DISPUTE RESOLUTION STUDIES IN THE INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING: AN INITIAL INVESTIGATIVE STUDY OF PROFESSORS' ATTITUDES

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Graduate Council of the North Texas State University in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

Delavar Ghadrshenass, B.A., M.B.A.
Denton, Texas
December, 1987
Conflict is present in all human relationships and societies. Throughout history, fighting has been more notable than peacemaking. Only recently have conflict resolution studies entered the mainstream of academia. Since peace is no longer an option, but a necessity, educators must become actively engaged in promoting the importance of peacemaking skills among their students.

In 1986, the National Institute for Dispute Resolution funded a study of conflict resolution in higher education. Results disclosed a proliferation of courses but little about their quality. The present study evaluates the status of alternative dispute resolution (ADR) in the curricula of three major universities in North Texas and compares it with results from four other universities which were reported to have the heaviest concentration of ADR courses. A questionnaire was constructed to collect data in the following areas: place, significance of ADR in contemporary curricula, important factors determining attitudes toward ADR, and expectations/aspirations of faculty concerning
teaching of ADR. Using a Likert scale, attitudes toward ADR were measured through regression analysis. Four of seven independent variables (age, sex, political orientation, and ADR training) were significant at \( p = .05 \).

Forty ADR-related courses were identified in seven universities. The concentration of ADR courses was management (35%), law (28%), sociology (23%), business (8%), and political science (8%). No courses were identified by anthropology departments. Results also reveal that the older, liberal, female, and ADR-skilled individuals exhibit more favorable attitudes towards ADR.

The study concludes that (a) concentrated efforts should be increased to teach and train educators in ADR, (b) mediation centers should be created on university campuses, and (c) an ADR communications network and data bank should be established among universities in order to allow faculty, students, practitioners, and administrators to share information. A partial list of organizations involved in peace issues and resources for establishment of campus and community-based peace mediation centers are also provided.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Conflict is present in all human relationships and in all societies. Since the beginning of recorded history, there has been evidence of disputes between children, spouses, parents and children, neighbors, ethnic and racial groups, fellow workers, superiors and subordinates, organizations, communities, citizens, and governments and nations.

All societies, communities, organizations, and people involved in interpersonal relationships experience conflict at one time or another in the process of day-to-day interaction. Conflict is not necessarily bad, abnormal, or dysfunctional; rather, it is a fact of life. Conflict and disputes exist when people are engaged in competition to meet goals that are perceived as, or actually are, incompatible. However, conflict may go beyond competitive behavior and acquire the additional goals of inflicting physical or psychological damage (or even destruction) upon an opponent. It is then that the negative and harmful dynamics of conflict extract their full costs.

Not all disputes follow the negative course described above. Conflict can lead to growth and can be productive
for all parties. Productive conflict resolution, however, depends on (a) the participants' abilities to devise efficient cooperative problem-solving procedures, (b) the participants' capacities to lay aside distrust and animosity and to work together, and (c) the availability of solutions that will at least partially satisfy all of the participants' interests. Unfortunately, many people in conflict are unable (a) to develop an effective process, (b) to deal with the psychological barriers to settlement, or (c) to develop integrative solutions on their own. People in conflict often need help to resolve their differences.

Overview of Dispute Resolution

Humans have been regulating conflict for centuries. The political theories of Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau, Plato, and Ibn Khaldun deal with the problems of regulating conflict within and between societies. Galtung (1965) traced the development of institutionalized conflict resolution from the medieval period. The use of oracles, trial by ordeal, regulated warfare, private and judicial duels, and arbitration were prominent techniques in that development.

Nevertheless, fighting has been more notable than peacemaking and peacekeeping, and there is little doubt that considerably more energy has been invested in creating new
methods for waging conflict than in regulating and resolving it. This imbalance in investment has been reinforced by modern historians and social theorists who, by oversight or by design, have consistently slighted the process of conflict regulation. Conflicts, for example, usually terminate in negotiation, peace settlements, reconstruction, and reestablishment of peaceful relations. However, historians usually devote entire chapters to the fighting stages of war and only paragraphs to the termination process (Unnithan & Singh, 1969; Haas, 1965). There has also been a noticeable lack of scholarly interest in nonviolent resistance to tyranny, aggression, and conscription for war (Eckhardt, 1974). Only recently, with the research of scholars such as Gene Sharp (1973) and Peter Brock (1968), has the study of this important method of conflict regulation entered the mainstream of academic scholarship.

Fortunately, increasing numbers of scholars, industrial and community leaders, government officials at all levels, and students have shown interest in conflict regulation in the past few years. As the destructive potential and accessibility of weapons increase, so does the urgency of developing a means of regulating conflict and minimizing its violence.
As conflict regulation becomes a more significant concern for academicians, policy makers, and leaders of social change movements, it is hoped that both academic and professional specializations will take shape. More faculty members will teach and research conflict regulation, and more students will study and practice it, thus moving into professional peacemaking roles. Important fields, such as education, business, government, public interest organizations, and legal systems, will realize the increasing need for professional help in conflict regulation.

Conflict regulation as an academic subject is both old and new. It is old in the sense that academicians have written about it since the beginning of this century; George Simmel's insightful discussion of mediation (1950) was originally published in 1908. It is new in that it is just beginning to be recognized as a legitimate field of study by colleges and universities. Most teaching about conflict regulation has been incidental to some other subject of primary concern, such as international law, labor relations, peace studies, community organizations, and family counseling. In contrast with this dispersion of courses among many disciplines and applied fields, much of the research regarding conflict regulation has produced findings that have general applications in diverse
situations and at various levels. Several writers (Jackson, Schmidt, & Leggett, 1952; Wehr, 1979) have commented on the similarities in the methods of negotiation and intervention in different conflict situations.

Therefore, curricula in conflict regulation are typically trans-disciplinary. The term *trans-disciplinary* is used in preference to *interdisciplinary* because conflict regulation draws on limited aspects or specializations of several disciplines, rather than on their entire contents. "Conflict regulation cuts across rather than integrates the relevant disciplines" (Wehr & Washburn, 1976, p. 43). No other academic program can involve as many interests. It attracts people from the traditional liberal arts departments of psychology, sociology, political science, economics, anthropology, speech, philosophy, and religion, as well as from the professional schools of law, social welfare, and business. This attraction alone profoundly indicates the blossoming "synthesis period" of an interdisciplinary research era (Winkler, 1987, p. 15).

**Sociology and Alternative Dispute Resolution**

In recent years, tremendous attention has been given to alternative forms of dispute resolution (ADR). Many states have passed important new legislation in the areas of community and child custody mediation. Congress has created the United States Institute of Peace. The American Bar
Association and local bar associations have created special committees concerned with various aspects of dispute resolution. Educational institutions from elementary to post graduate, particularly law schools and business schools, have introduced conflict-resolution-related courses (O'Connell & Curle, 1985).

Sociology, in general, and clinical sociology, in particular, have rich histories in advancing an understanding of conflict and its resolution. Along with other disciplines, sociology has contributed greatly to an understanding of conflict (Unnithan & Singh, 1969). Threads of conflict theories can be found in a number of sociological specialties, including social control, sociology of law, sociology of the family, community sociology, sociology of peace, social psychology, collective behavior, and social movements. Numerous sociologists are responsible for some of the most insightful analyses of conflict and conflict forums available. The contributions of social theorists to our understanding of such violence are considerable. Such names as C. Wright Mills, Kenneth Boulding, Pitrim Sorokin, Johan Galtung, Karl Marx, Luise Coser, Anatol Rapaport, Quincy Wright, and Jessie Bernard come immediately to mind (Wehr & Washburn, 1976).

More effective means of intervention in patterns of family violence have been viewed. Divorce and
post-divorce relationships have come under profound scrutiny (Kressel & Pruitt, 1985). Sociologists have assisted community mediation programs, as well as court ordered programs, by collecting and analyzing descriptive program data (Pruitt & Rubin, 1986).

In short, sociologists can help to develop the field by "applying the discipline's understanding of roles, power exchange, and symbolic interaction to this important phase of peacemaking behavior" (Lowe, 1986, p. 6).

A National Study

The building blocks for integrating conflict resolution studies--courses, research projects, training programs, networks, and literature--already exist. What remains to be developed is a way to interconnect them. Courses on negotiation and conflict resolution are perhaps the most developed of these components. With support from the National Institute for Dispute Resolution, a research team at the University of Colorado identified and surveyed many of these courses and their contents. Included in this survey were courses substantially devoted to the history and methods of resolving or managing conflict. The research team surveyed over 500 institutions in the United States (Wehr, Abrometi, Lederach, Sherman, & Westerlynd, 1986).

In general, the results disclosed a great deal of course proliferation but not much integration.
The researchers identified 838 courses taught in 294 institutions across 43 states (Wehr et al., 1986). This number represents 53% of the 550 schools surveyed. A heavy geographical concentration in 12 states accounts for 73% of the courses (see Appendix A).

Institutional concentration is also noticeable. Seven universities (3.4%) account for almost 17% of the courses (Appendix A). Over 50% of the courses surveyed were concentrated in law, government/political science, sociology/anthropology, business/commerce, and management/organization (Appendix A). These concentrations reflect both (a) the importance of conflict and dispute resolution in these subject areas and (b) the investment already made in alternative dispute resolution by certain disciplines.

There are, however, certain areas that the survey does not address. Nothing is revealed about the quality of the courses offered or about the instructors. Are these courses taught regularly by tenured faculty members? How many involve related research? What degree of commonality, standardization, or integration is there across these 838 courses? As a beginning, the study's results provide some baseline data with which to monitor trends as conflict resolution studies move into the future.
Need for Present Study

As we have seen, interest in conflict study has grown remarkably. This interest appears to stem from concern about human conflict at several different levels of experience. First, violence within families has been considered to be so serious that it has been described by one author as "an incurable epidemic" (Smith, 1979, p. 170). Secondly, within nations there are frequent tensions between various subsets of the population that may sometimes seriously weaken national unity and national economic development (e.g., conflicts between regional groups, racial groups, employers and employees, occupational groups, and political pressure groups). Thirdly, at the international level, conflicts range from short-lived squabbles between neighboring countries to long-standing cold wars, all of which affect the well-being of the international community.

Are conflicts between individual groups and nations really on the rise ("Lack of," 1987)? Arnold Weber, President of Northwestern University and a longtime advocate of dispute resolution teaching and research in higher education, believes this to be true. "Because of continued conflicts in international relations, race relations, and labor management relations, public interest in dispute resolution enjoys great interest and a sense of
immediacy" (Weber, 1986, p. 5). He also states that "at this point, dispute resolution education remains highly eclectic. Only in recent years have we seen systematic, concerted efforts to develop a comprehensive and unified intellectual framework which embraces the activities that derive from different disciplines . . ." (Weber, 1986, p. 5). Along with a drastic increase in the rate of many violent and nonviolent crimes in America ("Urban Murders," 1987), results of a recent study by the Bureau of National Affairs reveal a tremendous increase in labor strikes and lockouts in the United States between 1983 and 1986 (Central Broadcasting System [CBS], 1987). The report indicates a shocking increase in the number of lockouts, from 15,000 in 1983 to 57,000 in 1986.

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this study was to ascertain the place and significance of alternative dispute resolution (ADR) in institutions of higher learning as perceived by selected faculty members of specific academic departments in the North Texas area as compared with four other universities in different regions of the country that reflect the heaviest concentration of ADR courses. A major reason for conducting this study was to identify the ADR-related courses which were being taught in these universities at the time of the research. Along with this objective, an effort was made to
determine faculty attitudes toward ADR, as well as those important factors which influence these attitudes (i.e., age, sex, political orientation, academic affiliation, department size, background and training in ADR, and community service involvement). A further objective of the study was to ascertain the aspirations and expectations of faculty members concerning ADR's inclusion as an area of study within their departments.

Significance of the Study

Nowhere has the dispute resolution field experienced such fervent growth as it has in higher education. Other than the first and only national survey on dispute resolution courses in higher education (Wehr et al., 1986), there exists almost no quantitative research about the status or direction of ADR in institutions of higher education. Therefore, this study is an attempt to evaluate ADR within a broader social context, especially for the rapidly-growing area of North Texas.

A further contribution of this dissertation can be seen in its attempt to awaken a sense of conscious awareness about the place and significance of ADR in the curricula of higher education. This awareness would be instrumental in achieving the goal of integration for the interdisciplinary subject of ADR. It is obvious that an integrated, well
researched and well supported interdisciplinary subject such as ADR can be of tremendous help, not only to professors and instructors in universities, but also to judges, practitioners, policy makers, and administrators as well.

Studies of intrafamily conflict, as well as of conflicts at other levels, tend to show that the techniques one generation uses to handle conflict are passed on to the next generation (Smith, 1979). Therefore, those involved in the pursuit of conflict studies in schools are concerned essentially with the building of peacemaking skills in interpersonal and intergroup relationships. They strive not only to immediately improve the quality of life at those levels, but also to form a viable basis for conflict management for individuals in the years ahead, ultimately helping the cause of peace at the international level. There is justification for considering this dissertation as a significant contribution to the field of ADR.

Demographics of Area, Universities, and Departments

North Texas Area

The Comptroller of Public Accounts has divided the state of Texas into six economic regions: (a) East Texas, (b) the Dallas/Fort Worth metroplex (D/FW), (c) the Plains,
(d) the Central Corridor, (e) the Border, and (f) the Gulf Coast (Texas Almanac, 1987). Even though the Dallas/Fort Worth metroplex is an area well-suited to agriculture, the economic base has come to be dominated by manufacturing, commerce, services, and finance.

According to the Texas Almanac (1987), the D/FW metroplex has the most diversified economy in the state of Texas. In spite of falling energy prices, "a healthy, durable goods manufacturing sector provides almost fifteen percent of the region's total employment, the highest percentage of all the other regions of Texas" (p. 565). Production of electronics, aerospace, and military hardware are also considered very important to the economy of the region (Texas Almanac).

The role of the D/FW metroplex as a trade and financial center is evident from employment distribution figures. The region has a higher percentage of its employment in wholesale trade (8.2% of total employment) and finance, insurance, and real estate (7.3% of total employment) than do any other Texas regions (Texas Almanac, 1987).

Tourism is also an important industry in the D/FW metroplex. It contributes significantly ($17 billion per year) to the economy in Texas. Tourism, therefore, provides the second highest source of income for the Texas economy (WFAA TV, 1987, August 31). Dallas is one of the most
visited cities in Texas and is one of the top five
convention and trade show hosts in the country (Texas
Almanac, 1987). As the second largest city in Texas (and
the seventh largest in the nation), Dallas has become one of
the most popular places in the country to make movies
(Hulbert, 1984).

A 1985 report from the U.S. Census Bureau revealed that
between 1980 and 1984 the Dallas/Fort Worth Consolidated
Metropolitan Statistical Area (D/FWCMSA) was the second-
fastest growing Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) in the
nation at 14.2% growth, second only to Houston (Texas
Almanac, 1987). This tremendous expansion and rapid growth
create a potential atmosphere of heightened competition,
which in turn may well give birth to undesirable tensions
and unhealthy conflicts. For example, through a recent
congressional investigation into the "use of deadly force by
the Dallas Police Department," it was revealed that Dallas
ranks among the top five cities in the nation in almost all
areas of crime (KDFW TV, 1987, May 7; WFAA TV, 1987, May 8).
Between 1973 and 1987, 118 people were killed by officers of
the Dallas Police Department. Three-fourths of the victims
were blacks (Sanders, 1987).

According to a report from the Greater Dallas Crime
Commission to the Dallas City Council, crime in the Dallas
area has risen 15 times higher than the growth rate of the
city in recent years (WFAA TV, 1987, July 27). As a result, the subject of overcrowding in the prison population has emerged as a legitimate concern for the North Texas correctional authorities. The report indicates that "at the [then] present time, there are over 2,200 inmates that the system cannot provide a place for" (WFAA, 1987, July 27).

Selected Universities

The universities included in this study are North Texas State University, the University of Texas at Arlington, Southern Methodist University, the University of Iowa, Cornell University, the University of Colorado at Boulder, and the University of California at Los Angeles. The Texas universities were selected because of their proximity to the D/FW metroplex. North Texas State University is the sixth largest university in Texas, with over 21,000 students presently enrolled. Approximately 30% of the student body is comprised of graduate students. "North Texas is considered to be among the five research universities in Texas because of its facilities, faculty, and location" (LeMane, 1987, p. 3). North Texas State University is projected by the Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System, to be the fourth largest university in the state and the largest university in the region by the year 2000 (North Texas State University [NTSU], 1986). According to the Denton Chamber of Commerce
North Texas State University is the largest employer in the City of Denton (3,164 employees).

The University of Texas at Arlington (UTA) is one of the 14 (and the second largest) institutions in the University of Texas System. It was founded in 1895 as Arlington College, a private liberal arts institution. Over the years, it has become a major university for research and teaching in the state, with over 23,000 students (UTA, 1986).

Southern Methodist University (SMU) was founded as a major center for learning in 1911. Independently and privately endowed, Southern Methodist University has developed strong bonds with the Dallas business community at large (SMU, 1986). Another reason for selecting Southern Methodist University for this dissertation is the fact that it is the only university in the North Texas area which has a law school.

The student population at Cornell University in Ithaca, New York has grown from the 5,000-6,000 students in the early 1900s to its present figure of about 18,000 students (Cornell University, 1987). Since 1828, Cornell University's scholars and students have reached out to embrace every aspect of human affairs. In 1870, in a pioneering spirit, Cornell admitted the first women students in America (Cornell, 1987). It continues to be one of the
most distinguished international centers of higher learning (Cornell, 1987).

The University of Iowa was founded in 1847, in Iowa City, as Iowa's first public institution of higher learning (University of Iowa, 1987). It was the first public university in the nation to admit men and women on an equal basis and the first institution of higher education to accept creative work in theater, writing, music, and art as theses for advanced degrees. The University of Iowa currently enrolls students from 88 foreign countries, and its total student population for the Fall of 1985 was over 29,650 (University of Iowa, 1987).

The University of Colorado at Boulder (main campus) has five colleges and four professional schools that offer more than 4,000 courses in over 140 fields of study. There are approximately 82 bachelor's degree programs (University of Colorado, 1987). The university enrolls students from 50 states and over 70 foreign countries. With a total enrollment of approximately 20,000 students, the Boulder campus is the largest campus in the Colorado University system (University of Colorado, 1982).

The University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA) is a large and complex institution devoted to undergraduate and graduate scholarship, research, and public service. Started in 1868, UCLA has been known for academic excellence.
Many of its programs are rated the best in the nation and some as among the best in the world (UCLA, 1987). Nearly 150 buildings on 411 acres house 13 colleges and schools and serve over 34,000 students—the largest student enrollment of the University of California system (UCLA, 1987).

**Departments**

Certain departments were selected from within the above-described universities: Law, Political Science, Sociology, Anthropology, Business, and Management. According to the National Survey (Wehr et al., 1986), these departments reflect over 50% of the heaviest concentrations in ADR instruction. Although the Department of Management is usually a part of the business school, Management and Business were treated as two separate categories in order to correspond to the results from the National Survey. Thus, the revised version of the departments were: Anthropology, Business (excluding Management), Law, Management, Political Science, and Sociology.

**Summary of Methodological Procedures**

The main objectives of this study were to gather data in the following three areas: (a) place and significance of alternative dispute resolution (ADR) in contemporary curricula, (b) important factors concerning attitudes toward
ADR, and (c) expectations/aspirations of university faculty concerning teaching of ADR courses.

In order to examine these three objectives, a questionnaire (Appendix B) was constructed in four parts and tested for its face validity (see Appendix C). Further testing for validity (conceptual/congruent) was done upon collection of the data (Appendix E).

The questionnaire, along with a cover letter (Appendix B) explaining the nature and scope of the study, was sent to four randomly-selected faculty members in each of the six departments (Anthropology, Business (excluding Management), Law, Management, Political Science, and Sociology) at each of the seven selected universities (North Texas State University, Southern Methodist University, University of Texas at Arlington, Cornell University, University of Iowa, University of Colorado, and the University of California at Los Angeles (total N of 160).

To assure significant return, a follow-up letter (Appendix B) and another copy of the questionnaire were again sent to each subject two weeks after the original mailing, along with a stamped, self-addressed envelope.

Out of 160 questionnaires, the study required a minimum return of 80 in order to be considered adequate for further statistical analysis. "A response rate of 50% is
considered adequate, a response of 60% is good, and a response of 70% is very good" (Babbie, 1975, p. 265).

Upon collection of the data, each item of the questionnaire was properly coded and transferred onto a keypunch work sheet. This data was then tabulated for further computer programming and analysis.

Since both the dependent variable (Y = Attitudes) and the seven independent variables (X₁ = Sex, X₂ = Age, X₃ = Academic Affiliation, X₄ = Department Size, X₅ = Political Orientation, X₆ = Training in ADR, and X₇ = Community Service Involvement) were measured at the interval level (or were treated as interval level by use of "dummy" variables), the best methodological tool for use in testing the procedures was the regression model (p = .05). The regression model (R) enabled the researcher to determine which variations of the independent variables' (X₁-X₇) were significant in the total explanation of the dependent variable (Y = Attitudes).

Part I of the questionnaire was used to construct the demographic data—the independent variables. Part II was used to gather information (questions 1 through 11) which indicate the quality, frequency, and number of teaching and research subjects related to ADR. Questions 1 through 8 of Part III were the basis used to form attitude scores of the respondents on the subject of ADR. After applying a
numerical value to each answer on this part of the questionnaire (1, 2, 3, 4, or 5), the total scores for each respondent were calculated. The lower the total score on the Likert scale, the more favorable attitude the respondent showed toward ADR. Part IV and question 12 in Part II were reserved for the respondents' comments, suggestions, and expressed expectations. The analyses of the collected, coded, and tabulated data were done through MUSIC files and SAS analysis at the North Texas State University Computing Center.

More detail on the subjects of measurement, operational definitions, and the general methodological assumptions and procedures of this study are given in Chapter III.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Background

Dispute resolution has a long history. The Bible refers to Jesus as a mediator between God and men. "For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus; who gave himself as ransom for all, to be testified in due time" (I Timothy 2:5-6). Churches and clergy have often been mediators between their members and other disputants. Until the Renaissance, the Catholic church in Western Europe was probably the central mediation and conflict management organization in western society. Clergy mediated family disputes, criminal cases, and diplomatic disputes among the nobility are common (Bianchi, 1978).

With the rise of nation-states, resolution of disputes assumed a new, formal, secular, diplomatic, intermediary role. Diplomats, such as ambassadors and envoys, acted to "raise and clarify social issues and problems, to modify conflicting interests, and to transmit information of mutual concern to parties" (Werner, 1974, p. 95). Starke (1968) provides an excellent summary of historical peace plans from the 13th to the 19th centuries.
The practice of dispute resolution methods, such as mediation, is not confined to western culture. In fact, mediation has probably been more widely practiced in China and Japan, where religion and philosophy place a strong emphasis on social consensus, moral persuasion, and striking a balance or harmony in human relationships (Brown, 1982). Mediation is currently widely practiced in the People's Republic of China through People's Conciliation Committees (Ginsberg, 1978; Li, 1978).

Latin America and other Hispanic cultures also have a history of mediated dispute settlement. Nader (1969) reports on the dispute resolution process in the Mexican village of Ralu'a, where a judge assists the parties in making consensual decisions. Lederah (1984) describes other models of dispute resolution in Hispanic cultures, such as the Tribunal de las Aguas (water courts) in Spain.

Alternative forms of dispute resolution can also be found in Arabian and African cultures (Antoun, 1972; Gulliver, 1971). A comprehensive evaluation of alternative forms of resolving disputes in nonwestern cultures has been discussed by Sally Mery (1984).

As may be seen, the application of ADR is universal. Thus, the above-mentioned studies illustrate that the practice of ADR in general, and mediation in particular, is a major method of resolving disputes in different cultures.
Mediation also has a long history in the United States. Auerbach's *Justice Without Law* (1983) is an excellent historical account which describes the dispute resolution mechanisms of the Puritans, the Quakers, and other religious sects; procedures of Chinese and Jewish ethnic groups; and informal alternative dispute resolution efforts in general.

**Interest in Peace**

Humanity's concern for peace reaches back in history for centuries. Gene Sharp (1973) traces organized "nonviolent resistance" (p. 76) to war and military occupation as early as the 16th century, and designs for dispute resolution plans date back several centuries before that, including such proponents as Cicero, Dante, Kant, and Woodrow Wilson (Wyner & Lloyd, 1946).

Objection to organized violence in the United States has its roots in the religious pacifism of peace sects--the Quakers, the Brethren, the Mennonites, and the Anabaptists (Pardesi, 1982). These groups preached and practiced nonviolence in interpersonal relationships and through nonparticipation in war. In fact, the Society of Friends (Quakers), in its century-long Holy Experiment with nonviolent government in Pennsylvania, came closer than any group has to political institutionalization of nonviolent philosophy (Brock, 1968).
Popular resistance to war and conscription in the United States grew by the middle of the last century, and peace organizations, such as the American Peace Society and the League of Universal Brotherhood, came into existence (DeBenedetti, 1980). During this period, eloquent spokesmen, such as Henry Thoreau; David Dodge; and a most remarkable emissary to Europe, Elihu Burritt, were produced (Curi, 1971).

People have been interested in the study of conflict and peace since Biblical times. However, the 19th century provided the dramatic, energetic thrust which is still felt today. Charles Darwin was interested in the struggle within species for survival of the fittest. Sigmund Freud studied the internal combat of various psycho-dynamic forces for control over the ego. Karl Marx, reflecting the dialectical philosophy that preceded him, developed a political and economic analysis regarding the assumption that conflict is an inevitable part of society. The 19th century also marked the beginning of the application of social science to the problems of war and violence. Throughout history, many scholars had worked at fashioning legal restraints on war (Boulding, 1982). Now, they looked for natural law that would explain the violence and war phenomena. The Paris Peace Congress of 1849, for example, awarded first prize to a Belgian lawyer for his essay "La Science de la Paix" which
sought laws of war and peace throughout historical data analysis (Fink, 1973). This systematic approach to the study of war and peace continued, and it became a particular concern in the social sciences through the influence of the conflict theories of Marx and Social Darwinism. Problems ranging from the psychology of human aggression, to economic factors in war, to questions about international law and organization were carefully probed. Various peace-related research organizations were established, including the American Society for International Law (1906), the Carnegie Endowment (1910), and the Peace Palace Library (1913) (DeBenedetti, 1980). These institutions marked the beginning of a new intellectual approach to the problem of peace that has continued until the present.

World War I and its devastating results called into question the established international order and precipitated the creation of international organizations such as the League of Nations; it also gave new birth to the scholarly study of peace, war, and international relations. Established in the interwar period were the Hoover War Library (Stanford, 1919), the Royal Institute of International Affairs (London, 1920), the Swiss Institute Universitaire des Hautes Etudes Internationales (Geneva, 1927), the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy (Tufts,
1933), and the Utrikespolitiska Institut (Stockholm, 1938; Wehr, 1986).

Following World War I, international relations emerged as an interdisciplinary field. Previously, political scientists did not consider international affairs to be central, or even relevant, to their discipline. In the interwar period, however, much energy was directed at organizing conferences, publishing papers and journals, and establishing courses in what eventually became something of a discipline in its own right.

Peace in Academic and Professional Organizations

After World War II, there were other institutions which became involved in the subject of peace. Interest in peace research grew to an important extent within the academic disciplines, and within at least one professional association, the American Psychological Association. A new peace/violence research section was established, and in the mid-1930s it was called the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues (Fink, 1973). Peace-related research appeared much more frequently in professional journals (Fink, 1973).

However, as Passmore (1974) suggests, this appearance in the professional journals, at least in sociology, peaked during and shortly after the periods of war, with no
sustained high level of interest. The same study indicated that professional journals in sociology contributed to almost 11% of all of the peace-related topics published in professional publications, second only to the publications in the fields of political science and international relations.

There seems to have been a resurgence of peacemaking energy and a new proliferation of citizen, academic, and intergovernmental peace organizations after each major war of this century. The post-World War II era produced the United Nations, and in the academic community, organizations such as the Pugwash Group, the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, and the International Studies Association were formed (Wehr, 1986). The Committee to Study the Organization of Peace, and World Federalist USA are just a few of the public groups that began in that period and remain active today. Appendix D provides partial lists of peace organizations which are active today in the United States and abroad.

In the 1960s, additional transdisciplinary peace research organizations were established, including the International Peace Research Association, the Peace Research Society (International), and the Conference on Peace Research in History (Fink, 1973). A great number of academic institutions were begun in the postwar period to
study peace-related problems. Some of these followed traditional international relations and foreign policy approaches, whereas others focused on the more recent contributions of the behavioral sciences. Among the latter were the University of Michigan's Center for Research on Conflict Resolution; the Peace Research Center, University of Lancaster, England; and the International Peace Research Institute, Oslo, all established in 1959. The science-oriented peace research movement represented by these centers has since grown in number to more than 50 such programs around the world (Newcombe & Newcombe, 1969).

The global peace research network expanded rapidly as regular publications were established: The Journal of Conflict Resolution (1957); The International Newsletter on Peace Research of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (1963) (whose publication soon became the International Peace Research Newsletter); the Peace Research Newsletter; the Journal of Peace Research (International Peace Research Institute, Oslo); and Alternatives: A Journal of World Policy of the Institute for World Order (1975) (Wehr, 1986).

The Professional Peace Research Association also began to publish journals and proceedings of its annual and biennial meetings: Peace Research in Japan (The Japan Peace Research Group, 1967); Papers of the Peace Research Society
(International), 1968; Proceedings (International Peace Research Association, 1966); and Peace and Change (Conference on Peace Research in History, 1972). These publications significantly reinforced the interpersonal networks linking peace researchers and provided opportunities for further research visibility, credibility, and future advances in the field of peace and nonviolent research.

Throughout the United States' history, many university professors have responded to periods of turmoil and stress by personal involvement. They have joined movements, contributed time and talents, and incorporated their experience into research and teaching. In the aftermath of World War I and in the threat of World War II, Quincy Wright (1942) and Lewis Richardson (1960) began their studies of the nature of international law. The law strike of the '30s stimulated the establishment of university centers for training and research in labor-management relations. Following World War II and its sequels in Korea and Vietnam, programs for peace studies and research proliferated in the western world and in Japan. The struggle in the United States over civil rights and environmental issues during the '60s and '70s intensified student and faculty interest in conflict and its uses. Efforts to settle disputes generated by these movements often led to litigation that increased
the work load of an already overburdened judicial system and accelerated the movement for reform of the courts. One way of coping with the increasing number of court cases was by providing the alternative of settling disputes by mediation or arbitration. A recent directory published by the American Bar Association identifies over 200 dispute resolution programs (American Bar Association, 1986). Many of them have been initiated and administered by law schools and university departments of political science and sociology.

As one social movement succeeded another, each had an impact on academic life. New courses and programs were begun, research was undertaken, specialized journals were established, and institutions and associations were organized. These social movements affected different sectors of academe. Industrial disputes and unionization especially affected departments of economics and schools of business administration. The midcentury wars had their greatest impact on the colleges founded by the historic peace denominations, notably the Quakers, the Brethren, and the Mennonites. An early response was the establishment in 1948 of the Peace Studies Program at Manchester College, which is affiliated with the Church of the Brethren. A recent survey obtained information about peace studies programs in 52 colleges and universities and 16 seminaries.
and schools of theology (Lopez, 1978). The Institute for World Order received more than 400 syllabi for courses on peace and world order from faculty (Institute for World Order, 1981).

Out of the ferment in the '60s and '70s, a demand emerged for a participatory democracy in which people affected by policies and decisions would be involved in their formulation. It was a theme of the various liberation and environmental movements and gained impetus from the provision in the National Environmental Protection Act of 1969 which mandated the preparation of an impact statement (Passmore, 1974). The guidelines for its implementation required citizen participation in planning. The process of public involvement in making decisions inevitably and properly brings latent conflicts into the open. The opposing positions of different interest groups become manifest and controversies ensue (Passmore, 1974). The application of citizen participation procedures in many spheres of society has revealed the inadequacy of existing institutions for coping with conflicts and has stimulated efforts to apply to the new situation the techniques of dispute settlement that have long been used in industrial and international relations. The settlement of these differences is an essential aspect of the decision-making process. To cope with tensions and to assist in reaching
agreements acceptable to all parties requires the services of skilled personnel. To provide these important services, there has been a proliferation of agencies, institutes, and centers, many of which have been located at universities. Examples are the Racial Negotiations Project established at the University of Michigan about 1970, the Office of Environmental Mediation at the University of Washington in 1973, the Mediation Project at the University of Massachusetts, and the Negotiation Center at Harvard University (Barrett, 1986). Appendix D provides a partial list of educational institutes now involved in peace studies in the United States. To help meet some of the initial needs of this emerging field of dispute resolution, the Hewlett Foundation began a program of grants for conflict resolution in January 1984 (Barrett, 1986). This funding grew out of the foundation's grants for environmental conflict management and community disputes and its prior support of the National Institute for Dispute Resolution. The program emphasizes general support to organizations working in three categories: theory development, conflict intervention practices, and promotion of the field's growth.

In the theory category, this foundation has provided initial funding of eight university centers for the study of negotiation and conflict resolution. They include (a) The Program on Negotiation at Harvard Law School and (b) centers
at the University of Hawaii, the University of Michigan, the University of Minnesota, Northwestern University, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, the University of Wisconsin, and Syracuse University (Barrett, 1986).

It is relevant to the instructional aspect of this movement that the staff members of these agencies also teach courses and workshops. Professor Gerald Cormick, who directed the University of Washington facility, taught an evening course on "How to Resolve Environmental and Community Disputes through Negotiation and Mediation." Professor Paul Wehr, a sociologist who leads the Environmental Conciliation Project at the University of Colorado, teaches "Conflict Management in Social and International Systems." The careers and interests of many scholars, like those of these researchers, have involved them in a variety of situations concerning different social levels, including industrial, ethnic, community, regional, and national conflicts. The adaptations of techniques learned in one situation, and application of those techniques to other situations, inevitably led to a search for the underlying principles. Instead of seeing conflict regulation as merely a set of useful techniques for solving a particular problem (whether it be international peace, ethnic tensions, or rebellions against oppressive regimes), they are "recognizing regulated conflict as a process
fundamental to the attainment and maintenance of a just social order" (Murray, 1980, p. 2).

It is the perspective of those who envisage the development of general, cross-level, theories of conflict and its regulation that has inspired the development of instructional programs in conflict regulation. When programs from different schools are compared, they reveal many similarities.

Universities as Promoters of Change

Although the role of universities as neutral entities in political and philosophical arenas is strongly advocated by some professors (Palermo, 1981), in light of the previous discussions, it is obvious that most university-based movements can have a great impact on social and political institutions. The university can be viewed as the nerve center of a social system.

Looking back at the comparison between our social intellectual networks and the brain, therefore, we can see the university as having a role somewhat like those higher nerve centers in abstracting and combining and analyzing and reassessing all the other information of the society—in short, in "thinking". They are centers for the development of novel concepts and the examination of goals and values, which can persuade the other segments of society by illuminating what they are doing and what the consequences are. They are lookout centers for warnings and for the development of alternative policy options. (Platt, 1975, p. 17)

Therefore, a commitment to truth-seeking and critical analysis, a relative freedom to question openly, and the
university's role as a training ground for both future policy-making and political activism all enhance the university's potential for encouraging creative challenge within a society.

It is argued that the "active society" emerging in the 1960s took shape within and around the university. Students and faculty were the organizers and the most committed participants. Movements such as antiwar, women's liberation, minority rights, ethnic consciousness, consumer protection, and ecology each have a taproot in the university (Wehr, 1986). These participatory mobilization movements grew out of the intellectual and political unrest within universities. Therefore, education continues to be a major factor in social transformation as it makes relatively powerless collectivities more reachable (e.g., the semi-educated are more reachable than the uneducated). Although the processes involved are slow, the long-run trends seem unmistakable. Post-modern societal processes are producing the conditions which make the transformation of monopolized societies more likely. (Etzioni, 1968, p. 538)

Compared to other American institutions, it is easy to conclude that the university will continue to be an impetus for institutional change. The way in which university students around the world are currently building a movement of generally peaceful protest against the proliferation of nuclear weapons and nuclear power suggests that nonviolent action is also becoming institutionalized as a dispute
resolution technique. Walker (1973) estimates that 25,000 people in the United States alone were trained in nonviolent direct action in the period of 1967 to 1972. With the nonviolent campaigns of more recent years, that number has certainly increased.

Alternative Dispute Resolution Techniques and the Legal System

The scope of conflict regulation extends over a range of ways for coping with conflict in social situations, including such methods as negotiation, mediation, and arbitration. Initiative for coping with the tensions between parties with unequal power may come from either the subordinate party through the use of nonviolent techniques and civil disobedience, or through the dominant party by the employment of cooperation, delegation of power, or involvement of others in the decision-making process.

The term ADR refers to ways of settling conflicts other than by adjudication. ADR encompasses a range of approaches, among which the most important are negotiation, conciliation, mediation, arbitration, and fact finding (Henry & Lieberman, 1985). All but negotiation use a neutral third party to help resolve the dispute, and all but arbitration leave the final resolution in the hands of
the disputing parties. The following definitions offer a brief overview of these ADR approaches/techniques.

**Negotiation.** Voluntary problem solving and/or bargaining conducted directly between the disputing parties in order to reach a joint agreement on common concerns.

**Conciliation.** Voluntary negotiation with the help of a third party who serves to bring the parties together to talk or who carries information between the parties.

**Mediation.** Voluntary participation in a structured process where a neutral, third party assists disputing parties in identifying and satisfying their interests relative to the dispute.

**Fact Finding.** Investigation conducted by neutral third parties which results in a recommended settlement.

**Arbitration.** Voluntary or required participation in a process of explaining, presenting, and justifying needs, interests, and/or positions which results in a binding or advisory settlement determined by a neutral, third party (Girard, Rifkin, & Townley, 1985).

It should be remembered that adjudication is formal, contrary to the above informal ways of resolving disputes. Adjudication is governed by rules or laws and results in judgements which are handed down by a judge or jury and enforced by the state or other institution. All of the various ADR approaches emphasize cooperative, direct
involvement of the parties in decisions, and the reduction
of tension.

The first arena in which mediation was formally
institutionalized in the United States was in
labor-management relations (Simkin, 1971). In 1913, the
U.S. Department of Labor was established, and a panel, the
"commissioners of conciliation," was appointed to handle
conflicts between labor and management. This panel
subsequently became the U.S. Conciliation Service and in
1947, was reconstituted as the Federal Mediation and
Conciliation Service (Simkin, 1971).

Federal use of mediation in labor disputes has provided
a model for many states. The private sector has also
initiated labor-management and commercial relations
mediations. The American Arbitration Association was
founded in 1926 to encourage the use of arbitration and
other techniques of voluntary dispute settlement.

Mediation sponsored by government agencies has not been
confined to labor-management issues. The U.S. Congress
passed the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and created the
Community Relations Service (CRS) of the U.S. Department of
Justice. This agency was mandated to help "communities and
persons therein in resolving disputes, disagreements, or
difficulties relating to discriminatory practices based on
Since the mid 1960s, ADR approaches (especially mediation) have gained significance as widely practiced approaches to dispute resolution. In the community sector, the federal government funds the Neighborhood Justice Centers (NJCS) which provide free or low-cost mediation services to the public to resolve disputes efficiently, inexpensively, and informally. Some community programs are independent of governmental agencies and offer a grass roots, independent dispute resolution service in which community members sit on mediation or conciliation panels and help neighbors resolve their disputes (Shonholtz, 1984).

Mediation is also practiced in schools and institutions of higher learning. In this setting, disputes are mediated among students, such as the potentially violent interracial conflict handled by Lincoln (1976); between students and faculty; between faculty members; or between faculty and administration (McCarthy, 1980; McCarthy, 1984).

There are many other areas in which this most popular approach of ADR is used. The use of mediation in criminal justice systems and correctional facilities, family and divorce disputes, environmental issues, and landlord-tenant conflicts are but a few.
There is, we are told, a dispute resolution "explosion". Statistics bear that out. When the Special Committee [of Dispute Resolution] was established in 1976, there were only a handful of mediation programs. Today, as our recent survey has shown (Dispute Resolution Program Directory, 1986-87), more than 350 mediation programs are in operation. In 1976, there were perhaps 2,500 community mediators. Today there are more than 20,000. While today more than 20 states have specific dispute resolution statutes, 10 years ago not a single one did. In 1976, no bar association had a committee on dispute resolution. Today, more than 120 do (Bar Association Directory on Dispute Resolution, 1986). And although in 1976 no law school offered a course in dispute resolution, today more than half do so. . . .

(Olsen, 1986, p. 1)

This statement by the chair of the American Bar Association reflects tremendous growth in the field of ADR. One of the reasons for such an advocacy is "the high cost of courting" (Ferris, 1986, p. 3). People sue not only because they feel wronged, but because the insurance company will pay for it!

Most people dislike the current legal climate. A Gallup survey showed that the public thinks that the cost of the legal system is too high, that many suits are unjustified, that damage awards are too high, that delays are too frequent, and that change is necessary (Ferris, 1986). Clearly, the time for change has come. Individuals, organizations, corporations, and special-interest groups have all shown a great deal of interest in the growing popularity of ADR.
The litigation explosion "during this generation" says former U.S. Chief Justice Warren Burger, "is suggested by a few figures" (Burger, 1982, p. 2).

From 1940 to 1981 annual federal district court civil case filings increased from about 35,000 to 180,000. This almost doubled the yearly caseload per judgeship from 190 to 350 cases . . . The real meaning of these figures emerges when we see that federal civil cases increased almost six times as fast as our population. (Burger, 1982, p. 2).

From 1950 to 1981, annual Court of Appeals filings climbed from over 2,800 to more than 26,000. "The annual caseload per judgeship increased from 44 to 200 cases. This growth was 16 times as much as the increase in population" (Burger, 1982, p. 3).

The high costs of courting, as well as drastic increases in the legal system's caseloads, suggest that ADR is perhaps the best alternative for the court system, as well as for the people. In the present legal system, resolution of over 90% of all the cases are already done outside the adjudicative system (Meadow, 1986). Other studies found that 90% of the mediations conducted result in agreements (Ray, 1982). Of equal importance, 85% of the participants interviewed after mediation expressed satisfaction with the process. One participant felt that the process was unusual because she "was treated like a human being" (Ray, 1982, p. i).
Although some writers may disagree with the effectiveness of settlements resolved through mediation among the intimates (Cordella, 1986), statistics have shown that since most conflicts, most homicides, and most felonious assaults in the United States are between people who know one another, ADR mechanisms which develop positive values among the disputants are the most effective ways of settling disputes (Shonholtz, 1984).

Summary

In recent years, there has been a phenomenal growth of interest in ways of coping with social conflict and in applying intervention techniques (i.e., ADR) in areas of human activity in which they were previously little used (Bonoma & Milburn, 1977). This trend has expanded the need for personnel who are skilled in the general principles of conflict management applicable to any situation of tension between and among individuals and groups. A number of organizations, agencies, foundations, and institutions of higher learning have responded to this need. They have been providing services, giving instruction, developing teaching materials, and subsidizing innovative projects (Volpe, 1986).

American universities have been the locus of much activity concerning dispute resolution and management. Faculty members have been conducting research, organizing
agencies to provide dispute settlement services, and initiating courses on the study of conflict (Margocsy, 1979). Currently, the peace movement is giving added impetus to these activities.

Dispute resolution and management is a component of many general peace studies programs. A recent survey found that, on the average, dispute resolution and regulation constituted about one-fifth of the subject matter of these general programs (Lopez, 1979). Other approaches that were emphasized in these programs were war/peace systems, futures or world order, and nonviolent values and lifestyles. The diversity of these subjects suggest that "the content of most of these programs is rather eclectic" (Carey, 1980, p. 94).

Emerging disciplines such as dispute resolution or conflict regulation can be thought of as a process developed through a sequence of four stages: the evolution of basic concepts, formulation of appropriate research methods, institutionalization, and finally, public recognition (Carey, 1980). This dissertation is primarily concerned with its contribution to the phase of institutionalization, and the author hopes it will be considered as such.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Measurements of the Dependent and Independent Variables

The dependent variable (Y = Attitudes) can be measured at the interval level, and its variation is explained by the proportionate variations in the independent variables (X1 = Age, and so forth). Using the Likert scale, the total scores of items one through eight of the questionnaire (Part III) constitute the dependent variable variations.

Among the independent variables, variables such as Age, Department Size, Background and Training in ADR (in hours), and Community Service Involvement (in hours) are interval level data by nature. The other independent variables (Sex, Academic Affiliation, and Political Orientation), however, are potentially measured at levels other than interval. As Loether and McTavish (1980) explain, it is permissible to treat these nominal level data as interval level variables by using the "dummy variables" (p. 364).

One of the objectives of this study was to observe the correlations of the independent and dependent variables. In other words, the study was aimed at explaining the proportions of variations explained in the dependent
variable by the contributive variations of the independent variables.

Sampling Procedures

As mentioned in the National Survey of Dispute Resolution Studies conducted by the University of Colorado Sociology Department, over 50% of the courses involved in ADR are concentrated in the following disciplines: Law, Political Science, Sociology/Anthropology, Business/Commerce, and Management/Organization.

The population target for this study, therefore, consisted of the above-mentioned departments within the following universities in five different states and regions of the country: North Texas State University (NTSU), Southern Methodist University (SMU), University of Texas at Arlington (UTA), Cornell University, University of Iowa, University of Colorado at Boulder, and University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA).

A list of all the faculty members was formed by consulting the most recent and appropriate (general, graduate, or departmental) catalogs of each university. Then, four individuals from each department were randomly selected to receive the questionnaire. It should be noted that NTSU and UTA do not have law schools; therefore, the total number of subjects in the survey equaled 160 in 40 departments at 7 universities. Table 1 presents the
distribution of questionnaires among various selected departments of the seven universities.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>NTSU</th>
<th>UTA</th>
<th>SMU</th>
<th>Cornell</th>
<th>Univ. of Iowa</th>
<th>UCLA</th>
<th>Univ. of Colorado</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aN = 160.

Because the total number of subjects under study was 160, a minimum return of 80 (50%) was required to be considered as adequate response for further reporting and analysis (Babbie, 1975).

It should also be remembered that although responses from each department represent a "representative" sampling
of that department, because of the special structure of this study's sampling (sampling-in-time) in selection of the universities and specific departments, the results of the study need to be replicated with other populations by future researchers.

Questionnaire Construction and Collection of Data

The National Survey disclosed important facts about the concentration and proliferation of conflict and dispute resolution subjects and the investments already made in alternative dispute resolution by certain disciplines (Wehr et al., 1986). However, it does not reveal anything about the quality of the courses offered or their instruction. Are these courses taught regularly by tenured faculty members? The questionnaire used in the study was designed not only to answer such questions, but also to collect data in three areas: (a) the place and significance of ADR in curricula, (b) important factors concerning attitudes toward ADR, and (c) the expectations/aspirations concerning teaching of ADR courses. Part I of the questionnaire (total of 7 questions) is designed to reveal demographic information for the respondents (providing data for the independent variables). In Part II of the questionnaire (12 questions), respondents are asked to share information on the number, frequency, history, and quality of ADR
instruction and research in their respective departments. Part III of the questionnaire (10 questions) deals with the respondents' opinions on the subject of ADR. By means of a Likert scale, respondents' preferred answers were solicited according to the following choices: 1 = Strongly Agree (SA), 2 = Agree (A), 3 = No Opinion (NO), 4 = Disagree (D), or 5 = Strongly Disagree (SD). The first eight items of this part of the questionnaire include the formation of the total scores on attitudes concerning ADR's instruction and inclusion in the curricula. Questions number 9 and 10 were used to gather general information.

The Likert scale in this study involves a total of eight statements, each with five response categories. The total scores for the respondents across all eight statements were computed. In order to test and verify the face validity of Part III of the questionnaire, a panel of experts in ADR were asked to evaluate the questionnaire. This group included a national arbitrator, a lawyer, and a counselor. Their approval and comments are presented in Appendix C. After collection of data through factor analysis, these eight statements were tested for consistency of responses. A "conceptional/congruent" validity can also be concluded since there was a uniformity of directions for all eight items in Part III of the questionnaire (Lin, 1976) (see Appendix E).
The respondents' expectations, suggestions, and comments on the subject of ADR in general, and on this study in particular, were included in Part IV of the questionnaire and in question 12 of Part II. In order to identify the courses related to ADR, the respondents applied the following definition for inclusion: "a course with a substantial portion devoted to the history, and/or theory, and/or method of resolving or managing conflict" (Wehr et al., 1986, p. 3).

The questionnaire (Appendix B), along with a cover letter (Appendix B) explaining the nature and scope of the study, were mailed to all of the 160 selected faculty members. The cover letter included complete instructions on how to answer the questions. A self-addressed, stamped envelope was provided for the respondents' convenience in returning the questionnaire. A copy of the original questionnaire, with a follow-up letter (Appendix B), was sent to the same faculty members approximately two weeks after the first mailing. This was done to assure a significant return.

Because the main source of data collection involves human subjects, prior permission was obtained from the NTSU Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (Appendix C).
Operational Definitions

The dependent variable \( Y = \text{Attitudes} \) and the seven main independent variables \( \{X_1 = \text{Sex}, X_2 = \text{Age}, X_3 = \text{Academic Affiliation}, X_4 = \text{Departmental Size}, X_5 = \text{Political Orientation}, X_6 = \text{ADR Training}, \text{and} X_7 = \text{Community Involvement}\) require further explanation. The following discussion identifies the variables, their respective measurements, and their operational definitions (see also Figure 1).

1. **Sex \( (X_1) \).** Although nominal/categorical information by nature, sex can be measured on an interval level using dummy variables.

2. **Age \( (X_2) \).** In this study, it was assumed that people under 40 years of age are young, those who are in the age range of 40-50 formed the middle-aged category, and those who are 50 years of age or older were classified as old. Age was measured on an interval level.

3. **Academic Affiliation \( (X_3) \).** This variable was treated and measured as interval level data using dummy variables.

4. **Department Size \( (X_4) \).** This refers to the full-time faculty members of each department under study. This variable was also measured on interval data. Departments of 8 faculty members or less were considered small, 9 to 15
were considered average, and those of 15 or more were considered above average.

5. Political Orientation ($X_5$). This variable can also be treated and measured as interval level data using dummy variables.

6. Background and Training ($X_6$). This indicates the total number of credit hours (or equivalents of university credit hours) that subjects have in formal training, practical experience, counseling, or education in ADR-related subjects (i.e., negotiation, mediation). Attending seminars related to ADR is another example of this kind of background. Subjects with 1 or less hours of training are categorized as having 0 or "none" training, those with 2-5 hours of training are categorized as "below average," those with 6-9 hours are considered "average," and those with 10 or more hours of training are classified as "above average."

7. Community Involvement(s) ($X_7$). This includes service to community organizations (on a voluntary or paid basis) exceeding 1 hour per week. Anything less than 1 hour per week will be considered as "0" or "none". Subjects with 2-3 hours of service are said to have "below average" involvement, those with 4-6 hours of service constitute the "average" range, and those with 7 or more hours of service form the "above average" involvement categories.
**Figure 1**

**Interpretation of Variations in Attitudes Favoring ADR (Y)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable ($X_1 - X_7$)</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Over 50</td>
<td>40-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Under 40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 50 (Old)</td>
<td>40-50 (Middle)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 40 (Young)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Affiliation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTSU, UTA, SMU, Cornell, Univ. of Iowa, Univ. of Colorado, and UCLA; Departments: Anthropology, Business, Law, Management, Political Science Sociology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department Size</strong></td>
<td>Under 8 (Below Avg.)</td>
<td>9-15 (Average)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political Orientation</strong></td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Background &amp; Training in ADR</strong></td>
<td>1 or less (None)</td>
<td>2-5 (Below Avg.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total Credit Hours)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Involvement(s)</strong></td>
<td>1 or less (None)</td>
<td>2-3 (Below Avg.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total No. of Involvement Hours)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The dependent variable ($Y = \text{attitudes}$) was measured at the interval level (using the Likert scale) for Part III of the questionnaire. After adding the scores of each respondent on Part III of the questionnaire, the final
conclusions were drawn. Those whose total score was between 8-13 are shown to have a "strongly favoring" attitude toward ADR. Those with scores of 14-20 "favor" ADR. Scores of 21-27 indicate "no opinion" on the subject of ADR. Scores totaling 28-34 demonstrate a "not favoring" attitude, and those with scores of 35-40 show "strongly not favoring" attitudes toward ADR.

Regression Model

Because both the dependent and independent variables can be measured or treated as interval level data, and in light of the following assumptions, the use of a multiple regression model (R) was chosen as a methodological tool (Loether & McTavish, 1980).

1. The sample size is large (N = 160).
2. Independent variables are assumed to be related in a linear fashion with the dependent variables and among themselves.
3. Effects of independent variables can be added.
4. Independent variables are minimally correlated.
5. No direction is predicted for the dependent variable (Y = attitudes) as it is explained by the variations of seven independent variables.

Thus, the further assumption that $p = .05$ (level of significance) for a two-tailed test is applied.
The regression model intends to identify the important independent variables which play significant roles by their variations in the explanation of the total variation of the dependent variables.

Coding, Data Entry, and Analysis

After the questionnaires were returned, answers to each item of the questionnaire (Parts I, II, and III) were assigned a coded number (e.g., 1 for Male, 0 for Female and so on). These coded numbers were transferred onto a keypunch work sheet which in turn was used to tabulate and prepare further computer usage and program writing material. The analysis of the collected data was performed through the MUSIC files and SAS analysis available at the Computing Center at North Texas State University (Statistical Analysis Software, 1985). This analysis focused not only on the previously stated objectives of the questionnaire, but also (through cross tabulation of independent variables and other important items), on a better understanding of the issues involved in teaching and researching of ADR in the selected institutions of higher learning.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS, RESULTS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Analysis of Return

In a 40-day period, a total of 102 questionnaires were returned, of which 96 are used in this study. The other six were returned to the researcher unanswered because the individual had retired or transferred or was deceased. Therefore, the rate of usable return in this study is 60%. According to Babbie (1975), this is considered a "good response rate" (p. 265). A detailed listing of the questionnaires returned from each university is given in Table 2.

Of the 96 respondents, 30 are female (31.3%); the remaining 66 (68.8%) are male. The classification of the respondents based on age, department size, political orientation, hours of training in alternate dispute resolution (ADR), and hours of community service involvement can be found in Appendix E.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Number of Questionnaires Sent</th>
<th>Number of Questionnaires Received</th>
<th>Return %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NTSU</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMU</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Iowa</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Colorado</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>160</strong></td>
<td><strong>96</strong></td>
<td><strong>M = 60</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percentage rate of return by department is shown in Table 3. As can be seen, the highest rates of returns were from the University of Colorado (71%) and from the Sociology and Management Departments (68% each). The only two departments that did not respond at all were the Departments of Anthropology and Political Science at Cornell University.
Table 3

Total Return Percentage By Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NTSU</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>NA^a</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMU</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTA</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>NA^a</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Iowa</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Colorado</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^aThese universities do not have a Law School.

Place and Significance of ADR Courses in Curricula

The respondents identify a total of 40 courses in the six departments of the seven universities. Table 4 presents the distribution of ADR courses within the universities surveyed.
Table 4
Distribution of ADR-Related Courses by University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NTSU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Iowa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Colorado</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(N = 40.\)

The concentration of these ADR-related courses are distributed as follows: UCLA (25%), University of Colorado (23%), University of Iowa (20%), Cornell (15%), NTSU (8%), UTA (8%), and SMU (3%). The concentrations by department are: Management (35%), Law (28%), Sociology (23%), Business Administration (8%), and Political Science (8%).

No ADR courses are identified by the 16 respondents from the
Anthropology departments. Therefore, compared to the National Survey (Wehr et al., 1986), the results of this study indicate that the Management Department (instead of Law) has the highest percentage of courses related to ADR, followed by Law (instead of Political Science), Sociology (no change), Business Administration (no change), and Political Science (instead of Management).

Forty-four percent of the respondents indicate that either they or another individual are teaching ADR-related courses in their departments. Appendix E provides information on the number, quality, frequency, history, and methods used in the 40 ADR-related courses that are taught. The respondents indicate that 52% of these courses began during 1970s, with 29% beginning in the 1980s. It is indicated that 84% of these courses will be offered as regular courses each year in the future.

While 84% of these courses were not required by the students majoring in the various departments under study, almost 60% of the students who were taking them had graduate status. The results also reveal that 60% of the faculty who were teaching these courses are tenured, whereas only 26.5% were involved in any kind of research on the subject of ADR.

The most frequently-used method in conflict resolution courses is negotiation (28.3%), followed by conflict analysis (22.6%), arbitration (20.8%), mediation (18.9%),
and collective bargaining (5.7%). There are other methods used, such as "nonviolent direct action" (Sociology, 3.8%) and "keystone process" (Business and Policy Administration, 3.8%). These methods of conflict resolution, with distribution by department and college, are given in Appendix E.

Important Factors Determining Attitudes on ADR--

The Results of the Regression Model

The second objective of this study was to determine important factors determining attitudes of respondents on ADR. Attitudes were measured on a Likert scale and are represented as scores between 8 and 40 (8 indicating the most favorable attitude, and 40 being the least favorable attitude on ADR's inclusion and instruction in the curricula). The final results are shown in Table 5.

Table 5

Classification of Total Scores on Attitudes toward ADR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 - 13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 - 20</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 27</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 - 34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to the results of the regression model, of the seven main independent variables of Sex, Age, Department Size, Academic Affiliation, Political Orientation, Hours of Training in ADR, and Hours of Community Service Involvement, four variables were significant enough to explain almost 36% of the dependent variable ($Y = \text{Attitudes}$). If $X_1 = \text{Sex}$, $X_2 = \text{Age}$, $X_3 = \text{Political Orientation}$, and $X_4 = \text{Hours of ADR Training}$, then the regression model can be shown as

$$Y = 32.03 + 2.05X_1 - 0.18X_2 - 6.54X_3 - 0.25X_4.$$  
(Figures have been rounded up to the nearest 10th). Table 6 depicts the results of the regression.

Table 6
Results of Regression Model

| Independent Variable | Regression Coefficient | Standardized Coefficient | $t$ for $H_0$ | $p > |t|$ Probability |
|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| Sex                  | 2.05                   | 1.12                     | 1.83          | 0.05*             |
| Age                  | -0.18                  | 0.06                     | -3.13         | 0.0024*           |
| Political Orientation| -6.54                  | 1.38                     | -4.74         | 0.0001*           |
| ADR Training         | -0.25                  | 0.11                     | -2.36         | 0.02*             |

*$p = .05$.

Intercept = 32.03; $R$-Square = 0.36; Adj. $R$-Square = 0.33; $F$ value = 11.79; Prob.$< = 0.0001$. 
The results of this model are interpreted in the following discussion.

1. Sex. Originally, females were coded 0 and males were coded 1. Therefore, the parameter estimate of 2.05 indicates that the higher the respondent's score on the questionnaire (which means a less favorable attitude), the greater probability that the individual is a male respondent. It also shows that the mean scores of male and female respondents on the attitudes toward ADR are 2.05 points different from each other.

This finding confirms previous observations of women's position regarding peace issues. United States opinion polls show a gender gap when it comes to questions concerning economic distribution, the development of weapons, and peace initiatives. According to a 1983 New York Times/CBS opinion poll, 74% of the women polled believed that the development of the nuclear bomb was a bad thing, compared to 56% of the men interviewed (Abzug, 1984).

2. Age. The effect of age on attitudes results in opposite indicators. The older the person is, the lower is his or her score. This may be true because the people who finished their Ph.D. degrees or were teaching during the 1960s were witnessing tremendous unrest and social uprising which became an important part of their conscious-building era. The parameter estimate of -0.18 indicates that an
increase in age by 1 year will change the attitudes score by 0.18.

3. **Political Orientation.** Because liberals were coded as 1 and conservatives as 0, the more liberal a person's political orientation, the higher the chance of that person having favorable attitudes on ADR. This variable is the most significant of all of the independent variables ($p > 0.0001$). The regression coefficient of -6.54 indicates that the mean score difference of 6.54 in the attitudes is obtained by changing the political orientation of the respondent from liberal to conservative (and vice versa).

4. **ADR Training.** This variable determines how much training each of the respondents has in ADR. Therefore, the more training hours a person has in ADR the greater the likelihood that the person would favor ADR and its inclusion in the curricula. The parameter estimate of -0.25 exhibits that each extra hour of ADR training is responsible for 0.25 of change in the attitudes score (favoring ADR). This variable is the only one controllable by people or institutions; therefore, it becomes the essential basis for any advancement and progress in the field of ADR.

Appendix E indicates that all of the eight questions in Part III of the questionnaire are loaded on one factor. Through factor analysis, the uniformity of direction for these questions is proven and some "congruent/conceptual"
validity is assured. Appendix E illustrates residual testings which provide assurances about the appropriateness of the model and indicates further that those assumptions which were made about the regression model were all sound and accurate.

Respondents' Expectations, Aspirations, and Comments

Most of the respondents are supportive of the study's design, plan, and scope. Only one law professor is somehow suspicious about the role of ADR in the present legal system. In contrast, one management professor sees ADR almost exclusively in the realm of modern law. Most comments and suggestions come from the sociology and management departments.

Respondents give suggestions regarding the kinds of new courses that should be taught in their departments: Community Building and Peace, Manager as Negotiator, Nonviolent Direct Action, World Peace, World Order Systems, Environmental Management, and Policy Analysis and Conflict Resolution.

One sociology professor writes "I think I might be interested in it [ADR] . . . On the other hand, I don't think there are apolitical solutions to political problems." Another sociologist elaborates
I do agree that mediation skills and their salience are important in a conflict ridden society (which conflict is of long and almost unchanging level—though of changing nature). . . . It is the changing nature of conflict that makes me skeptical about institutionalizing conflict resolution.

Another comment praises the Conflict Mediation Program at the University of Colorado "[their] conflict mediation [program] is quite successful under the leadership of Paul Wehr. . . ." This is, again, an indication of excellent teaching and research facilities in the University of Colorado Sociology Department in the field of ADR (the University of Colorado Sociology Department under this study is found to have offered 6 courses in ADR-related subjects, which is more than any other department in the study).

Finally, another deeply felt and shared comment by a sociologist clearly exhibits the vital importance of ADR in the curricula of institutions of higher learning:

This is certainly the type of tuning that everyone who knows about the cost of [destructive] conflict should be for. . . . It influences the peace-making skills of generations . . . but [nobody] thinks about [it] because they are so involved in their own struggle to survive budget cuts!

Recommendations

As shown in Appendix E, the majority of the respondents agree on the subject of conflict and its resolution and management. Each item of Part III of the questionnaire is weighted against the total respondents'
responses. In the light of these findings, the writer makes the following recommendations:

1. There needs to be an increase in the training and teaching of ADR courses. As Bower (1983) also recommended, conflict management skills should be a prerequisite for those assuming teaching and administrative roles in higher education. Another researcher advocates teaching ADR techniques to university students simply because most individual disciplines, such as economics and history, do not prepare students for handling "complex and controversial" issues (Collier, 1984, p. 27).

How can conflict studies be made a part of the school curricula? The easiest way is to create one or more self-contained units which focus on conflict as part of the social science curriculum. Such a unit may draw upon the experiences students have in other disciplines, but it should be organized to assure that the students can make, and will continue to make, connections with other studies.

Another basic way of more effectively bringing conflict studies into the curriculum is to review the various subject disciplines and interdisciplinary studies taught at the school and ask how the resources, conceptual ideas, and methods basic to those areas may contribute to an understanding of conflict (e.g., the study of conflict in drama and literature, the occurrence of tension and war in
history and sociology, competition and cooperation among animals in biology, the question of choice in moral and religious instruction, and the study of the judicial system in law). The cumulative effect of such an integrated approach could have a powerful impact upon the student's understanding of conflict and its management. This recommendation concurs with the results of studies conducted by Wehr (1976), Thiry (1972), Jandt and Hare (1976), and Weider-Hatfield (1981).

2. Mediation centers should be created on university campuses. Mediation is one of the fastest growing, informal ADR programs in communities and on college and university campuses. The key element which distinguishes mediation from other methods of solving conflict is the participation of a nonjudgmental, third party. One effect of the on-campus protests of the 1960s and 1970s was increased sensitivity of institutions to the legal rights of students. Mediation offers an alternative to formal legalistic procedures for dealing with a wide range of conflicts involving students, staff, faculty, and community residents.

Mediation can be used in a variety of ways to deal with many individual and social problems and needs. It can be incorporated into disciplinary codes as an option for administering specific code violations, or it can be
structured to resolve student conflicts in which no code violations are involved. It is a "useful intervention tool for short-term crises that over the long-term may require therapy" (Girard, Rifkin, & Townley, 1985, p. 7). In a broad context, mediation provides a forum for resolving any conflict involving personal, institutional, or policy differences. Appendix D provides important resources for the creation of mediation centers on university/college campuses.

3. The establishment of a communications network and data bank for ADR is also recommended. There are many university professors in the United States who are presumably interested in communicating with each other regarding conflict resolution. There are also hundreds of course syllabi representing the accumulated experience, teaching methods, research, and biographic knowledge of faculty concerned, all of which could and should be shared through such a network (Wehr, 1986).

Abstracts of all published material relevant for conflict resolution theory and practice could be obtained and be fed into a data pool/bank. This bank could be used as a teaching and research tool within various departments of different universities. By using a computerized system, any student taking courses in social conflict, dispute resolution, or conflict management could identify and enter
appropriate pieces of literature for inclusion in the bank. The data bank would also provide access to a vast area of knowledge in history, methods, and schools of thought, as well as the latest publications concerning conflict resolution.

"World transformation and peace is not merely desirable—it is inevitable" (Wehr, 1976, p. 5). It will come about peacefully or through violence. It will result in greater global justice or widespread repression, tyranny, and exploitation (Wehr, 1976). It is the path and the cause of peace and justice to which this study was addressed.

According to Ervin Laszlo, a member of the Club of Rome, "Peace in the contemporary world is no longer an option but a necessity" (1986, p. xiii). To achieve peace, a new orientation of thought and knowledge is needed. In a world in which technologies of destruction can obliterate the world's human population many times over, and in which technologies of production, service, and communication are sophisticated, but vulnerable, force is not an instrument of security but of genocide (Laszlo, 1986). The human civilization can only survive if conventional wisdom is reoriented by new insights. Although world peace is a global issue, it must be initiated at the individual level. Preparation necessary for this awakening and reorientation blossoms to maturity at educational institutions.
Many institutions and organizations presently exist which have recognized and responded to the need for peacemaking and reorientation in human history (see Appendix D). Nevertheless, it seems appropriate to conclude with a portion of a current statement issued from the Universal House of Justice, the supreme governing body of Baha'i's in the world, who has been a guiding force in promotion and fulfillment of unity, harmony, and peace among all nations and peoples.

The Great Peace towards which people of good will throughout the centuries have inclined their hearts, of which seers and poets for countless generations have expressed their vision, and for which from age to age the sacred scriptures of mankind have constantly held the promise, is now at long last within the reach of nations. For the first time in history, it is possible for everyone to view the entire planet, with all its myriad diversified peoples, in one perspective. World peace is not only possible but inevitable.

(Universal House of Justice, 1985, p. 13)
APPENDIX A

ADR-RELATED NATIONAL STATISTICS IN HIGHER EDUCATION
## DISPUTE RESOLUTION COURSE DESCRIPTION BY STATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number of Courses</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA D.C.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WV</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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HEAVIEST CONCENTRATIONS BY SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Number of Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse University</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard University</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Colorado - Boulder</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne State University</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Denver</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Iowa</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Akron</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Mason University</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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DISCIPLINARY CONCENTRATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disciplines</th>
<th>Number of Courses</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government/Political Science</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology/Anthropology</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/Commerce</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management/Organization</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication/Speech</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace/Conflict Studies</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial/Labor Relations</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration/Planning</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Relations</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Bargaining</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Management</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child and Human Development</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Studies</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment/Natural Resources</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Reprinted by permission from National Institute for Dispute Resolution, Washington, D.C.
APPENDIX B

INSTRUMENTS FOR DATA COLLECTION
Dear Faculty Member:

Thank you for taking the time to fill out the enclosed questionnaire. The questionnaire has been designed to gather information on the place and significance of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) in the curricula of various departments of selected universities in the United States. A further objective of the study is to determine important factors concerning attitudes favoring the inclusion of ADR in selected departments within these universities.

May I request that all respondents fill out Parts I, III, and IV of the questionnaire. Part II is for those individuals whose departments specifically offer (or have offered) courses related to ADR. The criteria for inclusion of such courses has been adopted from the definition used in a recent national survey for the National Institute for Dispute Resolution which can be found in Part I of the questionnaire.

Your input is extremely important in examining the status of ADR. I can further assure you that your voluntary participation in answering this questionnaire will be held in strictest confidence. Please feel free to write your suggestions/comments at the end of the questionnaire (Part IV) as well.

For your convenience, a self-addressed and stamped envelope has been enclosed. Please return this questionnaire as soon as possible.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Delavar Ghaedrshenass
Ph.D. Candidate
Department of Sociology
North Texas State University

Enclosures: Questionnaire
Return Envelope
THE QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire has been designed to gather data in three areas: (1) the place and significance of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) in curricula, (2) important factors concerning attitudes toward ADR, and (3) the expectations/aspirations concerning teaching of ADR courses.

Note: Please remember the criteria for inclusion of a course: "A course with a substantial portion devoted to the history, and/or theory, and/or method of resolving or managing conflict." If a course examines the theory and practice of nonviolent direct action as a conflict management method, it should be included.

PART I. DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS

1. What is your sex? Male ____ Female ____

2. What is your age? _____

3. What is the name of the university you are employed at? ___________________________ department? ___________________________

4. How many full-time faculty members are there in your department? ______

5. Which of the following most accurately describes your political orientation?
   Liberal _____ Conservative _____

6. Have you had any seminars or courses in ADR in your field of training? Please indicate the total number of credit hours, or its equivalent, you have had (if none, please write 0): ______________

7. Are you involved in the activities of organizations outside the university as a (paid or unpaid) volunteer providing services to others (i.e., Big Brothers, Big Sisters, Crisis-Center Counseling, Churches, Civic Services, School Boards, etc.)? If yes, please indicate the total number of involvement hours per week (if none or less than one hour, please write 0): ______________
PART II. GENERAL QUESTIONS

The purpose of this part of the questionnaire is to gather information on the quality of ADR courses taught in your department. Having the criteria in Part I in mind, please answer the following questions.

1. Do you teach (or have you ever taught) any courses related to ADR? Yes _____ No _____

2. Is there anyone else in your department who teaches course(s) on ADR? Yes _____ No _____

Note: If you have answered "Yes" to either of the above questions, please continue answering the remainder of the questions in Part II.

3. How many ADR-related courses are offered by your department? ________________

4. How often is such a course taught in your department? Each semester ____ Each year ____ Every other year ____

5. Are these courses taught by only tenured faculty members? Yes _____ No _____ Not sure _____

6. Is this a required course for students who are majoring in your department? Yes ____ No ____ Not sure ____

7. Is this course offered only at the graduate level? Yes ____ No ____ Not sure ____

8. When were these courses introduced by your department? Before 1960s ____ During 1970s ____
   During 1960s-1970s ____ During 1980s ____

9. Will this course be offered as a regular course in the future? Yes ____ No ____ Not sure ____

10. Are you doing (or have you ever done) any research on the subject of ADR? Yes ____ No ____ Not sure ____

11. In your course(s), which of the following methods of conflict resolution are mostly used? Conflict Analysis ____ Mediation ____
   Negotiation ____ Collective Bargaining ____
   Arbitration ____ Other (please name) ____________________________
12. Besides the present courses in your department, what other courses can and should be offered (related to ADR)? Please list them below.

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.

PART III. QUESTIONS CONCERNING ATTITUDES ON ADR

In this part of the questionnaire, you are asked to indicate your opinion on the subject of ADR. The preferences listed are Strongly Agree (S.A.), Agree (A.), No Opinion (N.O.), Disagree (D.), or Strongly Disagree (S.D.).

1. Conflict (in general) is on the rise.
   S.A. ___ A. ___ N.O. ___ D. ___ S.D. ___

2. I think it is a "good idea" to teach courses in ADR.
   S.A. ___ A. ___ N.O. ___ D. ___ S.D. ___

3. In order to have more recognition and institutionalization, I feel that ADR needs more literature of its own (publications, professional organizations, etc.).
   S.A. ___ A. ___ N.O. ___ D. ___ S.D. ___

4. I am in favor of establishing centers, such as the Center for Mediation, on my campus.
   S.A. ___ A. ___ N.O. ___ D. ___ S.D. ___

5. I would like to see the creation of networks and data banks among teachers, researchers, practitioners, and students of different universities and departments to enhance and share the body of knowledge in the field of ADR.
   S.A. ___ A. ___ N.O. ___ D. ___ S.D. ___

6. I am willing to participate in the creation and development of such a network.
   S.A. ___ A. ___ N.O. ___ D. ___ S.D. ___
7. I believe that "peacemaking skills" of the students who successfully complete such course(s) in ADR will be greatly improved.
S.A. ___  A. ___  N.O. ___  D. ___  S.D. ___

8. I am in favor of an integrative expansion of the field of ADR by different disciplines even though some people think that the resolution of conflicts should be handled by "licensed" professionals.
S.A. ___  A. ___  N.O. ___  D. ___  S.D. ___

9. It is my opinion that "lack of funding" is the main reason for some departments not offering courses in ADR.
S.A. ___  A. ___  N.O. ___  D. ___  S.D. ___

10. I think ADR courses are more likely to be found in union-favoring states.
S.A. ___  A. ___  N.O. ___  D. ___  S.D. ___

PART IV (For All Respondents)

Suggestions/Comments (Please print clearly):

Thank you again for your participation in this project.
August 31, 1987

Dear Faculty Member:

On August 14, 1987, a questionnaire was mailed to you. If you have already answered it, please disregard this letter, and my sincere thanks to you for your cooperation. However, if you haven't had a chance to answer it, I am enclosing another copy of the questionnaire for your reply and convenience. Thank you again for your input on examining the status and significance of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) in the curricula of your department and university.

May I again request that all respondents fill out Part I, III, and IV of the questionnaire. Part II is for those individuals whose departments specifically offer (or have offered) courses related to ADR. The criteria for inclusion of such courses has been adopted from the definition used in a recent national survey for the National Institute for Dispute Resolution which can be found in Part I of the questionnaire.

Your input is extremely important in examining the status of ADR. I can further assure you that your voluntary participation in answering this questionnaire will be held in strictest confidence. Since there are more than one questionnaire being sent to each department, your anonymity is assured. Please feel free to write your suggestions/comments at the end of the questionnaire (Part IV) as well.

For your convenience, a self-addressed and stamped envelope has been again enclosed. Please return this questionnaire as soon as possible.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Delavar Gadrshenass
Ph.D. Candidate
Department of Sociology
North Texas State University
Denton, TX 76203

Enclosures: Questionnaire, Return Envelope
APPENDIX C

AUTHORIZATIONS
Verification of the Questionnaire's "Face Validity"

We the undersigned have read and evaluated the attached questionnaire, and find it being valid in what it intends to measure.

National Arbitrator

Lawyer

Counselor

[Signature]

[Signature]
TO:            Delavar Ghadrshenass, Sociology  
FROM:       Bert Hayslip, Jr., Chairman, Institutional Review Board  
           for the Protection of Human Subjects  
SUBJECT:  Your project, "Dispute Resolution in Institutions of  
           Higher Learning: An Attitude Survey  
DATE:       August 4, 1987  

Your proposal, "Dispute Resolution in Institutions of Higher  
Learning: An Attitude Survey" has been approved under the  
Exemption Category #3 rule.  

If you have any questions, please call me at x-2675.  

Good luck on your project.
APPENDIX D

PEACE RESEARCH RESOURCES
### UNIVERSITY PROGRAMS CONCERNED WITH PEACE STUDIES

#### A. Undergraduate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akron, University of</td>
<td>Akron, OH 44304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Peace Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D'Youville College</td>
<td>Dubuque, IA 52001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Political Science</td>
<td>Dubuque, IA 52001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska, University of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace Arts Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College, Alaska 99701</td>
<td>D'Youville College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peace Studies Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Buffalo, NY 14207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augsburg College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Theology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis, MN 55405</td>
<td>Earlham College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peace &amp; Conflict Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Madison, WI 53711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beloit College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace Studies Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beloit, WI 53511</td>
<td>Edgewood College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent Studies in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peace &amp; Conflict Res.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richmond, IN 47374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethel College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace Studies Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Newton, KS 67117</td>
<td>Georgetown University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Center for Peace Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, DC 20007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program for Study of Peace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chestnut Hill, MA 02167</td>
<td>Goshen College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FAXCOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goshen, IN 46526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento Peace Studies Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento, CA 95819</td>
<td>Graceland College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dept. of Sociology &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lamoni, IA 50140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco Peace Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco, CA 94132</td>
<td>Gustavus Adolphus College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peace Education Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. Peter, MN 56082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colgate University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace Studies Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton, NY 13346</td>
<td>Hamline University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dept. of History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. Paul, MN 55104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton, University of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace Studies Institute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton, OH 54509</td>
<td>Harvard University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program in Peace, Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&amp; Social Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Paul University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Vision &amp; Analysis of Peace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, IL 60614</td>
<td>Cambridge, MA 02138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hawaii, University of
Alternative Futures Program
Honolulu, HI 96822

Hilbert College
Institute on Educating
for Non-Violence
Hamburg, NY 14075

Indiana University of PA
Institute for Projective
Policy Studies
Indiana, PA 15701

Iowa, University of
Center for World Order Studies
Iowa City, IA 52240

Juniata College
Peace Studies Program
Huntington, PA 16652

Kent State University
Center for Peaceful Change
Kent, OH 44240

Manchester College
Peace Studies Institute
North Manchester, IN 46962

Manhattan College
Pacem in Terris Institute
Bronx, NY 10471

Mankato State College
Peace Studies Program
Mankato, MN 56001

Maryland, University of
World Order Program
College Park, MD 20742

Massachusetts, University of
Future Studies Program
Amherst, MA 01002

Massachusetts, University of
Global Survival Studies
Amherst, MA 01002

Minnesota, University of
World Order Program
Minneapolis, MN 55455

Missouri, University of
Peace Studies Program
Columbia, MO 65201

Monmouth College
Program in Peace Studies
West Long Branch, NJ 07764

Northeast Missouri State
University
Kirksville, MO 63501

Notre Dame, University of
Program in Nonviolence
Notre Dame, IN 46566

Oregon State University
Corvallis, OR 97331

Paterson State College
Peace Studies Program
Wayne, NJ 07470

Pittsburgh, University of
Committee on Conflict Reso-
lution & Peace Studies

Portland, University of
Peace Studies Program
Portland, OR 97203

Purdue University
Center for the Study of
the Person
Fort Wayne, IN 46805

Purdue University
Dept. of Political Science
Lafayette, IN 47907

Rice University
Peace Studies Program
Houston, TX 77001
Richmond College  
War & Peace Studies Program  
Staten Island, NY 10301

Rocky Mountain College  
Dept. of Christian Thought  
Billings, MT 59102

St. Joseph's College  
Program for Study of Peace & Human Development  
Philadelphia, PA 19131

St. Louis University  
Institute for Education in Peace and Justice  
3700 West Pine Blvd.  
St. Louis, MO 63108

School for Int'l. Training  
World Issues Program  
Brattleboro, VT 05301

Stephens College  
Program in Nonviolence & International Affairs  
Columbia, MO 65201

Syracuse University  
Nonviolence Studies Program  
Syracuse, NY 13210

Texas, University of  
World Order Program  
Austin, TX 78712

Union College  
Peace & World Order Studies Program  
Schenectady, NY 12308

Washington, University of  
Conflict Studies Program  
Seattle, WA 98105

Wilmington College  
Peace Studies Institute  
Wilmington, OH 45177

Wisconsin, University of  
Center for Conflict Res.  
Suite 120, 520 Univ. Ave.  
Madison, WI 53706

Wisconsin, University of  
Peace Studies Program  
Stevens Point, WI 54481

Wittenberg University  
Transnational Education Program  
Springfield, OH 45501
B. Graduate Programs

American University
Graduate Programs
Pitman B. Potter Center for World Order
School of International Service
Washington, DC 20016

Antioch College
Peace Studies Program
Yellow Springs, OH

California State University, Los Angeles
Center for the Study of Armament & Disarmament
Los Angeles, CA 90032

Colorado, University of
Graduate Concentration in the Sociology of Conflict
Boulder, CO 80302

Columbia University
Institute of War & Peace Studies
New York, NY 10027

Cornell University
Program on Peace Studies
Center for International Studies
Ithaca, NY 14850

Denver, University of
Center for Teaching International Relations
Graduate School of International Studies
Denver, CO 80210

Duke University Law School
Rule of Law Research Center
Durham, NC 27706

Earlham School of Religion
Joint Peace Studies Masters Program
Earlham College
Richmond, IN 47374

Harvard University
Program in Peace, Justice & Social Change
Cambridge, MA 02138

Institute of Communications Research
University of Illinois
Urbana, IL 61801

Maryland, University of
Center for Teaching International Relations
College Park, MD 20742

Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Center for International Studies
Cambridge, MA 02139

Michigan, University of
MA Program in Community
Conflict Resolution
Ann Arbor, MI 48104

North Carolina, Univ. of
Studies of Conflict & Peace
Chapel Hill, NC 27514

Ohio State University
Mershon Center
Columbus, OH 43201

Pennsylvania, University of
Peace Studies Department
Philadelphia, PA 19104

Rutgers University
World Order Program
Graduate School of Education
New Brunswick, NJ 08903
*Reprinted (with permission of the principal author for use in this dissertation) from:

ORGANIZATIONS OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES
CONCERNED WITH PEACE

Austria

Austrian Peace Research Society
Lienfeldergasse 5/1/7, A-1160 Vienna

Austrian Society for Peace Research
1090 Vienna, Wilhelm Exnergasse 34

European Coordination Centre for Research & Documentation
in Social Sciences
Franz Josefs-Kai 3, 1010 Vienna, P. O. Box 974

International Institute for Peace
Mollwald platz 5, Vienna

Belgium

Centre of War Sociology
Institut de Sociologie de l’Universite Libre de Bruxelles
44 trenne Jeanne, Brussels 1050

Institute for Conflict Study
University of Peace, B 5200 HUY Rue du Marche, 35
Antwerp

Canada

Canadian Peace Research Institute
25 Dundana Avenue, Dundas, Ontario

Denmark

Hesbjerg Peace Research College
5573 Holmstrup, Fyn

Institute for Peace and Conflict Research
Onsgaardsvej 13, 2900 Hellerup

Finland

Tampere Peace Research Institute
Tammelan puistokatu 58B, 33100 Tampere 10
France

Institut Francais de Polemologie
7, Rue Gutenberg, 75 Paris XV

Germany

Deutsche Gesellschaft für Friedens- und Konfliktforschung
Gotenstrasse 27, 53 Bonn-Bad Godesberg

Free University of Berlin, Institute for Political Science
Department of Peace & Conflict Research, 1 Berlin 33,
Ihnesstrasse 21, West Berlin

Institute for Peace Research & Security Policy at
University of Hamburg
Falkenstein 1 D-2000 Hamburg 55

Peace Research Institute Frankfurt (PRIF)
Eschersheimerlandstrasse 14, 12 Stock, Frankfurt

Study Group for Peace and Conflict Research
D-69 Heidelberg, Haupstrasse 52

Study Group for Peace & Conflict Research, Inc.
53, Bonn, Königstrasse 47

Society for Future and Peace Research
3 Hannover, Eichenplan 1

India

Gandhi Peace Foundation
221-223 Deem Dayal, Upadhyaya Marg, Delhi 1

Indian Council on Peace Research
New Delhi

Gandhian Institute of Studies
Rajghat, Varanasi

Italy

Istituto Italiano di Polemologia e di Ricerche
sui Conflitti,
Via Arco 1, Milano

Centro di Formazione per la Pianificazione
Partinico (Sicily)
Japan

Japan Peace Research Group
Institute of Social Science,
University of Tokyo
Hongo 7-3-1, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113

Netherlands

Nederlands Instituut voor Vredesvraagstukken
Alexanderstraat 7, Postsbus 740, The Hague

Peace Research Center, Institute of Political Science
University of Nijmegen, Verlengde Groenstsraat 43, Nijmegen

Polemological Institute
Ubbo Emmiussingel 19 Groningen

Norway

International Peace Research Institute
P. O. Box 5052, Oslo 3

Rumania

Romanian Association for International Law and
International Relations
Soseaua Kiseleff nr. 471, Bucarest 1

Sweden

Department of Peace & Conflict Research
Uppsala University
P.O. Box 278, S-751 05 Uppsala 1

Interdisciplinary Conflict Research Group
University of Gothenburg
Statsvetenskapliga Institutionen, Fack, 100 25 Goteborg 52

Stockholm International Peace Research Institute
Sveavagen 166, 113 46 Stockholm

University Commission for Peace and Conflict Research
Paradisgatan 5, S-22350 Lund

Switzerland

International Union of Peace Societies
12 rue Michel-chanuet, 120 8 Geneva
correspondence to: 12 rue Dohis 94 Vincennes, France
Project-Study on Swiss Peace Research Institute
47, chemin de Rovereaz, 1012 Lausanne

Quaker Service, International Conference and Seminars
12, rue Adrien-Lachenal, 1207 Geneva

United Kingdom

J. D. Bernal Peace Library
70 Great Russell Street, London WC1 B 3BN

Centre for the Analysis of Conflict
University College London, 4-8 Endsleigh Gardens,
London W.C., 1 HOEG

Conflict Research Unit, London School of Economics
13, Endsleigh Street, London, W.C. 1

International Confederation of Disarmament and Peace
67, Endsleigh Street, London W.C. 1

Peace and Conflict Research Program
University of Lancaster, Lancaster

Richardson Institute for Conflict and Peace Research
Belgrove House, Belgrove Street, London WC 1H 8AA

USSR

Institute for International Affairs and World Economics
Peace Research Section, Moscow

Reprinted (with permission of the principal author for use in this dissertation) from:
PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS AND GROUPS CONCERNED WITH PEACE RESEARCH AND EDUCATION

AMERICAN ARBITRATION ASSOCIATION
140 West 51st Street
New York, NY

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE
1515 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005

'71 and '72 annual meetings included several panels on peace and conflict resolution. Has now established permanent sessions on peace research.

   National Academy of Sciences
   2101 Constitution Avenue, N.W.
   Washington, DC 20418

AMERICAN ORTHOPSYCHIATRIC ASSOCIATION
1790 Broadway
New York, NY 10019

Has Committee on Mental Health Aspects of Aggression, Violence, and War.

   Health Service
   Box 4343
   University of Illinois at Chicago Circle
   Chicago, IL 60680

AMERICAN PERSONNEL AND GUIDANCE ASSOCIATION
1607 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20009

Has a Peace Education Commission.

   East Noble High School
   South Garden Road
   Kendallville, IN 46755

AMERICAN PSYCHIATRIC ASSOCIATION
1700 18th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20009
Sociology of World Conflicts Section is in advanced stages of organization.

University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin

Department of Sociology
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York

ARM S CONTROL ASSOCIATION
11 Dupont Circle, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036

CANADIAN PEACE RESEARCH AND EDUCATION ASSOCIATION
Anatol Rapoport, President
Math Department
University of Toronto
Toronto, Ontario, Canada

CONFERENCE ON PEACE RESEARCH IN HISTORY
Department of History
Wittenberg University
Springfield, OH 45501

Additional Contacts:

John Jay College of Criminal Justice
City University of New York
315 Park Avenue South
New York, NY 10010

Department of Political Science
University of Illinois
Urbana, IL 61801

CONSORTIUM ON PEACE RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND DEVELOPMENT (COPRED)
Gustavus Adolphus College
St. Peter, MN 56082

Additional Contact:

National Institute for the Campus Ministry
Washington University
St. Louis, Missouri
COUNCIL FOR INTER-CULTURAL STUDIES AND PROGRAMS
60 East 42nd Street
New York, NY 10017

FEDERATION OF AMERICAN SCIENTISTS
203 C Street, N.E.
Washington, DC 20002

Represents social as well as natural scientists in education (through a tax-exempt fund) and lobbying activities on peace and ecology issues.

INTERNATIONAL STUDIES ASSOCIATION
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, PA 15260

ISA has established a Peace Studies Section.

Department of Political Science
Rice University
Houston, TX 77001

Department of Political Science
University of Hawaii
Honolulu, HI 96822

Mershon Center
Ohio State University
Columbus, OH 43210

PEACE SCIENCE SOCIETY (INTERNATIONAL)
Department of Peace Science
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA 19174

SOCIETY FOR THE PSYCHOLOGICAL STUDY OF SOCIAL ISSUES (SPSSI)
P.O. Box 1248
Ann Arbor, MI 48104

Division 9 of the American Psychological Association. Has Committee on International Relations.

Department of Psychology
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

SOCIETY FOR THE STUDY OF SOCIAL PROBLEMS (SSSP)
P.O. Box 533
Notre Dame, IN 46556
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UNITED STATES ORGANIZATIONS CONCERNED WITH PEACE

AMERICAN FREEDOM FROM HUNGER FOUNDATION
1717 H Street, N.W., Room 437
Washington, DC 20006

AMERICAN FRIENDS SERVICE COMMITTEE
1501 Cherry Street
Philadelphia, PA 19102

ANOTHER MOTHER FOR PEACE
407 North Maple
Beverly Hills, CA 90210

BUSINESS EXECUTIVES MOVE FOR VIETNAM PEACE AND NEW NATIONAL PRIORITIES
901 North Howard Street
Baltimore, MD 21201

CENTER FOR GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES
218 East 18th Street
New York, NY 10003

CCCO/AN AGENCY FOR MILITARY AND DRAFT COUNSELING
2006 Walnut Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103

CLERGY AND LAITY CONCERNED
235 E. 49th Street
New York, NY 10017

CONSORTIUM ON PEACE RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND DEVELOPMENT
Gustavus Adolphus College
St. Peter, MN 56082

COUNCIL FOR A LIVABLE WORLD
201 Massachusetts Avenue, N.E.
Washington, DC 20002

COUNCIL ON RELIGION AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
170 East 64 Street
New York, NY 10021

FEDERATION OF AMERICAN SCIENTISTS
203 C Street, N.E.
Washington, DC 20002
FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION
Box 271
Nyack, NY 10960

FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION
345 East 46 Street
New York, NY 10017

FRIENDS COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL LEGISLATION
245 Second Street, N.E.
Washington, DC 20002

FUND FOR PEACE
1865 Broadway
New York, NY 10023

INSTITUTE FOR WORLD ORDER
1140 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS
1730 M Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036

SANE
245 Second Street, N.E.
Washington, DC 20002

UNITED NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF THE USA
833 United Nations Plaza
New York, NY 10017

WAR RESISTERS LEAGUE
339 Lafayette Street
New York, NY 10012

WOMEN STRIKE FOR PEACE
637 West 127 Street
New York, NY 10027

WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE FOR PEACE AND FREEDOM,
U.S. SECTION
1 North 13 Street
Philadelphia, PA 19107

WORLD FEDERALISTS, U.S.A.
2029 K Street N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
WORLD WITHOUT WAR COUNCIL OF THE U.S.
1730 Grove Street
Berkeley, CA  94709
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RESOURCES

The following are lists of people and print resources that should prove valuable in learning more about the various focuses, issues, and approaches in campus and community-based mediation.

Print Resources


"An Integrated Academic/Court Mediation Project for Western Massachusetts," Legal Studies Department, University of Massachusetts/Amherst, 1980.


"Conciliation Programs at Colleges and Universities: Adaptation of Community Boards to Meet Campus Needs," Maria Sakovich, (San Francisco: Community Board Center for Policy and Training, October, 1983).


Houston, Texas Dispute Intake and Referral Center, Multi-Door Dispute Resolution Center, November, 1984.


"Legal Implications of Mediation," Frederick E. Snyder, Perspective, Fall/Winter, 1979, pp. 15-17.


"Mediation at Oberlin," George Langeler, presented at ACPA, Baltimore, Maryland, April, 1984.


Negotiation Mediation, Christopher W. Moore, (Denver: Center for Dispute Resolution, 1983).


People Resources for Mediation Training

Center for Collaborative Problem Solving
2822 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94109

Center for Community Justice
918 16th Street, N.W., Suite 503
Washington, DC 20006

Center for Dispute Resolution
430 West Ninth Avenue
Denver, CO 80302

Center for Mediation in Higher Education
American Arbitration Association
140 West 51st Street, 10th floor
New York, NY 10020
Children's Hearing Project  
99 Bishop Allen Drive  
Cambridge, MA 02139

Community Board Center for Policy and Training  
149 Ninth Street  
San Francisco, CA 94103

Community Relations Service  
Department of Justice  
5550 Friendship Boulevard  
Chevy Chase, MD 20815

Conflict Management Resources, Inc.  
61 West 62nd Street  
New York, NY 10023

Crime and Justice Foundation  
19 Temple Place  
Boston, MA 02108

Dispute Resolution Center  
1106 James Hall  
Brooklyn College  
Brooklyn, NY 11210

Dispute Services  
Oklahoma State University  
Stillwater, OK 74078

Institute for Mediation and Conflict Resolution  
49 East 68th Street  
New York, NY 10021

Interaction Associates, Inc.  
185 Berry Street, Suite 150  
San Francisco, CA 94107

124 Mount Auburn Street  
Cambridge, MA 02138

Mediation Trainers and Consultants of Boston  
45 Fendal Avenue  
Dorchester, MA 02124

National Center for Collaborative Planning and Community Services  
P.O. Box 1080  
Montpelier, VT 05602
Neighborhood Justice Center of Atlanta
1118 Euclid Avenue N.E.
Atlanta, GA 30307

Neighborhood Justice Center of Honolulu
1270 Emma Street, #402
Honolulu, HI 96813

The Center for Dispute Settlement, Inc.
67 Chestnut Street
Rochester, NY 14604

U/Mass Mediation Project
University of Massachusetts
425 Amity Street
Amherst, MA 01002

Urban Court Mediation
138 Templeton Street
Dorchester, MA 02124

*Reprinted (with permission of Dr. Janet Rifkin for use in this dissertation) from:
APPENDIX E

STUDY RESULTS
### FREQUENCIES TABLES

#### LIBERAL OR CONSERVATIVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIBCON</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONSERVATIVE</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### COLLEGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U OF COLORADO</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTSU</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMU</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORNELL</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>70.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U OF IOWA</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>86.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### DEPT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPT</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LAW</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIOLOGY</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTHROPOLOGY</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POL SCIENCES</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>61.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>81.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS ADM</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CLASSIFICATION OF AGE GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE GP</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNDER 40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVER 50</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CLASSIFICATION OF DEPT. SIZE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNDER 8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVER 15</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FREQUENCIES TABLES

#### CLASSIFICATION OF COM. SERVICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICE</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LESS THAN 1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>57.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>85.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>96.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 OR MORE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FREQUENCIES TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>55.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>59.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>70.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>77.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>79.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>82.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>84.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>91.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>92.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>93.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>94.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>96.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>97.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CLASSIFICATION OF ADR TRAINING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRAIN</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 OR LESS</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>77.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>90.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>94.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 OR MORE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FREQUENCIES TABLES

CONFLICT IS RISING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S AGREE</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO OPINION</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>83.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>98.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S DISAGREE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GOOD IDEA TO TEACH ADR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S AGREE</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO OPINION</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>73.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>98.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S DISAGREE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PUBLICATION ON ADR FOR PRESTIGEous

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S AGREE</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO OPINION</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>90.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>98.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S DISAGREE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SET UP A CENTER ON CAMPUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S AGREE</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO OPINION</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>83.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S DISAGREE</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>95.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FREQUENCIES TABLES

**CENTRAL INFO. FOR ADR MATERIALS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A5</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S AGREE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO OPINION</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>96.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S DISAGREE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WILLING TO PARTICIPATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A6</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S AGREE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO OPINION</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S DISAGREE</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IMPROVING PEACEMAKING SKILL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A7</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S AGREE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO OPINION</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>93.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>97.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S DISAGREE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INTEGRATIVE EXPANSION OF FIELD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A8</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S AGREE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO OPINION</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>97.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S DISAGREE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### LACK OF FUNDING IS MAJOR PROBLEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S AGREE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO OPINION</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>85.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>88.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S DISAGREE</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ADR WILL BE FOUND MORE IN UNION STATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S AGREE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO OPINION</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>82.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>94.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S DISAGREE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TEACHING ADR COURSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER FACULTY IS TEACHING ADR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FREQUENCIES TABLES
ADR RELATED COURSES OFFERED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GQ3</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>77.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HOW OFTEN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GQ4</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EACH SEM</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EACH YEAR</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVERY OTHER YRS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TAUGHT BY TENURED FACULTY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GQ5</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>59.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>96.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT SURE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADR A REQUIRED COURSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GQ6</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>96.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT SURE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FREQUENCIES TABLES

#### ADR A GRADUATE LEVEL COURSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GQ7</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>59.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>83.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT SURE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### FIRST BEGIN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GQ8</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DURING 70</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 TO 70</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>71.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DURING 80</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### REGULAR OFFERING IN THE FUTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GQ9</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>84.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT SURE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ANY RESEARCH ON ADR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GQ10</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>97.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT SURE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### GENDER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Analysis of Conflict Resolution Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dichotomy Label</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Pct of Responses</th>
<th>Pct of Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Analysis</td>
<td>V1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation</td>
<td>V2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>46.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbitration</td>
<td>V3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediation</td>
<td>V4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Bargaining</td>
<td>V5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>V6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses: 53 (100.0) 165.6

64 Missing Cases 32 Valid Cases
FACTOR ANALYSIS FOR ATTITUDE SCORES

INITIAL FACTOR METHOD: PRINCIPAL COMPONENTS

PRIOR COMMUNALITY ESTIMATES: ONE

EIGENVALUES OF THE CORRELATION MATRIX: TOTAL = 8 AVERAGE = 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.455717</td>
<td>0.845905</td>
<td>0.696119</td>
<td>0.645837</td>
<td>0.427700</td>
<td>0.395224</td>
<td>0.281946</td>
<td>0.241552</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIFFERENCE</td>
<td>3.09811</td>
<td>0.148737</td>
<td>0.050782</td>
<td>0.214137</td>
<td>0.032476</td>
<td>0.103274</td>
<td>0.050354</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPORTION</td>
<td>0.5570</td>
<td>0.1057</td>
<td>0.0970</td>
<td>0.0807</td>
<td>0.0535</td>
<td>0.0484</td>
<td>0.0365</td>
<td>0.0302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUMULATIVE</td>
<td>0.5570</td>
<td>0.6627</td>
<td>0.7497</td>
<td>0.8304</td>
<td>0.8838</td>
<td>0.9333</td>
<td>0.9668</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 FACTORS WILL BE RETAINED BY THE MINIMUM CRITERION

FACTOR PATTERN

FACTOR 1

A1 0.83930 CONFLICT IS RISING
A2 0.61280 GOOD IDEA TO TEACH ADR
A3 0.87189 PUBLICATION ON ADR FOR PRESTIGIOUS A4 0.77931 SET UP A CENTER ON CAMPUS
A5 0.82658 CENTRAL INFO FOR ADR MATERIALS
A6 0.60581 WILLING TO PARTICIPATE
A7 0.78570 IMPROVING, PLACEMAKING SKILLS
A8 0.75296 INTEGRATIVE EXPANSION OF FIELD

VARIANCE EXPLAINED BY EACH FACTOR

FACTOR 1

4.455717

FINAL COMMUNALITY ESTIMATES: TOTAL = 4.455717

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A3</th>
<th>A4</th>
<th>A5</th>
<th>A6</th>
<th>A7</th>
<th>A8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.408706</td>
<td>0.600538</td>
<td>0.451443</td>
<td>0.607327</td>
<td>0.700026</td>
<td>0.443239</td>
<td>0.617325</td>
<td>0.566944</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTE: 1 OBS HAD MISSING VALUES
RESIDUAL PLOT

PLOT OF TRESID*OBSNUM  LEGEND: A = 1 OBS, B = 2 OBS, ETC.

NOTE: 6 OBS HAD MISSING VALUES
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