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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This year’s research analysis of the Take Ten program is grouped in three categories for Primary Schools: A) overall results Grades 3-6 (Battell, Brown, Jefferson, Lincoln, Madison, Marshall, Perley); B) comparisons between in-school (Battell, Madison, Perley; n=267), after-school programs (Brown, Jefferson, Lincoln, Marshall; Grades 3-6, n=26), and a control group (Wilson, Grades 3-4, n=34); C) comparisons across prior experience with Take Ten. In addition, Intermediate and High School (Riley, Clay) surveys were analyzed. A total of 393 children were surveyed in this comprehensive evaluation.

PRIMARY: The evaluators concluded that there is an increased perception of violent acts in schools after participation in Take Ten, which can be attributed to the children’s increased awareness of what constitutes violence and their willingness to identify behaviors like name calling, dirty looks, and insulting comments as acts of violence. This is particularly important because it reflects a deeper understanding of Take Ten’s definition of violence.

Results also indicate that student learning varied depending on the program type. Students attending Take Ten “In-school” programs were more likely to learn a variety of curricular topics and change their beliefs regarding violence. This cohort was also more likely to have increased self-awareness of feelings and behaviors that are potentially linked with violence. In comparison, student learning in the “After-school” programs was more limited in either category. Students at the “Control Site” experienced no significant changes in learning relative to any topics in the two broad categories measured.

Additional findings indicate that learning from Take Ten varies by exposure to the program. After repeated exposure to Take Ten, children become increasingly aware of other aspects of their own negative behavior, which increases the need for finding more positive substitute behaviors. This is a very hopeful sign in promoting healthier alternatives to violence.

The teacher findings thus far suggest that those who continually remind their students of Take Ten concepts/principles will potentially influence students more than student volunteers over the long-term, due to their ongoing interactions with students. And while teachers’ appraisal of their school differed by location, it appears that utilizing teachers as instructors of Take Ten makes sense for two specific reasons: 1) Teachers appear to be sensitive to the climate of their schools; 2) Focused teacher involvement can have a more consistent effect on student outcomes than volunteers alone because teachers are present to model & reinforce the curriculum.

INTERMEDIATE: As a result of the low sample size, evaluators are unable to make a quantitative assessment of Take Ten’s program effectiveness at the intermediate level. The low numbers that led to the insufficient sample size require careful analysis by program administrators to ensure that safeguards are in place to secure a significant sample size for future assessment.

HIGH SCHOOLS: Evaluating Take Ten in the high schools, as seen in the 2006-07 assessment, was a difficult proposition for a variety of reasons. The majority of these obstacles resulted from multiple adjustments in the “small learning communities” program that were made at the School Corporation level, often with little time for staff and volunteers to adapt effectively. The main barriers included: insufficient and inconsistent blocks of time for mentors; competition from other programs during curriculum delivery; the choice of mentors as the subjects of the evaluation, rather than first-year student participants. According to the data collected under these circumstances, students were less convinced that it was possible to learn how to handle conflict in constructive ways. Nevertheless, students reported that they were more likely to use Take Ten this year to solve problems.

Finally, a consistent theme emerged from the primary, intermediate, and high school research. A significant number of children felt that school was not safe, and further, teens in high school felt that they were threatened by conflict in their schools. Such similar results across ages and grade levels suggest a pressing need for violence prevention programming like Take Ten to be implemented consistently across all grades and schools, positively reinforced by all adults in the building.
Take Ten is a violence prevention initiative operating at the Robinson Community Learning Center of the University of Notre Dame. Started in 1999 in South Bend, Take Ten made the commitment to evaluate program effectiveness after developing a curriculum based upon the original concept designed by Anne Parry in the mid-1990’s. In the 2007-08 academic year, 393 Take Ten youth participants were assessed in a longitudinal survey to determine significant changes in their knowledge, beliefs and behaviors with regard to violence and conflict (please see demographics of participants above). During the 2007-2008 school year, approximately 125 volunteers per semester worked directly with approximately 1,500 children each week. Those children then spread Take Ten’s message to over 7,000 of their peers through school activities and assemblies, morning announcements and peer mentoring at the high school level.

Take Ten engaged Joyce Long, Ph.D., faculty member from the University of Notre Dame (Institute for Educational Initiatives, Education, Schooling and Society Minor) to manage the effort, while Take Ten staff, student managers, as well as some local teachers administered the surveys to the children involved. The evaluation included participating schools in Mishawaka and South Bend, and utilized the same evaluation tools as had been used with 381 students in the previous school year (pre and post, self-assessment surveys). Take Ten administrators received consent from the University of Notre Dame’s Institutional Review Board and the South Bend Community School Corporation to continue the evaluation of program effectiveness for 2007-2008.
This year’s research analysis of the pre and post-survey responses are grouped in three categories: A) overall results of Grades 3-6 (Battell, Brown, Jefferson, Lincoln, Madison, Marshall, Perley); B) comparisons between in-school programs (Battell, Madison, Perley; Grades 3-6, n=267), after school programs (Brown, Jefferson, Lincoln, Marshall; Grades 3-6, n=26), and a control group (Wilson, Grades 3-4, n=34); C) comparisons across prior experience with Take Ten.

The decision to administer the Primary Form to grades 3-6 was based upon three factors. First, the largest primary site (Battell, n=131) included grades 3-6. Second, in contrast to the instruction of Take Ten at Battell during regular school hours, other 5th/6th grade sites were after school programs. By classifying grades 3-6 together, we could compare results across program types. Third, on-site teachers at SBCSC intermediate schools confirmed that the Primary Form was more appropriate for the reading levels of 5th and 6th grade students in their buildings. Students’ pre- and post-changes in knowledge/beliefs, feelings/values/behavior, and perceptions of school climate revealed the following trends for grades 3-6.

I. PRIMARY Report - Overall Trends

“Children in this age group significantly improved their understanding that they should not be violent to each other.”

The gender breakdown of students who completed the Primary Survey was 56% male and 44% female. According to ethnicity, the following groups were represented (in alphabetical order): African American (21%), Asian (1%), Caucasian (46%), Hispanic (20%), Mixed (10%), Other (4%). The sample was comprised of four grade levels: 3rd (40%), 4th (34%), 5th (10%), 6th (16%). Taken as an overall group, the Primary Report data revealed the following significant trends, which are described below and portrayed in Table 1 (p. 14).

1. Knowledge and Beliefs: Significant changes in children’s knowledge and beliefs of the following key concepts were found in the following pre-/post-mean comparisons:
   a) Children learned that conflict is a frequent and inevitable problem between people (t=2.080, p<.01). This is meaningful in that one of the core principles of the curriculum is to teach children the inevitability of conflict, that conflict does not inevitably result in violence, and that sometimes conflict leads to better outcomes.

   b) Children in this age group also significantly improved their understanding that they should not be violent to each other (t=-3.457, p<.01).

   c) They became more convinced that grown-ups were not the only ones who could keep a fight from starting (t=-2.246; p=.<.05).

   d) They also increased their belief that teachers should not hit students (t=2.405, p=.<.05).

   e) Finally, they suggested their friends’ work habits at school needed improvement (t=2.409, p=.<.05).
“Students became more aware that they were calling people names.”

2. Feelings, Values, and Behavior: Another goal of the curriculum is to help children gain understanding about values and principles, which shape individual conduct and decision-making. In order to achieve this level of understanding and application, children must be able to honestly assess their own conduct and motivations. Survey responses demonstrated the following changes in standards for how students judge themselves over the course of the program year.

   a) Students’ positive feelings for working with teachers at their school actually declined over time (t=−2.392; p<.05).

   b) Students were more apt to admit that they have actually disliked people (t=−3.263, p<.01).

   c) Students were more likely to report they let others get in trouble for something they did (t=−1.980, p<.05).

   d) Students became more aware that they were calling people names (t=−2.379; p<.05).

   e) Students assessed themselves as being less likely to be nice to people who were unfriendly (t=−4.199, p<.01) or to go out of their way to help someone in trouble (t=−2.723; p<.01).

   f) Students described themselves as being annoyed with people who asked them to do things for them (t=1.998, p<.05).

   g) Students were less likely to claim they readily communicated positive feelings for someone directly to the person (t=−1.981, p<.05).

3. School Climate: The analysis revealed two significant changes: First, students were less inclined to believe their school was safe (t=−2.435; p<.05). Second, students in Take Ten assessed that the number of people in their school who called other people names had increased (t=−2.753, p<.01). Additionally, a trend observed in the primary children surveys is an increased reporting of acts that constitute violent behaviors around them at the end of the school year (although this trend was not statistically significant).

Comments: Comparing this perception to school data and teacher accounts (please see pages 7-8), the evaluators concluded that heightened awareness of violent acts does not signify that an actual increase in violent acts occurred in the children’s schools. Instead, increased perception of violent acts should be attributed to the children’s increased awareness of what constitutes violence, and their willingness to identify behaviors like name-calling, dirty looks, and nasty comments as acts of violence. This is particularly important because it reflects a deeper understanding of Take Ten’s definition of violence.¹

¹ Take Ten defines “Violence” as anything that can cause physical or emotional harm to yourself, others, or your surroundings.
“One new finding relative to the in-school attendees was their heightened knowledge with regard to solving an argument through trading perspectives with another person.”

II. PRIMARY Report Trends by Type of Program

1. In-school program (n=270): Analyses by group revealed that the majority of significant findings found in the overall analysis appeared within the in-school program results. These are described below and similarly included in Table 1 (p. 15). Parallels worth noting in the knowledge and beliefs data included the following: in addition to heightening students’ awareness of the regularity of emerging conflicts (t=2.226, p<.05) and learning that grown-ups were not the only ones who can keep a fight from starting (t=2.526, p<.05), students who were involved in Take Ten within the school day became more convinced that they should not be violent (t=-3.212, p<.01) and were less likely to assess their friends’ work habits in school as being nice (t=2.265, p<.05). One new finding relative to the in-school attendees was their heightened knowledge with regard to solving an argument through trading perspectives with another person (t=2.171, p<.05).

In the feelings and behavior category, all of the in-school students’ findings echoed the overall findings: Children were more likely to admit they have disliked others (t=-3.057, p<.01), thought of letting others get in trouble for them (t=2.552, p<.05), not always been nice to unfriendly people (t=3.187, p<.01), been annoyed by those who ask for help (t=2.308, p<.05), and called people names (t=-2.058, p<.05). Moreover, they were less likely to describe themselves as going out of their way to help someone in trouble (t=2.872, p<.01).

2. After-school program (n=27) and control groups (n=34): In contrast to the in-school data, the after-school program data revealed fewer significant findings, and the results differed in some respects from the in-school findings. After-school students were more convinced that conflicts can arise over anything (t=2.280; p<.05). They were more likely to admit that they got jealous of people who had better luck (t=2.304, p<.05), and evaluated themselves as not always being nice (t=3.077, p<.01). They also assessed the number of times that people in their school gave dirty looks as increasing (t=-3.005, p<.01). Finally, no significant changes in any category were present at the control site.

Comments: These results indicate that student learning varied depending on the program type. Students attending Take Ten In-school programs were more likely to gain knowledge on a variety of curricular topics and change their beliefs regarding violence. Furthermore, students within the In-school program were more likely to have increased self-awareness of feelings and behaviors that are potentially linked with violence. In comparison, student learning in the After-school programs was more limited in these categories, and students at the Control Site experienced no significant changes in learning relative to any topics in the two broad categories (Knowledge/beliefs; Feelings, values, and behavior).
III. PRIMARY Report Trends by Prior Experience with Take Ten

After noting the aforementioned differences between program types, additional analyses among the in-school participants were performed to determine if their prior experience with the program was influential. These analyses yielded particularly rewarding findings for evaluating the effectiveness of Take Ten’s program over time, and interestingly enough, few findings were duplicated across categories (i.e., 1-Know nothing about Take Ten; 2-Take Ten was in my school, but I was not in it; 3-Previously in Take Ten). All of the following results were statistically significant (Table 2, p. 16).

1. No previous knowledge of Take Ten: Children who initially knew nothing about the program (n=88) gained understanding on three very important points:

   a) They should not be violent to each other (t=-3.312, p<.01).
   b) Fighting is not a good way to end a conflict (t=-2.582, p<.05).
   c) Teachers should not hit students (t=2.993, p<.05).

They also grew in self-knowledge regarding their own behavior by indicating they got jealous of other people (t=2.324, p<.05), disliked other people (t=-2.911, p<.01), did not convey to people when they liked them (t=-2.017, p<.01), and did not work nicely in school (t=-2.278, p<.05).

Furthermore, they assessed their school as being unsafe (t=-2.042, p<.05) and claimed the number of times people in their school called others names was increasing (t=-2.226, p<.05)

2. Take Ten in my school, but I was not in the program: Within this group, although children appeared confused about the meaning of principles (t=-2.276, p<.05), they primarily gained awareness about their feelings/values/behavior. Within that category, they were more likely to admit they thought of letting others get in trouble for them (t=-3.580, p<.01), were not always nice (t=-2.408, p<.05), called people names (t=-2.282, p<.05), and made fun of others (t=-2.057, p<.05).

3. Previously in Take Ten: Significant changes were also prominent in this category. More specifically, students were more convinced that trading perspectives was the best way to solve an argument (t=2.243, p<.05) and were more likely to believe their friends did not work nicely at school (t=-2.534, p<.05). They were also less likely to assess themselves as liking to work with all their teachers (t=-3.466, p<.01). They were more cognizant of times they had played sick to get out of something (t=2.396, p<.05). They seemed more aware of their inability to tell someone how they felt without hurting them (t=-2.268, p<.05) and telling if people were sad by their facial expressions (t=-2.066, p<.01). Finally, like children in the previous category, they admitted they were not always nice (t=-2.776, p<.01) and considered letting others get in trouble for them (t=-2.105, p<.05).
Comments: In summary, these findings indicate that learning from Take Ten varies by exposure to the program. Initially, children begin reformulating their understanding of fighting as an acceptable option and are not as assured about the need to avoid violence—even from teachers. Reframing these concepts and reassessing estimates of school safety and the appropriateness of name-calling seem to occur during the same period of time. These initial re-evaluations of others’ behavior are accompanied by some initial re-assessment of personal behavior. After repeated exposure to Take Ten, children become increasingly aware of other aspects of their own negative behavior, which increases the need for finding more positive substitute behaviors. This is a very hopeful sign in promoting healthier alternatives to violence.

IV. PRIMARY Report - Teacher Ratings

1. Common discipline problems per day (range 0=not at all common; 5=very common)

   Ratings at Battell (n=20) were much lower than ratings at Madison (n=6). Although this could reflect the attitudes of a select group of respondents at Madison, the differences are still worth commenting upon. In every category, Madison teachers suggested that all forms of harassment and discipline problems were high (mean scores ranging from 4.4-4.76). In contrast, Battell teachers rated their school at moderate levels in all forms of harassment and common discipline problems (mean scores ranging from 2.76-2.89). However, insubordinate behavior was considerably higher (3.84) and disruptive behavior was highest (4.47).

2. Statements about the school

   In general, teacher ratings across both schools were comparable in many areas except for the following items.

   Madison teachers rated themselves as higher in:
   • Positive emotions (e.g., encourage, like), people talking, working with peers, and school community projects.
   • Positive behaviors: creating peaceful environments, not tolerating name calling, learning to handle conflicts, resolving conflicts, and taking students seriously.
   • Negative behaviors: too much time spent disciplining and lots of students fights.

   Ratings of Battell teachers were stronger in:
   • Student behaviors: pride in school, respecting other cultures, and working to improve school.
   • Teacher behaviors: establishing safe classrooms, and stopping discipline problems.

Comments: The teacher findings suggest that those who continually remind their students of Take Ten concepts/principles will potentially influence students more than student volunteers over the long-term, due to their ongoing interactions with students. And while teachers’ appraisals of their schools differed by location, it appears that utilizing teachers as instructors of Take Ten makes sense for two specific reasons:
   1) Teachers appear to be sensitive to the climate of their schools;
   2) Focused teacher involvement influences teacher attitudes, behaviors, and knowledge, as well as affecting more coherent and consistent student outcomes because teachers are present to model and reinforce the curriculum daily.
The children categorized in intermediate grades during this evaluation year were in seventh and eighth grades. The number of children responding to the survey in 2007-2008 proved too small to constitute a sample size (<30) that could provide statistically significant analysis. Possible reasons for this small sample may include the following factors:

- Take Ten administrative errors led to inadequate collection of consent forms and survey instruments.
- Survey collection complicated by the nature of program delivery: all intermediate Take Ten programming was after-school, voluntary, and had higher mobility.
- The South Bend Community School Corporation instituted an anti-bullying curriculum in all of the intermediate centers at the start of the '07-'08 school year. Anecdotal evidence suggests that the new curriculum may have caused student / faculty confusion or distraction from Take Ten commitments during the past year.
- In one building, transfers were reported from the Take Ten program to another after-school tutoring program offering financial incentives for participation, lowering attendance during the first semester. Participation in school-sponsored athletics had a negative impact on attendance during the second semester.
- Administrative support for the program was not consistent in one school and may have contributed to student inconsistency or mobility.

Comments: As a result of the low sample size, evaluators are unable to make an assessment of Take Ten’s program effectiveness at the intermediate level. The low numbers that led to the insufficient sample size require careful analysis by program administrators to ensure that safeguards are in place to secure a significant sample size for future assessment.
I. Introduction: Take Ten is administered differently in the high schools. Take Ten volunteers work with peer mentors, who in turn work with first year students. Take Ten volunteers go into the mentor homerooms every other week, for 30 minutes, and must not only deliver the lesson from the curriculum, but prepare the mentors to teach it. The mentors then go into their freshmen homerooms and deliver the same lesson. Due to limited volunteer resources, Take Ten only evaluated the mentor homerooms (3-5 per school) instead of the freshmen homerooms (20-25 per school). Assessment attempted to determine changes in school climate and perceptions of personal beliefs, behaviors, emotions, and ratings of the program’s curriculum / delivery.

II. HIGH SCHOOL Report – Overall: When all high school student responses were analyzed together (n=73), longitudinal analysis of student responses indicated the following:

1. Students were less convinced that it was possible to learn how to handle conflict in constructive ways (t=.233; p<.05).
2. Students were also less likely to believe that conflicts can produce anything good (t=.082; p<.05 level). However, additional analyses by location revealed that these latter results were especially prominent in Riley students (t=.103; p<.05).
3. Collectively, high school students tended to be less likely to encourage people to talk out their problems (t=.329; p<.01), but this was more true of Clay students (t=.529; p<.01).
4. As a group, confidence in knowing how another’s motivation for misbehavior could help students correct their own behavior decreased (t=.205; p<.05 level) and this decline was again more evident in Clay students (t=.324; p<.05).
5. Students tended to indicate that they were more convinced they could talk to their families about problems (t=.247; p<.05) and this finding was more typical of Riley students (t=.462; p<.01).
6. Finally, high school students reported that they were more likely to use Take Ten this year to solve problems (t=.210; p<.01) and this change was also higher for Riley students (t=.343; p<.01).
III. HIGH SCHOOL Results – Culture of School: Additional longitudinal analyses by school site revealed more differences between the two high schools.

1. At Riley, students were more prone to enjoy working with teachers on school-wide projects ($t=-.405; p<.05$ level), but were more threatened by conflict ($t=-.462; p<.01$ level).

2. At Clay, students were less likely to believe that the resolution of conflicts can benefit everyone ($t=.412; p<.05$ level) or that their families were willing to help them make decisions ($t=.294; p<.05$). However, they were also more convinced that the peer mentoring program had been a positive experience ($t=.312; p<.05$).

Comments: Evaluating Take Ten in the high schools, as seen in the 2006-07 assessment, was a difficult proposition for a variety of factors. The majority of these obstacles was common across all high schools, due in large part to multiple adjustments in the “small learning communities” program that were made at the School Corporation level, often with little time for staff and volunteers to adapt effectively. The main barriers were:

1. Insufficient and inconsistent blocks of time for mentors
   As in the past, Take Ten was limited to the strength of the mentor program as a whole, and in some instances, Take Ten was the only organized activity some schools had. Clay and Riley had a very strong mentoring program structure in place, though they struggled to juggle the convergence of schedules and various agendas within their buildings.
   Staff observations suggest that Adams was less structured with its mentoring program, and as a result, school staff were less successful in keeping their mentoring time secure, and struggled at times to even get their mentors to go to their freshmen homerooms, as assigned. Thus, no assessment was administered at Adams. Space concerns were also issues at Adams where two of the three mentor homerooms did not take place in traditional classroom settings, with one located in a shared cafeteria, making the administration of lessons even more difficult for volunteers.

2. Competition during curriculum delivery
   According to high school staff focus group results, their greatest challenge was keeping their mentoring time intact and not losing it to other programs. Time-consuming distractions included in the 30-minute allotment were: attendance-taking; announcements; and activities from various internal groups and programs in the building.
   In addition, many school-based activities had been designed to occur over five days, but now were forced to happen in only two, creating competition for time.
resulted in inconsistent or inefficient lesson-delivery, especially when the movement of mentors was taken into account (arriving to homeroom late, leaving early, or missing it entirely due to other responsibilities).

3. The choice of mentors as the subjects of the evaluation
   The Evaluation Team questions the proposition that assessing the mentors is the most effective method of determining program effectiveness for the following reasons.
   a. First, mentors must apply for the program and then are selected by a group of teachers and administrators. Most often, individuals are chosen because they are good students and/or exhibit strong leadership skills. This process may result in mentors who are atypical from the rest of the student body. While this is quite appropriate for the schools’ purposes, it likely skews evidence of Take Ten’s effectiveness when generalized for the student body.
   b. Second, many mentors will have already been taught Take Ten principles. It is not uncommon for 40%-60% of them to have served as mentors the year before, so the pre-testing data might be affected.
   c. Third, and perhaps most significantly, is the inconsistency with which our volunteers get to work with the entire group of mentors in the homerooms. Since the volunteers only had one 30-minute homeroom period, twice a month, to work with the mentors, consistent attendance was critical, but often unattained.

************************
OVERALL CONCLUSION

In summary, trends in the research are encouraging for ongoing implementation of Take Ten in the local Michiana area schools. The significant changes in the primary schools illustrate that dismantling beliefs takes time and yet, in itself, is positive growth. Re-building norms for healthy conflict resolution takes longer, as is demonstrated from the stronger changes in youth with previous experience with Take Ten. This suggests a long-term commitment by schools to offer the current curriculum and delivery will have a strong impact on violence in schools.

Changes in the curriculum are not recommended at any level based on current findings, though careful consideration of the implementation of the high school program is probably warranted, given restrictions in their scheduling, and their participant selection method. At the Intermediate schools, though this assessment lacked a sufficient sample in this evaluation cycle, observation suggests that the curriculum is sound. Delivery in the after-school hours, however, remains a concern for program consistency and long-term change among participants. Further research should include metrics on these implementation issues for recommendations and refinement of the program.

In addition, the evaluation team understands that the administration of the survey will undergo changes during the 2008-2009 academic year to collect more consistent and definitive data. Specifically in response to this year’s findings, the changes in the survey tools and delivery have been made with Take Ten staff to ensure:

- increased internal consistency
- stronger cross-sectional analysis
- increased uniformity in the rating scale
- all children in intermediate grades (5-8) will be grouped together for a sufficient sample of children in those grades.

Finally, a consistent theme emerged from the primary, intermediate, and high school surveys. The research indicated that a significant number of children felt that school was not safe, and further, teens in high school felt that they were threatened by conflict in their schools. (Battell Elementary in Mishawaka is an exception; harassment and discipline problems were rated at only a moderate level.) Such similar results across ages and grade levels suggest a pressing need that violence prevention programming like Take Ten should be implemented consistently across all grades and schools, and positively reinforced by all adults in the school environment.
Table 1: Pre- and Post- Mean Differences (t values) from Primary Report across overall, in-school, after-school, and control locations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>Overall (n=331)</th>
<th>In-school (n=270)</th>
<th>After-school (n=27)</th>
<th>Control (n=34)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and Beliefs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicts happen all the time.</td>
<td>2.080*</td>
<td>2.226*</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We should be violent to each other.</td>
<td>-3.457**</td>
<td>-3.212**</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trading perspectives is best way to resolve an argument.</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2.171*</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only grown ups can keep a fight from Starting.</td>
<td>-2.246*</td>
<td>-2.526*</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All my friends work nicely at school.</td>
<td>-2.409*</td>
<td>-2.265*</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You can have a conflict over anything.</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2.280*</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers should not hit students.</td>
<td>2.405*</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My parents help out at school.</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2.538*</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings and Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes I get jealous of people who have better luck than me.</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2.304*</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to work with all my teachers.</td>
<td>-2.312*</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have never really disliked someone.</td>
<td>-3.263**</td>
<td>-3.057**</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would never think of letting someone get in trouble for something I did.</td>
<td>-1.980*</td>
<td>-2.552*</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am always nice, even to people who are unfriendly.</td>
<td>-4.199**</td>
<td>-3.187**</td>
<td>-3.077**</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I get annoyed by people who ask me to do things for them.</td>
<td>1.998*</td>
<td>2.308*</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I go out of my way to help someone in trouble.</td>
<td>-2.723**</td>
<td>-2.872**</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I really like someone I want to tell or show them right away.</td>
<td>-1.981*</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not call people names.</td>
<td>-2.379*</td>
<td>-2.058*</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School climate:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Times per day people in our school call Other people names</td>
<td>-2.753**</td>
<td>-2.211*</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Times per day people in our school give dirty looks.</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>-3.005**</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My school is safe.</td>
<td>-2.435*</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01, *p < .05
Table 2: Pre- and Post- Mean Differences (t values) in Primary Report data across prior experience with Take Ten.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>All students</th>
<th>Know nothing about Take Ten</th>
<th>Take Ten was in building, but I was not in it</th>
<th>Previously in Take Ten</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=331)</td>
<td>(n=88)</td>
<td>(n=52)</td>
<td>(n=162)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge and Beliefs:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We should be violent to each other.</td>
<td>-3.457**</td>
<td>-3.312**</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trading perspectives is best way to solve an argument.</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2.243*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All my friends work nicely at school.</td>
<td>-2.409*</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>-2.534*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fighting is a good way to end a conflict.</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>-2.582*</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers should not hit students.</td>
<td>2.405*</td>
<td>2.993*</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My principles are my beliefs about right and wrong.</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>-2.276*</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feelings and Behavior</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes I get jealous of people who have better luck than me.</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2.324*</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to work with all my teachers.</td>
<td>-2.312*</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>-3.466**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have never really disliked someone.</td>
<td>-3.263**</td>
<td>-2.911**</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would never think of letting someone get in trouble for something I did.</td>
<td>-1.980*</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>-3.580**</td>
<td>-2.105*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am always nice, even to people who are unfriendly.</td>
<td>-4.199**</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>-2.408*</td>
<td>-2.776**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I really like someone I want to tell or show them right away.</td>
<td>-1.981*</td>
<td>-2.017*</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not call people names.</td>
<td>-2.379*</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>-2.282*</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can remember playing sick to get out of something.</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2.396*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I work nicely in school.</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>-2.278*</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not make fun of other kids.</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>-2.057*</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can tell someone how I feel without hurting them.</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>-2.268*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When someone is sad, I can tell by the look on their face.</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>-2.066*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School climate:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Times per day people in our school call other people names</td>
<td>-2.753**</td>
<td>-2.226*</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My school is safe.</td>
<td>-2.435*</td>
<td>-2.042*</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01, *p < .05; NS=not significant**
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