of problems affecting youth.
- The program must have an international focus.
- The program must involve collaborators who are scholars in the countries chosen as sites for the respective projects.

We successfully competed for one of these grants. Our initial project sought to provide the information we needed to devise the action research program described in this volume. The information was from two sources. The first was from a review of the literature reporting the nature and effectiveness of this type of program. The second was from case studies we conducted of a small number of programs in the United States and other countries. We had only a small grant that was insufficient to survey a large number of programs.

Literature Review

The literature on the reduction of intergroup tensions suggested many ways of accomplishing this. Stephan and Stephan (2001) identified the following strategies after surveying that literature: multicultural education, diversity training, intergroup dialogues, intercultural training, cooperative learning, conflict resolution programs, and morals and values education programs. We ultimately drew on all of these in designing our program.

Research Evidence

Research studies regarding interventions to improve intergroup relations between adolescents are not many. According to Stephan and Stephan (2001), there are only a few systematic evaluations of multicultural education. These studies provide evidence of their effectiveness (Hall, 1999; Johnson & Johnson, 1996; Lindsay, 1998). Evaluation research conducted by Bargal and Bar (1992) and Bar and Bargal (1995) concerning encounter workshops between Jewish and Arab youth in Israel point to changes achieved among participants as compared to a group of nonparticipants. Studies that evaluated students following participation in intergroup dialogue groups also demonstrated positive changes (Gurin, Peng, Lopez, & Nagda, 1999).

More recently, a special issue of the *Journal of Social Issues* (Nagda, Tropp, & Paluck, 2006) was published: "Reducing Prejudice and Promoting Social Inclusion: Integrating Research, Theory, and Practice on Intergroup Relations." The articles in this volume presented a great deal of current

knowledge derived from both theoretical and empirical sources. Several of the articles presented research directly related to our project. Molina and Wittig (2006) discuss a meta-analysis by Fishbein (1996) in which he examined 14 studies of multi-ethnic student teams. He concluded from this that "cooperative interventions reduced racial prejudice and discrimination toward known individuals of another ethnic group on the same team, yet these interventions were not as effective in reducing prejudice toward unknown members of those same ethnic groups" (p. 490).

Molina and Wittig (2006) conducted an experiment involving ninth-grade students in suburban Los Angeles enrolled in a mandatory life skills course. During each term, five of the six sections of the course participated in the Racial Awareness Program, which consisted of seven 50-minute weekly sessions led by college student–trained facilitators in the presence of their regular teacher. The results of this study demonstrated that acquaintance potential is a "consistent and robust predictor of prejudice reduction . . . while cooperative interdependence is a consistent and robust predictor of perceptions of a common group" (p. 505). *Acquaintance potential* is defined as "opportunities for individualized association with members of other racial/ethnic groups, which promotes both personalized knowledge about outgroup members and the potential to develop meaningful intergroup relationships" (p. 505).

In another article in this volume, Paluck (2006) specifically calls for an action research approach to investigating programs to promote intergroup relations. She also presents her own findings from a study of school diversity training (Paluck & Green, 2006) conducted by the Anti-Defamation League in several U.S. high schools. This program trained a representative sample of "Peer Trainers" to be "voices of tolerance in the hallways and classrooms of their schools." The program was evaluated through a telephone survey of students in both treatment and control schools. The investigators found that "the training program improved peer trainers awareness of and attitudes toward prejudice against various social groups, but not personal comfort with different groups" (p. 587). Additional discussion of previous research may be found in the article by Spencer et al. in this issue.

Case Studies

We sought to obtain specific information about projects being conducted at the time we initiated our own effort, and we therefore completed four case studies. Data were obtained from two sites outside of and two sites

within the United States. After contacting several non-U.S. sites, we chose one in Israel and one in South Africa. The information we present here is often a direct quote or a paraphrase from the reports of the collaborator in Israel (Dr. David Bargal) and in South Africa (Dr. Elizabeth Smit).

The U.S. sites are both in the state of Michigan, as our resources did not allow for travel to sites that were more distant from our home base. We call one such site "Midtown" and the other "Lake City." Research assistants employed by this project studied the two U.S. sites, and our information about these sites use the data they collected as well as official reports issued by the programs themselves (Roxanna Duntley-Matos and Alexandra Crampton, doctoral students at the University of Michigan in the Joint Program in Social Work and Social Science).

In choosing these sites, we identified Michigan schools that sought to reduce conflicts between students from different ethnic groups by bringing together groups consisting of individuals from each ethnic group, and this was the same criterion we applied in selecting non-U.S. sites. We had more difficulty than we had anticipated in finding these U.S. sites. This was because school systems in our geographical area that sought to alleviate ethnic conflicts either approached this issue through educational programs to promote cultural sensitivity or engaged only in one-on-one mediation, as described by Schrumpf, Crawford, and Usadel (1991), and never brought groups together. In fact, the staff of a very large Michigan school system told us that if the conflict-involved interaction between groups, the matter was turned over to administrators for disciplinary action.

Each of these projects was developed with extensive involvement of relevant school systems. The South African program was conducted in schools by a separate agency created to develop peaceful relationships between groups, and this was also true of Israel. One of the U.S. programs (Midtown) was conducted by the school system itself through external support from the government; the other (Lake City) was conducted by a social work agency under contract with the school.

Qualitative means were used to collect data, and the collaborators from each country worked together to identify the variables that would be used to make comparisons. Each collaborator was responsible for using the means at her or his disposal to collect the data, although limited funds were made available to assist with this task.

The sources of data were interviews with staff members of the various projects, school personnel, and observations of group sessions. A detailed presentation of the data from these case studies may be found in the article by Garvin, Bargal, and Smit (2005). In summary, however, the authors

found that the interventions varied considerably as regard their theoretical assumptions as well as their programmatic details. One has to assume that the sociopolitical reality, at least in the cases of South Africa and Israel, also dictated the methods of intervention and their content (racism and apartheid in South Africa and the Jewish–Palestinian protracted conflict in Israel). This is true to a lesser extent with regard to the two cities in Michigan, whose methods to cope with conflicts in schools focused mainly on means of mediation.

Irrespective of the method used during the intervention, we concluded that these programs played an important role in the lives of their participants as well as in the lives of others. The intent of each was to inculcate in participants openness to diversity, tolerance of differences, and the acquisition of basic skills to handle intergroup conflicts.

Project Development

On the basis of this literature review and other case studies, we initiated the project reported in this volume. One of the first activities was to select the schools that will serve as sites for the project, and this process is described by Garvin later in this volume.

In obtaining access to the schools, we were fortunate that one of our project staff, Henry Meares, as a faculty member of the University's School of Education, had engaged in other projects with the principals of the schools. He contacted them on behalf of the project and requested their cooperation. Thereafter, when we met with the principals, they easily gave their consent to participation. They were also informed about the principles of action research, such as the idea that this was a collaborative project to be developed jointly with the University and that it would evolve based on a continuous flow of information about its effects. Thus, teachers and administrators (and eventually students) would be part of the team guiding the project, along with those of us from the University of Michigan (referred to as the "policy committee"). Details on the policy committee as well as how participants were to be selected and how sessions were scheduled may be found in the article by Garvin.

Obtaining Additional Support

Initially, we required modest additional financial support beyond that supplied through the W.K. Kellogg grant. This was obtained from the Ann

Arbor Community Area Foundation. When the Kellogg grant ended, we obtained funds from the research and multicultural offices of the University and the Schools of Social Work and Education. It was a testimonial to the commitment of the schools that were the sites of the project and their belief in its effectiveness that they also contributed funds for these pilots.

We have not found it easy to obtain funds from public and private sources. Despite the fact that intergroup conflicts, especially in schools, undoubtedly negatively affect learning environments, we have not easily located sources for which this is a priority.

Implementation of the Action Research Approach

As we will indicate more completely later in this issue, we sought to conduct all the activities of this project in a manner consistent with the principles of action research (in the article by Bargal). In short, this required that all the procedures be developed collaboratively with the school sites. In addition, information will be obtained on the project's processes and outcomes, and this information will be provided to all the participants, who will use it to make both immediate and long-range changes in the project.

The mechanisms for providing this information to participants consisted of the following:

1. Observers were trained to observe group sessions and to write a narrative report on each session. This narrative included the content of the session and the specific verbalizations of the students and facilitators with respect to the content, the emotions expressed by these individuals, and the impact of these communications on the structure and process of the group. These narratives were distributed to all of the facilitators (including the peer facilitators who had completed the program the preceding year), who used them in their weekly debriefing and planning sessions. On the basis of this debriefing, modifications were made in the plan for the following meeting, as prescribed in the manual, when this appeared necessary. Examples of the situations that called for changes were problems in the group process (e.g., conflicts arose, situations that arose in the school required attention, students raised issues with respect to intergroup relations in the school).
2. A report on the progress of the group was presented monthly at policy committee meetings attended by facilitators, university staff, and assistant principals (who report, in turn, to the principals) assigned as liaisons to the project by the school administration.

3. A meeting was held annually and was attended by superintendents, principals, assistant principals, facilitators, and selected students. At this meeting, the experience of the previous year was presented, and implications for the following year's program were considered.
4. The project staff examined the data obtained from the qualitative and quantitative instruments described by Spencer in this volume. These data included the contents of interviews with all the student participants, in which they were asked what parts of the program they liked and did not like as well as what suggestions they offered for the following year's program.

Consequences of Action Research Approach

These various opportunities for feedback led to changes in both the ongoing program and the plans for the following year's program. Some examples of the changes developed in this way include the following:

- Students indicated that they sometimes felt unsafe in revealing their views. This led to greater emphasis on discussions of trust and respect. It also prompted us to spend more time in initial sessions on trust-building exercises, including discussions of hopes and fears associated with the project.
- Many students wished to deepen their understanding of intergroup relations and their skills in promoting them after the program ended. They worked with us in developing and implementing a plan for students to return the year after they experienced the program as participants as peer facilitators.
- Students were aware that the program was conducted in two schools whose students were dissimilar in ethnic composition and socioeconomic background. They expressed a strong desire to interact with students from the other school. This was carried out twice each year and became a highlight of the program as students became aware of their stereotypes about the other school and the ways such stereotypes are detrimental.
- Students were critical of the amount of time allocated to debriefing a discussion or other group experience. This led to the staff reducing the number of exercises at each session and increasing the debriefing time after an exercise.
- Staff thought they needed more training in facilitation skills. Each year, the amount of training was increased, including the staff experiencing the exercises themselves and then subsequently presenting them to the students. An important issue here was the recognition by facilitators that they needed to be as open with each other on identity-related issues as they asked of the students. Incidentally, our ability to ask staff to attend training sessions was limited by how much time we could ask teachers to be absent from their classes and social work students to give more time to their field experience. We hope that the availability of funding in the future will enable us to "buy" more time from facilitators.

Contents of This Volume

Because this issue is devoted to action research involving groups and as illustrated by our project, the first article, by Bargal, discusses the processes of this kind of research. It also stresses that action research is both a methodology and an ideology as it prescribes ways to collect and interpret data while being rooted in the democratic philosophy of promoting welfare in a humanistic way. It also compares action research to other, primarily positivist approaches to science and then presents and elaborates on a set of eight action research principles.

The next two articles in this volume present the theoretical foundations for the type of group work employed in our project. Stephan indicates the nature of intergroup conflict as well as the principles of conflict resolution in groups. He focuses particularly on psychological processes related to affect, cognition, and instrumental behavior. He subsequently deals with communication processes involved in improving conflict resolution as well as the nature of intergroup conflict resolution training.

In the next article, Bargal discusses more specifically the small group processes that play a role in conflict resolution and conflict resolution training. He illustrates many of these by references to an action research project he conducted involving Palestinian and Israeli Jewish youth. His work on this project was known to us when we developed our project and was highly influential in the development of its conceptual foundations.

The next article in this volume by Garvin describes the development and implementation of this action research program. He indicates three theoretical frameworks used in the program: namely, group development, social change, and problem solving. He subsequently presents information about the program manual used. He indicates how this manual divided the group's program into several phases and what the program for each phase was. He concludes with examples of activities for the group used at each phase.

The next article in this volume, written by Spencer, Brown, Griffin, and Abdullah, presents the kinds of data that were collected to evaluate the project and what these data show about project processes and outcomes. It is important to emphasize that the project thus far has consisted of a series of pilot studies and the data are appropriate for these. Future studies that are likely to be of an experimental or quasi-experimental nature will employ other types of data and analysis. Therefore, the final article in this volume, by Bargal and Garvin, presents conclusions about the project that can be drawn from the analyses and suggests future directions for this work.

References

Adorno, T., Frenkel-Brunswick, E., Levinson, D., & Sanford, R. (1950). *The authoritarian personality*. New York: Harper.

Allport, G. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Altmeyer, B. (1998). The other authoritarian personality. In M. Zana (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 30, pp. 47-92). New York: Academic Press.

Ashmore, R., & Delboca, F. (1976). Psychological approaches to understanding intergroup conflict. In P. Katz (Ed.), *Toward the elimination of racism* (pp. 73-123). New York: Pergamon.

Bar, H., & Bargal, D. (1995). *Living with conflict: Encounters between Jewish and Palestinian youth*. Jerusalem, Israel: The Jerusalem Institute for the Study of Israel.

Bargal, D. (2004). Groups for reducing intergroup conflict. In C. D. Garvin, L. M. Gutierrez, & M. J. Galinsky (Eds.), *Handbook of social work with groups* (pp. 292-306). New York: Guilford.

Bargal, D. (2006). Personal and intellectual influences leading to Lewin's paradigm of action research. *Action Research*, *4*(4), 367-388.

Bargal, D., & Bar, H. (1992). A Lewinian approach to intergroup workshops for Arab-Palestinian and Jewish youth. *Journal of Social Issues*, *48*(2), 139-154.

Brown, B. (1990). Peer group and peer cultures. In S. Feldman & G. Elliot (Eds.), *At the threshold: The developing adolescent* (pp. 171-190). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Campbell, D. (1965). Ethnocentric and other altruistic motives. In D. Levine (Ed.), *Nebraska symposium on motivation* (pp. 283-311). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Coch, L., & French, J. (1948). Overcoming resistance to change. *Human Relations*, *1*, 512-532.

Erickson, E. (1968). *Identity: youth and crisis*. New York: Norton.

Fishbein, H. D. (1996). *Peer prejudice and discrimination: Evolutionary, cultural, and developmental dynamics*. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Fiske, S., & Taylor, S. (1991). *Social cognition* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Forsyth, D. (1999). *Group dynamics* (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Garvin, C. D. (1997). *Contemporary group work* (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Garvin, C., Bargal, D., & Smit, E. (2005). *Group approaches to reducing ethnic conflict among adolescents*. Unpublished paper, School of Social Work, the University of Michigan.

Gurin, P., Peng, T., Lopez, G., & Nagda, B. R. (1999). Context, identity, and intergroup relations. In D. Prentice & D. Miller (Eds.), *Cultural divides: The social psychology of intergroup contact* (pp. 133-170). New York: Russell Sage.

Hall, R. (1999). Learning conflict management through peer mediation. In A. Raviv, L. Oppenheimer, & D. Bar-Tal (Eds.), *How children understand war and peace: A call for international peace education* (pp. 281-298). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Howard, J. (2000). Social psychology of identities. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *26*, 367-393.

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

Lieberman, M. (1980). Group methods. In. F. Kanfer & A. Goldstein (Eds.), *Helping people change* (pp. 470-536). New York: Pergamon.

Lindsay, C. (1998). Conflict resolution and peer mediation in public schools: What works? *Mediation Quarterly*, *16*, 85-99.

Molina, L. E., & Wittig, M. A. (2006). Relative importance of contact conditions in explaining prejudice reduction in a classroom context: Separate and equal? *Journal of Social Issues*, *62*(3), 489-510.

Nagda, B. A., Tropp, L. R., & Paluck, E. L. (Issue Editors). (2006). Reducing prejudice and promoting social inclusion: Integrating research, theory, and practice [special issue]. *Journal of Social Issues*, *62*(3).

Paluck, E. L. (2006). Diversity training and intergroup contact: A call to action research. *Journal of Social Issues*, *62*(3), 577-596.

Paluck, E. L., & Green, D. P. (2006). *Anti-bias education and peer influence as two strategies to reduce prejudice: An impact evaluation of the anti-defamation league peer training program*. Unpublished manuscript.

Schrumpf, F., Crawford, D., & Usadel, H. C. (1991). *Peer mediation: Conflict resolution in schools*. Champaign, IL: Research Press.

Sherif, M. (1966). *In common predicament: Social psychology of intergroup conflict and cooperation*. Boston: Houghton and Mifflin.

Spencer, M. S., & Nagda, B. A. (2002, August). *Outcomes of intergroup dialogues for students in elective and required courses*. Paper presented to the American Psychological Association Annual Conference, Chicago.

Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (2001). *Improving intergroup relations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Tajfel, H. (1982). The social psychology of intergroup relations. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *33*, 1-39.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In O. Worchel & W. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 7-24). Chicago: Nelson Hall.

Charles Garvin is professor emeritus at the School of Social Work at the University of Michigan. He is a former editor of *Small Group Research*. He has taught for more than 40 years at the university about group work, small group theory, and small group research. He is the author or editor of several books about group work, including *Contemporary Group Work* and *Handbook of Social Work With Groups*, and has written many articles dealing with small group theory and practice.

David Bargal is Gordon Brown Professor (Emeritus) at the Paul Baerwald School of Social Work and Social Welfare of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem. He has published more than 100 articles in professional journals and books, in addition to seven edited books and journals and three books under his authorship. His book (with H. Bar) *Living With Conflict: Encounters Between Jewish and Palestinian Youth* reported on 5 years of action research. He edited a collection of Kurt Lewin's writings in Hebrew.