
Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019

2010

Addressing Anger Management In A Middle School Setting: Initiating A Leadership Drive Anger Management Group

Isaac Burt
University of Central Florida



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Find similar works at: <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd>

University of Central Florida Libraries <http://library.ucf.edu>

This Doctoral Dissertation (Open Access) is brought to you for free and open access by STARS. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019 by an authorized administrator of STARS. For more information, please contact STARS@ucf.edu.

STARS Citation

Burt, Isaac, "Addressing Anger Management In A Middle School Setting: Initiating A Leadership Drive Anger Management Group" (2010). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019*. 4237.

<https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd/4237>



University of
Central
Florida

STARS
Showcase of Text, Archives, Research & Scholarship

ADDRESSING ANGER MANAGEMENT IN A MIDDLE SCHOOL SETTING: INITIATING
A LEADERSHIP DRIVEN ANGER M ANAGEMENT GROUP

by

ISAAC BURT

B.A. University of Louisville, 1999
M.P.A. University of Louisville, 2001
M.Ed. University of Louisville, 2006

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Education
in the Department of Counselor Education
in the College of Education
at the University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Summer Term
2010

Major Professors: S. Kent Butler & Mark E. Young

© 2010 Isaac Burt

ABSTRACT

This study examined the effect of a leadership driven anger management group on angry middle school students. Twenty-five participants from a local middle school were nominated by school faculty to be participants in the study. Twenty individuals participated and eighteen completed the study. The eighteen participants were assessed at pre and post test on measures of anger, anger control and personal relationships. Three research questions were tested: (1) Does a short term leadership focused anger management group reduce youths' overall anger? (2) Does such a group increase angry youths' ability to control anger urges? (3) Does this group reduce youths' expressed anger towards others? Study results indicated that the leadership driven anger management participants showed a significant reduction in overall anger. Although participants in the study had a significant increase in anger control expressed outwardly (AC-O), they did not show a significant internal perception of an increase in anger control (AC-I). Furthermore, results indicated that participants showed significant reduction in their expressed outward anger in their relationships (AX-O), but did not show significant differences in their perception of expressed internal anger in relationships (AX-I). A discussion follows explaining the possible reasons for this discrepancy, as well as limitations, modified procedures, and implications for this study. Lastly, the study completes with recommendations for future research in the field of counseling and anger management.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to thank the Lord almighty who blessed me with not only the opportunity, but also the strength to pursue my Ph.D. I want to acknowledge all my brothers and sisters in MEA, so by name, Carla, Jessica, Jennifer, Vonda, Courtney, Sarah, Kristol, and T-Paul, you all are fine examples of what we are capable of accomplishing in life. Furthermore, you all are some of the most driven and educated people I have ever met. To the future doctors, Dr. Proctor and Dr. Daniels keep pressing on, you all are inspirations to me and I wish you nothing but the best. To the future Dr. Brown, you are absolutely one of the strongest and most determined people I have ever met. You are bound for success and greatness. I did appreciate greatly your calming personality during my defense. At times, I wondered how you were able to balance so much and go through the program so fast. Amazing! To all my Holmes Scholars, past and present, I have mad love for each and every one of you all. We are some of the best, and every time one of us graduates, that is another step for equality and fairness.

I want to thank, especially Dr. Ngazembi, Dr. Nivishi, and my close friend, Dr. Shillingford. You women showed me not only care and concern, but also a friendship that I will never forget and cherish! To the future Dr. Gonzalez, thanks for having an open ear and being a calming influence when I was about to lose it. You are one of the reasons I am even able to write this acknowledgment. You know what I mean! To my magic brownie brother, Dr. Patel, I have nothing but respect and admiration for you. You preserved when many others would have quit and gave up. You truly went through hardships and I know you are going to shine in the field. I wish you and your family the best. Dr. Lewis, the future Dr. McCloud and Dr. Johnson, I appreciate your support through this process. To my cohort, I cannot say that I see eye to eye

with you all, but going through the last three years with you all has opened my eyes to a cultural awareness that I would have otherwise never been privy too. I hope to use those experiences as fuel for making changes in the field.

I want to thank my church family at Mount Lebanon, I know that you all have prayed for me, and I have never forgotten you. I am blessed to have you all in my life. Last, but definitely not least, none of this would have been possible without the loving support of the people who have been with me since the very beginning, my family and my boys. Mom, you are the single greatest person I have ever known and without you, I would not be the person that I am today. Words cannot describe the love I have for you and the sacrifices you made to allow me to get here. To my sister Tiandra, I am so proud of you! You have grown up and matured. I have to say that it is amazing. You give unconditionally, and when times were rough, the thought that I had you and Mom as support was sometime the only thing that keep me going. Thank you for being you. To my boys, Rasaan, Carlos (Da Don Dada), thanks for being there, brother. I vented to you all so much I felt like I should have paid for counseling sessions! But you know what? It paid off.....this cat from the 'ville made it! Yeah! Now on to NYC! Tu sabes, las mujeres que se parecen a Stacy Dash, cuidado ahora! Voy a ir a Nueva York!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	x
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Statement of the Problem	4
Unfair Socialization Practices	4
Social Evaluations	5
Lack of Prosocial Skill Building	5
Rationale.....	6
Social Cognitive Theory.....	6
Leadership and SCT	8
Purpose and Significance of the Problem	10
Theoretical Framework	11
Operational Definition of Leadership	12
Intentionality.....	12
Forethought and Self-Reactiveness	13
Self-Reflectiveness	13
Description of Intervention.....	14
Conceptual Framework	14
Instrumentation.....	14
Triadic Reciprocal Determini sm.....	15
Research Questions	17
Research Hypothesis	17
Operational Definitions of Anger	18
Summary	18
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW.....	20
Aggression in Schools.....	20
Lack of Prosocial Skill Building	21
Characteristics of Angry Youth.....	24
Adolescents and Aggression	25
Need for Prosocial Environments.....	26
Social Evaluations	27

Processes of Social Evaluations	28
Environments in Which Social Evaluations Occur	30
Power of Social Evaluations.....	31
Social Cognitive Theory and Leadership Development	33
Validity and Effectiveness of SCT	34
Triadic Reciprocal Determinism	36
Agentic Perspective of Social Cognitive Theory	37
Purposes of the Agentic Perspective	39
Self-Efficacy and the Agentic Perspective	39
Modes of Agency.....	40
Modeling.....	41
Socialization	43
Interventions.....	44
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY	53
Purpose of the Study	53
Research Questions and Hypotheses.....	54
Institutional Review Board Approval	55
Research Design.....	55
Participants	56
Group Facilitator.....	57
Informed Consent and Confidentiality Procedures	58
Instrumentation.....	59
Reliability and Validity	61
Procedures	62
Purposeful Selection of Older Students.....	63
Division of Participants into Groups	63
Dependent Variables	64
Independent Variable	65
Structure of LAMG	66
Description of LAMG.....	67
Leadership as defined by the Agentic Perspective.....	68
Data Analysis	69

CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS	71
Demographics of the Population Sample	72
Data Analysis Results.....	76
Research Question One	77
Research Question Two.....	78
Research Question Three.....	80
Summary	82
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION.....	83
Overview	83
Limitations	84
Limitations from Research Methods	84
School and Language Limitations	85
Limitations of Gender.....	86
Limitations of Population Sample	88
Limitations of Voluntary Participants	89
Limitations from Research Design	91
Lack of Control Group	91
Internal Threats to Validity.....	93
Pretest Sensitization and Mortality.....	93
External Threats to Validity	95
Experimenter effects.....	95
Participant Effects.....	96
Summary and Interpretation of Results.....	97
Research Question One	97
Research Question Two.....	98
Research Question Three.....	100
Modified Procedures	103
Within-Subject Designs.....	105
Efficacy of Within-Subject Designs	105
Requirements for Within-Subject Designs	106
Implications for Counseling	108
Implications for Counselors.....	108

Implications for Schools	109
Implications for Future Research	110
Implications for Research Gap	111
Implications for Working with Underserved Populations.....	112
Recommendations for Researchers Working with Underserved Populations.....	113
Summary	114
CONCLUSION.....	115
APPENNDIX A: IRB APPROVAL LETTER	117
APPENNDIX B: PRINCIPAL LETTER SIGNED.....	119
APPENDIX D: INFORMED CONSENT	121
APPENDIX F: DESCRIPTION OF BEHAVIORAL ACTIVITIES AND LESSONS	139
REFERENCES	147

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Description of Participants by Gender, Ethnicity and Age Pre-intervention.....	73
Table 2 Description of Participants by Gender, Ethnicity and Age Post-intervention	73
Table 3 Level of Participant’s Overall Anger Pre-Intervention.....	75
Table 4 Level of Participant’s Overall Anger Post Intervention	76
Table 5 Descriptive Statistics for Pretest and Posttest for AE-I.....	77
Table 6 Paired Sample T-Test for AE-I.....	78
Table 7 Descriptive Statistics for Pretest and Posttest for AC-O	79
Table 8 Paired Sample T-Test for AC-O	80
Table 9 Descriptive Statistics for Pretest and Posttest for AC-I.....	80
Table 10 Paired Sample T-Test for AC-I.....	80
Table 11 Descriptive Statistics for Pretest and Posttest for AX-O	81
Table 12 Paired Sample T-Test for AX-O.....	81
Table 13 Descriptive Statistics for Pretest and Posttest for AX-I.....	82
Table 14 Paired Sample T-Test for AX-I	82

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Aggression in schools has increased substantially within the past ten years (USDOE [US Department of Education], 2000). This increase has led to the widespread implementation of anger management groups (AMGs) in order to reduce aggressive behavior (Deffenbacher, et al., 1996; Galambos & Leadbeater, 2000; Grunbaum, et al., 2004). Historically, AMGs assisted counselors and administrative staff in identifying and supporting students most likely to have anger problems (Kellner, Bry, & Salvador, 2008). AMGs primarily dealt with offenders, while neglecting the environment in which the behavior occurs (Serin, Gobeil, & Peterson, 2009). As a result, a potentially negative social milieu manifests due to this environmental negligence. For example, non-attacked students may fear for their safety, thus affecting academic progress (Dahir & Stone, 2009).

Academic progress suffers when a student repeatedly worries about physical security and cannot concentrate in class (Ward & Dockerill, 1999). Excessive worry and lack of concentration in the classroom can stem from a number of sources. These sources are, but are not limited to the following: (1) The threat of having to ward off a bully or fighting others, (2) Called upon from administrative staff to substantiate another student's claims of victimization or (3) Feeling that retribution from other students will come due to substantiating students' claims of victimization. Frey et al. (2005) labels this phenomenon of students' excessive worry and lack of concentration as indirect victimization. It is indirect stemming from students suffering, although they may not be the actual person bullied or physically/mentally harmed. Through indirect victimization, anger extends and affects more than a single student bullied or threatened (Frey, et, al., 2005; Lorion,

2000). According to Feder (2007), the impact of aggressive behavior is a public health problem faced by schools and all of society. Thus, there is a push for schools to reduce aggression and build a more positive social environment as well as deal with aggressive students (Burt, Lewis, & Patel, 2010).

Current literature indicates AMGs need to emphasize effective prosocial abilities such as leadership in order to reduce aggression and improve relationships (Bandura, 2008a; Kellner, et al., 2008). By improving prosocial abilities, angry youths can experience better relationships with peers and adults (Hawley, Little, & Card, 2007). An emphasis on healthy relationships is paramount with angry youth, as relationships affect the way they see themselves (Orpinas, Horne, & Staniszewski, 2003). For instance, healthy relationships with reduced anger allow youth to better problem solve conflict when problems do emerge (Blanton, Christensen, & Shakir, 2006). Twemlow and Sacco (1998) state that if angry youth can begin positive, healthy relationships, a reduction in aggression can follow.

AMGs stress strict behavioral strategies, while largely ignoring relationships affecting behavior. Yet research by Orpinas and Horne (2004) for example, suggest behavioral change cannot occur until relationships change systemically within a school environment. According to these researchers, students do need to curb aggression but also peers and adults must modify their perception of angry youth. Bandura (2008b) affirms that behavioral observation and role models plays a significant part in determining youth behavior. Thus, it is imperative that school staff display desired behavior through their actions, using effective modeling (Pajares, 2006). For instance, some schools routinely and quickly suspend disruptive youth for acting out (Curtis, Van Horne, Robertson, & Karvonen, 2010). Without contemplating alternatives, the implicit

message is that quick, snap judgments are the best ways of dealing with problems (Burt, Patel, Butler, & Gonzalez, 2010). Additionally, these actions imply to youth that there are no alternative strategies to standard ways of thinking (Burt & Butler, 2010).

Counselors working in schools conducting AMGs encounter socially maladaptive aggressive youth frequently (Deffenbacher, et al., 1996). Past research suggested students comprising AMGs had a number of negative social characteristics. One of the most frequent assumptions was that students came from broken or single parent homes with low socio-economic backgrounds (Sullivan, 2000). Although many may come from that type of background, this perception is limited. Thus, it does not encompass the various and complex situations from which aggression may occur (Finn & Willert, 2006). The one commonality amongst most participants in AMGs, however, is that these students are angry, easily frustrated and lack prosocial skills (Grunbaum et al., 2004).

Grunbaum et al., (2004) states that due to frustration experienced by angry students, teachers, counselors, and peers alike frequently misunderstand and reject angry youth. People make assumptions, and treat them in accordance with their negative stereotypes (Deffenbacher, et al., 1996). An example is a student that has been marked as being a bad or problematic student. Once identified, he/she may receive treatment commensurate with the label (Piquero, 2008). Labeled and ostracized by people within his/her environment, the adolescent may act out, and become an angry student that plays up or down to the expectations of others (Rosenthal, 1985). Social consequences stemming from acting out are socially derogative labels such as bad/problematic that emerge and brand the youth as substandard. This message becomes a critical negative social label to the young person (Bandura, 1997). The social message conferred

is “do not expect much from your efforts”, and that a lifestyle corresponding with the label is the only option (Bandura, 1989; Constantine et al., 2007).

Statement of the Problem

Unfair Socialization Practices

A defining characteristic that angry youth have are that they encounter problems in school settings (Shek & Wai, 2008). These problems may partially stem from unfair socialization based on race, culture, religion or socio-economic status (Bandura, 1997; Constantine, et al., 2007). According to Hawkins, Catalano, and Miller (1992), angry youth come from various backgrounds, but experience similar problems. Common difficulties experienced are as follows: (a) low socio-economic status, (b) high accessibility to weapons, (c) experience inadequate academic preparation, (d) poor familial relations, and (e) experience with negative role models. These impediments mentioned correspond with Fondacaro and Weinberg’s (2002) findings. Fondacaro and Weinberg further assert that some institutions inadvertently label youth as angry.

Fondacaro and Weinberg (2002), state that societal establishments do not allocate power equally and label youth based on a number of characteristics. In some social settings, labeling stems from immigrant status, race or socioeconomic level. Society relegates these youth to subordinate roles, and treat them accordingly (Bandura, 1989). Succinctly stated, society reacts to these individuals based on collectively created and given social roles (Lerner, 1982). Stemming from this, there needs to be a solution that modifies the environment and proffers new societal roles (Bandura, 2001).

Social Evaluations

Bandura (1997) suggests that social evaluations dictate how youth feel about their behavioral self-efficacy and abilities. Research indicates that social evaluations and environmental conditions influence youth substantially (Bandura, 2008a, 2008b, 2009; Rosenthal, 1985). Social and environmental risk factors such as negative role models, low socio-economic status, and access to weapons combine to cause excessive stress and problems (Roysicar, 2009). This combination of factors causes some adolescents to act out and engage in aggressive acts (Hawkins, Catalano, & Miller, 1992). Yet traditional AMG's have neglected social/environmental factors in favor of focusing solely on an individual's anger (Kellner, 2001; Kellner, et al., 2008; Shek & Wai, 2008). Recent studies (Dwivedi & Gupta, 2000; Finn & Willert, 2006; Kellner, et al., 2008; Serin et al., 2009) have suggested adjustments to current AMGs. These recommendations were to: (a) incorporate environmental factors such as peers, teachers and family into the curriculum; (b) stop reliance on affective tactics that focus on high behavioral control; and (c) integrate prosocial skill building such as leadership development.

Lack of Prosocial Skill Building

According to Kellner, Bry, and Salvador (2008), very few studies have explored the effect of prosocial skill building and social evaluations on aggressive youth behavior. They claim dearth of research investigating the impact of prosocial skills and social evaluations in AMGs. Furthermore, Kellner et al., (2008), state, "relative gaps in knowledge have been mechanisms of change in anger management programs" (p. 217). The intent of this study was to begin to fill the gap and advocate for a leadership driven AMG (LAMG). Therefore, this study's purpose was to integrate leadership principles and AMG strategies together. By blending the two, it may help

angry youth in developing leadership roles in the classroom. Potentially this development of prosocial abilities and positive social evaluations will assist in reducing youths' anger. For instance, lack of positive social evaluations, according to Pullis (1994) can influence angry youth in a number of ways. First, angry youth may interact with the environment and people through aggressive acts and behavior, such as fighting. Second, angry youth may go into social isolation and refuse to communicate with adults and peers. Third, angry youth may refuse to do academic work and as a result, academic progression suffers (Dahir & Stone, 2009). Fourth, angry youth may engage in aggressive acts in order to gain attention. All of the preceding factors combine to place youth at a distinctly poor social disadvantage (Lindsay, 2001). Complicating matters is that positive role models for youths falling into this category might be small. Thus, youth may only have negative influences to base their behavior on in schools and in the community (Burt & Butler, 2010). In the next section, a discussion on social cognitive theory (SCT) as a valid theoretical foundation on which to base a LAMG begins.

Rationale

Social Cognitive Theory

SCT is one of the most thoroughly researched and empirically based theories in the behavioral sciences (Cara, et al., 2006; Bandura, 2001; Martin, 2004). According to Rice and Dolgin (2005), SCT is critical in understanding the development of youth. For instance, modeling, reinforcement and self-efficacy are instrumental concepts not only in SCT, but also in comprehending the behavior and nature of angry adolescents.

Bandura, Ross, and Ross (1961a) state that anger is more than simple biological urges and impulses, but environmental factors such as role models plays a significant part. Included in anger are personal factors (cognition and emotion) that interact with behavior and environment. Through a triadic interaction between behavior, personal factors and environment, anger is created, developed, and expressed (Bandura, 1986). SCT addresses all three of these factors in a holistic theory stating that each influences one another, in varying magnitudes (Bandura, 2009). An example of how SCT addresses anger is in the following scenario: A youth may have a biological predisposition for anger (personal factors). However, a strong, receptive and warm environment that stresses non-aggressive conflict resolution may reduce anger (Coopersmith, 1967). A non-aggressive environment has individuals that successfully model how to handle conflicts positively. Consequently, youth's angry thoughts and emotions potentially decrease due to the influence of a non-aggressive environment and positive role models (Bandura, Ross, & Ross, 1961b).

SCT's holistic approach takes into consideration the number of influences that affect angry behavior, and stresses the importance of each (Orpinas & Horne, 2004). In fact, Kellner et al.'s (2008) research states that a holistic approach is missing in existing AMGs. Orpinas and Horne (2004) recommend that without understanding anger as a whole, behavior change is not sustainable. This corresponds with Day (2004), who suggests that holistic, contemporary behavior therapies like SCT are very effective with angry youth. Bandura (2008a) espouses that in addition to holistically understanding anger, developing leadership gives youth purpose, direction, and meaning in life.

Leadership and SCT

Developing leadership parallels the growth and development process of adolescence (Avolio, Walumbwa, & Weber, 2009). In order for maturation to occur, youth require experiential experiences that stimulate growth and development (Strom & Strom, 2009). Both leadership and developmental models promote experiential learning in their conceptual frameworks (Zimmerman & Cleary, 2006). Furthermore, similarities between leadership and youth developmental concepts are numerous, such as autonomy, dependence, and rebellion (Havinghurst, 1972; Selman, 1980; Vygotsky, 1978).

SCT suggests that when youth are involved in leadership programs they are in constant movement and fluctuate between growth and development (Bandura, 2001). According to Selman (1980), adolescent development mirrors the fluctuation seen in leadership development programs. Moreover, similar to leadership programs, adolescents grow by placement with another who is more skilled in particular areas (Bronfenbrenner, 1987). An example of placement is angry youths' association with a teacher, mentor, or adult role model in which new skills or social roles are learned. Thus, SCT research indicates that leadership is a vital concept when working with angry youth.

Research in SCT indicates that increased self-efficacy is a major contributor to a number of positive behavioral outcomes in individuals, especially angry youth. For instance, improved academic self-efficacy is associated with increasing struggling students' mathematical skills (Schunk, 1989). Carroll and Bandura (1990) found that increasing athletic self-efficacy corresponded with an increase of complex physical abilities in athletes. Conversely, when self-efficacy is low, there is a significant reduction in gains/improvements made among athletic

competitors (Lindsley, Brass, & Thomas, 1995). Socially, self-efficacy improves career exploration maturity with youth and assists in ability to manage conflict at work and with family (Duffy & Lent, 2008; Hennessy & Lent, 2008). For angry youth, an increase in perceived self-efficacy can lead to the prosocial development of leadership, positive directions, and purpose (Bandura, 1986; Bandura, 2009). However, if angry youth demonstrate a high degree of self-efficacy for aggression, these youth readily resort to anger to get what they want from others.

When angry youth have a high sense of self-efficacy for aggressive means, these youth react hostilely to situations that others feel are innocuous (Bandura, 1986). Angry youth interact with others aggressively, and use aggressive methods to resolve difficulties. Bandura (1986) states that “the development of personal efficacy in coercive styles of behavior permits easy control over others, it is estranging in ways that can lead down a transgressive life path” (p. 174). Bandura believes that angry youth need to increase their efficacy in prosocial ways of resolving problems, which includes decreasing coercive styles of behavior. Orpinas and Horne (2004) agree with Bandura, and recommend angry youth need to increase prosocial self-efficacy. Bandura (2008b), Zimmerman and Cleary (2006) and Martin (2004) all suggest that an increase in perceived efficacy can decrease anger, improve leadership, and advance academic functioning. Accordingly, SCT has substantial research evidencing its legitimacy as a valid tool to use with angry youth. Whether in decreasing anger, increasing perceived efficacy, or in leadership development, SCT is imperative with youth (Pajares, 2006). Thus improving leadership should result in higher self-efficacy and lowered anger.

Purpose and Significance of the Problem

The purpose of this quantitative study was to determine whether youth who participate in a leadership driven anger management group (LAMG) have a reduction in anger, increase in anger control, and better personal relationships. The intent of this design was to assess if an eight-week school based LAMG was effective with angry middle school students. The State Trait Anger Expression Inventory 2nd Edition (STAXI-2) assessed youth pre and posttest. The study also attempted to enhance AMGs by providing empirical evidence for a leadership driven method utilizing concepts from SCT. Potentially this novel approach lends itself to assisting adolescents with anger issues. Cooper, Lutenbacher, and Faccia (2000) claim some AMGs have dubious results generalizing reductions in anger outside of the treatment setting. Due to these unclear results, they state that these AMGs are not adequately meeting the needs of participants. The direction this study took was that the influence of a LAMG would assist in reducing aggressive behavior in adolescents. As a result, the changes made in behavior would generalize to other areas outside the treatment setting.

This study involved a public middle school who provided the participants for this investigative research. The public middle school serves approximately 2,000 students and includes grades 6th-8th. The school, through in school suspension (ISS) and out of school suspension (OSS) records, behavioral referrals, report cards, teachers', professional school counselors' and psychologists' recommendations, nominated students who displayed significantly higher rates of anger and less prosocial skills than peers.

Theoretical Framework

Blanton, Christensen, and Shakir (2006) postulate that developing leadership skills allows youth to problem solve, communicate, and cooperate with others better. Their postulations draw from Bandura (1986), who stated that personal control allows for a sense of certainty and an ability to shape life events in a way that is productive. In most cases, adolescents give proxy control to parents, administrators, and other adults. Therefore, youth may develop a sense of helplessness that can stifle youths' sense of self-efficacy, leadership and development (Seligman, 1991).

In order to prevent learned helplessness, Neisser (1976) suggests that counselors need to support youths' personal expectations, beliefs, and goals. He further states that if supported, adolescents' potential for social confidence may increase. Increasing social confidence gives form and direction to youths' behavior that can buffer against negative influences (e.g. social evaluations) that impede positive behavior. Thus, it is imperative for counselors to support youth not only behaviorally, but socially as well. Similar to Neisser, Bandura (1986) advocates that social confidence gives form and direction to behavior, but adds that environment is influential. Specifically, he believes cognition (social confidence), behavior, and environment interact and influence one another. Bandura labeled this triadic interaction as reciprocal determinism. A bi-directional influence exists between the three, as each affects the other in varying magnitudes. An example of how cognition (personal factors), behavior and environment interact is in the following excerpt taken from Bandura's (1997) book on self-efficacy:

Efficacious people are quick to take advantage of opportunity structures and figure out ways to circumvent institutional constraints or change them by collective action.

Conversely, inefficacious people are less apt to exploit the enabling opportunities provided by the social system and are easily discouraged by institutional impediments.

(p. 6)

Developing leadership skills has the potential to immerse youth in an environment that positively affects their beliefs of self-efficacy and personal expectations (Bandura, 1986).

Furthermore, Bandura promotes the idea that a change in self-efficacy needs support by a rich social milieu, incorporating a high degree of positive modeling, social influence and tutoring. For angry youth conditioned not to believe in their abilities, a rich social milieu can assist in improving beliefs of control over their environment. Thus, these youth may be more readily able to overcome institutional constraints or impediments placed on them. Some AMG, although therapeutically helpful, lack a rich social milieu. Consequently, these AMG neglect the importance of social support for participants in the program (Orpinas & Horne, 2004).

Operational Definition of Leadership

Intentionality

The leadership method of this study utilized concepts from the agentic perspective of SCT. Operationally defined, the agentic perspective is a person or group of people that intentionally influences one's own functioning and other environmental events (Bandura, 2008a). According to the agentic perspective, once a person or group acts intentionally, they are an active determinant (Bandura, 1986). When a person acts as an active determinant, they purposively shape the environment to better suit their needs, as well as for others (Bandura, 1997). In the agentic perspective, there are four fundamental components. They are as follows: (a)

intentionality, (b) forethought, (c) self-reactiveness (self-regulation), and (d) self-reflection. Intentionality focuses on a leader's active plans and implemented strategies to attain goals and objectives. In intentionality, a leader must negotiate and mediate with others in order to accomplish tasks. In order for a group to obtain goals, intentionality must be a joint or collaborative effort (Bandura, 2008a). Thus, group intentionality requires a shared commitment between members. Additionally, group intentionality requires leaders to work systematically through interdependent plans to achieve goals.

Forethought and Self-Reactiveness

Forethought entails more than simply thinking about future oriented plans. In forethought, leaders set goals and anticipate the outcomes likely to come from their strategies. With forethought, leaders should be able to direct and predict their moves preemptively (Bandura, 2008b). In the agentic perspective, forethought gives purpose, direction, and coherence to decision making. According to Bandura, (2008a) self-reactiveness, or self-regulation, builds upon intentionality and forethought. Self-reactiveness includes not only being deliberate in decision-making, but also being able to constructively self-motivate and regulate oneself in executing the steps necessary in the decision making process.

Self-Reflectiveness

The fourth component, self-reflectiveness, states that leaders are not just thinkers, decision makers, and agents of acting. Bandura (2008a) states that leaders should self-examine their own functioning. Through self-reflectiveness, leaders reflect on their efficacy in judgments, soundness of decision-making, as well as the meaning of goals/objectives. If there is disconnect,

leaders, through self-reflection, can make corrections as needed (Bandura, 2006). In SCT, the ability to reflect on actions and thoughts is the most critical principle of the agentic perspective. In order for adolescents to develop the ability to self-reflect, socialization plays a significant part (Bandura, 2008a).

Description of Intervention

The intervention utilized in this study is a LAMG (leadership driven anger management group). The intervention is comprised of eight core counseling sessions, and two paperwork sessions (one pre-session and final paper work session). Program duration was ten weekly sessions. Each core session contained four integral parts, as suggested by Blanton, Christensen, and Shakir (2006). First, there was an (1) opening question, followed by (2) a behavioral lesson (leadership/agentic practice), (3) a behavioral activity (leadership/agentic practice), and lastly, (4) appreciations and closings (leadership/agentic practice). More detailed information regarding the specificity of opening questions, behavioral lessons, and activities are in the appendix section of this study. Each core counseling session lasted between 45-60 minutes. Opening questions took approximately 5-10 minutes, behavioral lessons lasted between 10- 25 minutes, behavioral activities ranged from 15-30 minutes, and appreciations and closing took 5-10 minutes. Pre-session and paperwork sessions took approximately 15-30 minutes to complete.

Conceptual Framework

Instrumentation

This study used the STAXI-2 as an outcome measure. According to Spielberger (1999), the STAXI-2 is a behavioral ratings tool utilized to assess overall anger, anger control and anger

expression with others. The STAXI-2 contains several scales, such as the Anger Expression Index (AX Index), Anger Control In (AC-I), Anger Control Out (AC-O), Anger Expression In (AX-I) and Anger Expression Out (AX-O). All five levels are measures of anger that provide a diversified view of youths' behavioral functioning. According to Spielberger (1999), the STAXI-2 assists in accurately identifying anger and emotional problems. Additionally, the STAXI-2 is multidimensional in that it measures multiple levels of anger. These various levels include positive and negative elements, encompassing adaptive and clinical dimensions (Spielberger, 1999). These domains, used with individuals ages 9-18, provide clinicians with detailed information for clinical assessment and diagnosis. The behavior that the STAXI-2 measures (anger) is critical to know in order to reduce aggression in youth (Frey et al., 2005).

Triadic Reciprocal Determinism

Environment, personal factors, and behavior play a critical role in understanding anger with youths (Bandura, 1986). Each component affects the other, in varying magnitudes. Bandura (1986) labeled this phenomenon as triadic reciprocal determinism. Interventions attempting to decrease adolescent anger need to address each aspect, in order to be successful (Orpinas & Horne, 2004). Thus, for LAMGs to reduce youth aggression, techniques and strategies must effectively concentrate on reciprocal determinism. In LAMGs, strategies emphasize to youth the interaction of environment, personal factors, and behavior. For example, in LAMGs, youth focus on personal factors, such as their strengths and weaknesses. After focusing and seeing what areas are adequate and what needs improvement, youth are encouraged to identify strong points and areas of growth (Bryson, Crosby, & Bryson, 2009). Secondly, LAMGs' strategies deals with

environmental factors, as youth focus on external opportunities available, as well as external threats that may impede progression on objectives (Thompson & Strickland, 1987).

In LAMGs, youth are encouraged to understand how their anger affects not only them, but also people around them. By holistically realizing how their behavior affects others, self-awareness increases which can lead to leadership growth (Bandura, 2008a). Through a leadership-driven focus, there is an emphasis on environmental factors such as external opportunities and threats. In this process, external opportunities and threats are peers, adults and events in the environment that are either valuable resources or barriers in youths' lives (Bandura, 2006). The strategies in LAMGs do not identify all of youths' strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, or threats. However, the strategies identify the characteristics that are influential in obtainment of the goals and objectives set out by the adolescent. Therefore, action is set forth that influences the behavior of youth to accomplish goals. Corresponding with SCT, this action-oriented activity comprises the behavioral component of reciprocal determinism (Bandura, 2001).

In summary, research indicates a gap in the literature with AMG's ability to reduce anger in youth, increase youth's ability to control anger and decrease youth's expression of anger. Kellner et al. (2008), Shek and Wai (2008), and Langdon and Preble (2008) state that traditional AMGs lack prosocial components such as leadership that is needed to make the groups stronger. Burt, Lewis, and Patel (2010) recommend that AMGs need to focus on more than just high affective control strategies. They state that some AMGs emphasize affective control, at the expense of neglecting understanding how anger expresses with others in the environment. Additionally, in order for AMGs to provide better services for angry youth, a holistic focus is

required (Burt, Patel, Butler, & Gonzalez, 2010). There is a need for AMGs to develop strategies that decrease anger, increase anger control, and decrease anger expression with others (Burt et. al, 2010). Therefore, the intent of this study was to investigate the following three research questions in order to make a case for a LAMG with angry youth.

Research Questions

The three research questions this study seeks to answer are the following: (1) Does a short term LAMG have an influence on youths' overall aggressive behaviors? (2) Does a short term LAMG increase angry youths' ability to control aggressive urges? (3) Does a short term LAMG reduce youths' expressions of anger with others?

Research Hypothesis

In determining the effect of a LAMG on the behavior of aggressive youth, three research hypotheses were investigated.

H₁: A short term LAMG assists in reducing youths' overall anger ($p < .05$).

H₀: A short term LAMG has no effect on youths' overall anger ($p > .05$).

H₂: A short term LAMG increases angry youths' ability to control anger urges ($p < .05$).

H₀₂: A short term LAMG has no effect on angry youths' ability to control anger urges ($p < .05$).

H₃: A short term LAMG reduces youths' expression of anger with others ($p < .05$).

H₀₃: A short term LAMG has no effect on youths' expression of anger with others ($p < .05$).

Operational Definitions of Anger

This study addressed angry youth who were experiencing difficulties in school settings. These students had at least one of the following criteria: (1) behavioral disruptions in the classroom, (2) inability to control anger, and (3) poor social relationships with others.

(1). Aggressive behaviors are actions that inflict bodily harm, through hands, feet, or any body movement that incorporates external objects (such as a bat, chair, or bottle). This also includes verbal acts, such as yelling, curse words, or insults (Twemlow & Sacco, 1998).

(2). Inability to control anger is youths who are unable to control outward and inward manifestations of anger. Outwards manifestations include slamming doors and hitting others. Inward manifestations include an inability to control angry feelings or calm oneself down quickly (Spielberger, 1999).

(3). Poor relationships are relationships marked by aggression, lack of coping mechanisms when agitated by others, and inability to handle disagreements with others positively (Spielbrger, 1999).

Summary

The literature supports the need for AMGs that are clear, concise, and backed by research. This study constructed a leadership-driven anger management group as a modification to AMGs in order to assist youth in reducing anger, increasing anger control and reducing youths' expressions of anger with others. Some AMGs place a heavy emphasis on the symptoms of anger, rather than the behavior itself (Herrmann & McWhirter, 2003). As a result, major issues are unresolved, which stem from a variety of sources, such as an unresponsive

environment, low self-efficacy, and harmful social influences (Bandura, 2009). LAMGs potentially give counselors and school staff a comprehensive resource that draws upon the strengths of angry youth while addressing the sources that some AMGs neglect.

This study sought to reduce aggressive behaviors in adolescent students in a middle school setting utilizing a LAMG based on SCT. Specifically, this study's LAMG draws the operational definition of leadership from the agentic perspective of SCT (Bandura, 2001, 2006, 2008b). Leadership driven models have a number of behavioral benefits, such as increasing self-efficacy in youth (Bandura, 2006). Additionally, Bandura (2002) espouses that leadership-driven models provide behavioral benefits regardless of youths' societal, minority or cultural status. In LAMGs, a strength based approach accessing strengths and external opportunities is a fundamental tool. By accentuating strengths and weaknesses, this approach provides direction and purpose to decision making (Bryson, Crosby, & Bryson, 2009). If significant, AMGs may need modification in order to deal more productively with angry youths

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter argues that environmental influences such as social evaluations, modeling, and socialization are major contributors to aggressive behaviors (Frey et al., 2005). Additionally, this chapter will focus on the development of pro-social skills as an enhancement to anger management groups (Twemlow, Sacco, & Fonagy, 2008). Specifically, this chapter will address current and past research that states a case for developing leadership skills with angry individuals. First, discussion of aggression and the effect of anger on schools, bystanders and perpetrators begin the chapter. This discussion includes current terminology and the shift from the term anger management. Secondly, the negative societal impact of terms such as angry/aggressive on adolescents follows. Thirdly, the agentic perspective of social cognitive theory (SCT) explains the pragmatic basis for developing leadership skills in angry adolescents. The fourth part provides information on the importance of socialization and the type of environments influential with angry youth. Lastly, reviews of studies with aggressive youth in schools utilizing anger management groups end the chapter.

Aggression in Schools

Research indicates an increase in adolescent aggression the last ten years, specifically within schools (USDOE [US Department of Education], 2000). Feder (2007) suggests that recent school shootings were the result of aggressive behavior (bullying). This increase in anger has led to widespread implementation of anger management groups (AMGs) in schools in order to stop problematic behavior (Deffenbacher, et al., 1996; Galambos & Leadbeater, 2000; Grunbaum, et., al 2004). Initially called AMGs, terminology has changed over the years. A trend went from

labeling anger reduction programs as anger management, to conflict resolution programs. However, the term school wide positive behavioral support (SWPBS) program is currently popular with administrative school officials (Curtis, Van Horne, Robertson, & Karvonen, 2010). In order to alleviate confusion, the current terminology, SWPBS will supplant past definitions of anger management for this chapter.

Historically, SWPBSs assisted counselors and administrative staff in identifying and supporting students most likely to have anger problems (Kellner, Bry, & Salvador, 2008). SWPBSs primarily dealt with offenders, while neglecting the environment in which the behavior occurred (Serin, Gobeil, & Peterson, 2009). As a result, a potentially negative social milieu may manifest due to this environmental negligence. For example, non-attacked students may fear for their safety, thus affecting academic progression (Dahir & Stone, 2009; Ward & Dockerill, 1999). Through indirect victimization, anger extends and affects more than a single student that is bullied or threatened ((Frey, et, al., 2005; Lorion, 2000). According to Feder (2007), the impact of aggressive behavior is a public health problem faced by schools and all of society. Thus, there is a push for schools to reduce aggression and build a more positive social environment (Burt, Lewis, & Patel, 2010).

Lack of Prosocial Skill Building

Current literature indicates that SWPBSs need to emphasize effective prosocial abilities such as leadership in order to reduce aggression and improve relationships (Bandura, 2008a; Kellner et al., 2008). By improving prosocial abilities, angry youths can experience better relationships with peers and adults (Hawley, Little, & Card, 2007). An emphasis on healthy

relationships is paramount with angry youth, as relationships affect the way youth see themselves and their behavior (Orpinas, Horne, & Staniszewski, 2003). For instance, Twemlow and Sacco (1998), state that when angry youth begin positive, healthy relationships with others, a reduction in aggression follows.

SWPBSs conversely, stress strict behavioral strategies, while largely ignoring relationships that affect behavior. Orpinas and Horne (2004) suggest that behavioral change cannot occur until relationships change systemically within a school environment. For example, Orpinas and Horne state that not only do students need to curb aggression, but also peers and adults need to modify their perception of youth with anger issues. Bandura (2008b) affirms that behavioral observation and role modeling plays a significant part in determining youth behavior. Thus, it is imperative that school staff display desired behavior through their own actions, using effective modeling (Pajares, 2006). For instance, some schools routinely and quickly suspend disruptive youth for acting out (Curtis et al., 2010). Without contemplating viable alternatives, the message implicitly suggested to youth is that quick, snap judgments are the norm (Burt, Patel, Butler, & Gonzalez, 2010). Additionally, this belief implies to youth that there are no alternative strategies to standard ways of thinking (Burt & Butler, 2010).

Impact of Aggressive Behavior on Youth

Sullivan (2000), states that suspending students as the sole method for correcting aggressive behavior is problematic for youth and schools. For instance, youth associate acting up as not simply having a bad day or passionately disagreeing with others. Conversely, youth correlate acting up as part of their personality that results in a form of adolescence incarceration (Twemlow et al., 2008). In schools, adolescent incarceration is normally in school suspension

(ISS) or out of school suspension (OSS). Through these prison-like types of disciplinary action, schools could unknowingly be creating a self-fulfilling prophecy (Rosenthal, 1985) for youth. For some, a negative self-fulfilling prophecy may limit youths' perspective, feed negative self-efficacy and relegate them to a desolate future (Bandura, 1997).

In many schools, ISS and OSS is a type of institutional punishment (Sullivan, 2000). Taken from strict behavioral management standards, punishment rarely makes behaviors disappear (Leff, Power, Manz, Costigan, & Nabors, 2001). Thus, anger is a school wide problem that affects students, teachers, principals and counselors alike (Orpinas & Horne, 2004). All four must work together to systemically transform the environment in which anger occurs. Dahir and Stone (2009) stress that in the present atmosphere of high accountability schools have a decision to make. Students, teachers, administrators, and counselors all need to evaluate their role in being a part of either the solution or problem.

Research indicates that if schools are not successful in reducing aggression, alternatives such as residential facilities may be the next logical step (Twemlow et al., 2008). However, long-term care such as residential homes is costly and dependent on government funding and taxes (Twemlow & Sacco, 1998). Additionally, research indicates dubious results for the effectiveness of residential treatments (Twemlow, Sacco, & Fonagy, 2008). Recent studies suggested relying solely on strict behavioral strategies and residential facilities may not be appropriate with angry persons (Kellner, et al., 2008; Serin et al., 2009; Twemlow et. al., 2008). Therefore, there needs to be an intervention that can assist individuals early, or augment existing programs once past the early intervention stage (Hawkins, Catalano, & Miller, 1992). Leff et al. (2001) suggested interventions with aggressive or angry persons might need to emphasize a prosocial/social

component. Without a prosocial aspect augmenting interventions, behavior may deteriorate rapidly for these individuals. Leff et al. further asserted that dearth of prosocial skills leads angry people to encounter problems in life due to an inability to communicate effectively with others.

Characteristics of Angry Youth

Counselors working in schools conducting SWPBSs encounter socially maladaptive aggressive youth frequently (Deffenbacher, et al., 1996). Past research suggested students comprising SWPBSs had a number of negative social characteristics. One of the most frequent assumptions was that students came from broken or single parent homes with low socio-economic backgrounds (Sullivan, 2000). Although many may come from that type of background, this perception is limited. Thus, it does not encompass the various and complex situations from which aggression may occur (Finn & Willert, 2006). The one commonality amongst most participants in SWPBSs, however, is that these students are angry, easily frustrated and lack prosocial skills (Grunbaum et al., 2004).

Grunbaum et al. (2004), state that due to frustration experienced by angry students, teachers, counselors, and peers alike frequently misunderstand the youth. From this misunderstanding, people assume negative dispositions about the youth, and treat them poorly (Deffenbacher, et al., 1996). An example is a student that has been marked as being a bad or problematic student. Once marked, he/she may receive treatment commensurate with the label (Piquero, 2008). Labeled and ostracized by people within his/her environment, the adolescent may act out, and become an angry student that plays up or down to the expectations of others (Rosenthal, 1985). Social consequences coming from acting out are socially derogative labels

such as bad/problematic that emerge and brand the youth as substandard. This message then articulates a critical negative social implication to the young person (Bandura, 1997). The social message conferred is do not expect much from your efforts, and there are few positive options available to them in life (Bandura, 1989; Constantine et al., 2007).

Adolescents and Aggression

According to Gottfredson, Gerstenblith, Soule, Womer, and Lu (2004), a rise in youth aggression occurs when adolescents receive negative social messages from others. Apsler (2009) substantiates Gottfredson et al. study, as well as suggesting additional findings. Apsler states that not only does youth aggression increase, but that behavior escalates between the hours of 2 p.m. and 6.p.m. This time corresponds with the period adolescents are out of school and have minimal to low adult supervision. Gottfredson et al. (2004) espoused that negative social messages and low adult supervision combine, resulting in youth aggression. Their work drew from Twemlow and Sacco (1998), who suggested that negative social evaluations, boredom, and lack of social support amalgamate, which may lead to youth aggression.

Britzman (2005), states that adolescents are engaging in an increasing number of aggressive activities that are affecting schools and communities. The Center for Disease Control (CDC) (2008) found similar results to Britzman in their exhaustive study. In CDC's study, 18 % of high school students admitted to carrying weapons, while 36% of students reported being in a physical fight within the past 30 days. Unfortunately, aggression is a behavior not relegated solely to high schools. The Institute of Education Sciences National Center For Education Statistics (2009), found staggering results regarding aggressive behaviors in schools. In 2007-

2008, 20.5 % of all surveyed primary schools reported that aggressive behaviors occurred several times a week. Middle schools suggested even larger numbers, with 43.5 % of schools surveyed stated that violent acts occur daily. Overall, 25.3 % of all schools surveyed suggested that daily or at the very least, weekly aggressive behaviors transpired. Additionally, this study suggested that anger and aggression manifest in two primary behavioral ways: physically/verbally.

Need for Prosocial Environments

Bradshaw, Sawyer, and O'Brennan (2007) suggested that approximately 30% of all students engage in physical or verbal aggressive acts. To reduce aggression, Bandura (2006) suggests that practitioners utilize a holistic approach. Bandura's holistic ideal incorporates personal factors, behaviors, and environment working together systemically. Similar to Bandura's view, SWPBSs need to be holistic and comprehensive in order to meet the needs of aggressive adolescents (Zimmerman & Cleary, 2006). As stated previously, one component that SWPBSs routinely neglect is prosocial environments. Newsome and Gladding (2003) report a number of benefits that potentially occur when utilizing prosocial environments within SWPBS. For instance, they state that: (a) positive feedback increases, (b) students improve in developing new methods in handling stress, and (c) youth feel supported in their development and growth. Thus, if practitioners wish to see these benefits materialize with angry youth, implementation of a prosocial environment is necessary. Specifically, SWPBSs need to develop holistic/comprehensive plans, integrating personal factors, behavior and environment (Bandura, 2001).

Akos, Goodnough, and Milsom (2004) confirm the advantage of using prosocial, comprehensive environments with SWPBSs. They stated that positive social evaluations in prosocial environments foster a number of positive behavioral outcomes for youth. First, social support increases, which can, potential, promote better communication skills for angry youth. Second, new methods on dealing with stress and problem solving improve. Third, positive interactions with peers and adolescents increase substantially. According to Day (2004), counselors need to utilize these evidenced based, contemporary behavioral methods in SWPBSs. Hence, school counselors and other staff working with adolescents need to incorporate and encourage positive social evaluations for youth (Pajares, 2002).

Social Evaluations

Bandura (1997) suggests that social evaluations dictate how youth feel about their behavioral self-efficacy and abilities. Without positive social support, angry youth may interact with the environment/people in a number of ways. Pullis (1994) proposed that angry youth may interact with anger, go into social isolation, refuse to do academic work and/or engage in aggressive acts in order to gain attention. Positive role models for youths falling into this category might be small. Thus, youth may only have negative influences to base their behavior on (Burt & Butler, 2010). Additionally, environmental risk factors emerge and cause excessive stress and problems (Roysicar, 2009). Issues such as low socio-economic status, access to weapons, and lack of role models amalgamate. This combination of factors causes some adolescents to engage in aggressive acts (Hawkins, Catalano, & Miller, 1992).

Literature states that social evaluations and environmental conditions influence youth substantially (Bandura, 2008a, 2008b, 2009; Hawkins, et al., 1992; Rosenthal, 1985). In SWPBSs, however, there is an emphasis on the individual, as environmental factors are neglected (Kellner, 2001; Kellner et al., 2008; Shek & Wai, 2008). Recent studies (Dwivedi & Gupta, 2000; Finn & Willert, 2006; Kellner et al., 2008; Serin, et al., 2009) have suggested adjustments to current SWPBSs. These recommendations were to: (a) incorporate environmental factors such as peers, teachers and family into the curriculum; (b) stop reliance on affective tactics that focus on high behavioral control strategies; and (c) integrate prosocial skill building such as leadership development.

According to Kellner et al., (2008), very few studies have explored the effect of prosocial skill building and social evaluations on aggressive youth behavior. They claim dearth in research that investigates the impact of prosocial skills and social evaluations with SWPBSs. Furthermore, Kellner, et al. state, “relative gaps in knowledge have been mechanisms of change in anger management programs” (p. 217). Coinciding with their statement, the purposes of this study was to fill this gap and advocate for an integration of SWPBSs and leadership skill development. By integrating the two, it may help angry youth in developing leadership roles in the classroom. Potentially this development of prosocial abilities and positive social evaluations will assist in reducing youths’ anger.

Processes of Social Evaluations

Recent developments in the counseling literature have suggested that social evaluations form in a number of ways. For instance, Pajares (2006), stated others can conduct social

evaluations, such as peers, friends, or supervisors. However, he additionally posited that social evaluations could be illusory. For instance, people may hold to the erroneous belief that others are judgmental, although the ideal may be false (Moran & Eckenrode, 1991). These notions may persist, even when faced with contradictory evidence. For youth, faulty misconceptions are even more pervasive than in adults (Rice & Dolgin, 2005). Pajares stated that social evaluations for youth are interpersonal, in that they judge themselves to an internal standard of criteria. Both situations (real or illusory), have an influence on how youth behave, think and act. Regardless of if it is by others, or self-evaluation, there is a belief that a judgment is taking place.

Roskies (2006) posited the idea that social evaluations are random and arrive at inopportune times. However, he stated that thoughts stemming from social evaluations are under youths' control. He espoused that even if social evaluations are bad, youth can be purposeful in shaping their behavioral responses to negative circumstances. Succinctly stated, outcomes (such as anger, level of self-efficacy) depend on thoughts of the youth. Bandura (2008b) supported Roskies belief, as he purported youth can be productive in light of negative social evaluations. For instance, some students are hesitant to participate in SWPBSs. Although well intentioned, some SWPBSs have an air of stigma, such as being only for troubled students (Blanton, Christensen, & Shakir, 2006). Bandura (2009) stated youth might function effectively despite these negative social evaluations. Additionally, he declared that instead of allowing negative social evaluations to affect them, youth have the capability to shape their circumstances positively. All that is missing is a prosocial component that can buffer against negative social evaluations. Therefore, Bandura believed that youth can learn from social groups such as SWPBSs and contribute back to the environment positively.

Environments in Which Social Evaluations Occur

In order to contribute back to the environment positively, Bandura (2001), states that adolescents go through a number of self-regulatory processes. One process is that youth observe behavior and the environment under which social evaluations occur. Adolescents judge their behavior in relation to an internal sense of self and desired outcomes. Youth then regulate themselves by thinking of how the consequences will affect them. With angry adolescents, the social evaluation process may manifest itself in the following: Young people do things that give them satisfaction and a sense of self-esteem, and refuse to act in a manner that violates their interpersonal code of conduct (Bandura, 1986). An example is youth who act out in class, and refuse to comply with simple school protocols. Young people may act in such a manner because refusing to adhere to rules gives a sense of personal satisfaction, and obeying rules violates their personal sense of identity. Unfortunately, this obstinate sense of personal identity is one internalized through countless negative social evaluations that youth may have encountered over time (Bandura, 2006).

With angry adolescents in schools, these individuals may feel marginalized because of negative social evaluations that adversely affect their self-worth. Bandura (2006) suggests that repeated exposure to negative social evaluations can lead youth to blame themselves for their troubles. During this process, adolescents may degrade themselves and devalue their self-worth. As such, young people tend to behave in a way that corresponds with the negative social evaluations thought of them, called the self-fulfilling prophecy (Rosenthal, 1985). The example of the rebellious youth mentioned in the previous paragraph that refuses to adhere to rules is a prime example of the self-fulfilling prophecy.

When negative social evaluations are apparent, it creates an environment that is harmful to youth, as the strength of words has a powerful effect on adolescents (Gottfredson et al., 2004). Historically, Bandura (2008a) gives examples of the power of language that served as euphemisms for tragedies. For instance, in the Watergate scandal, lying was “a variation of the truth”. Nuclear accidents such as Chernobyl, were labeled as “energy breaks”, and reactor accidents as “abnormal reactions”. Youth with anger problems are “problem children”, “rebellious” or “rowdy” (Bandura, 2008a). Widespread acceptance of negative social evaluations normalizes youths’ beliefs of angry behavior as standard. The effect of this normalization makes it appear as if nothing about the behavior can change. Adolescents see this, and as such, react to it by accepting the words and begin behaviors equal with the label given (Bandura, 2001).

Power of Social Evaluations

Litt’s (1988) study gives a salient description of the power of social evaluations. In his study, individuals received tests to indicate how high their self-efficacy was in tolerating cold. After testing, the researcher placed participants into either a low or high percentile rank for pain tolerance, when compared to a normalized standard. The information provided by the researchers to participants was false, and represented arbitrary findings. The impact of these results, however, influenced the participants. Once told how they compared to others, social evaluations influenced efficacy beliefs in withstanding pain. For instance, individuals told that they were in a high percentile, the greater the changes made in withstanding pain when tested again. Conversely, the opposite appeared for the low tolerance group. When their social expectations

led them to believe they were inadequate, their performance mirrored their social evaluations. This seminal study lent credence to the power of social evaluations.

Research indicates that SCT can improve youths' reactions to negative social evaluations, not just domestically, but culturally and internationally as well (Bandura, 2002). Through improving familial self-efficacy beliefs, negative behaviors towards women and youths decreased in Latin American countries with a patriarch culture (Bandura, 2002). Coupled with this, SCT was influential in reducing anger in males, increasing the perceived status of women and decreasing negative beliefs towards children in Africa and Asia. According to Schunk and Mecee (2006), SCT and the agentic perspective are powerful tool in reducing negative behaviors with youth domestically, as well as internationally.

Social Evaluations and the Agentic Perspective

According to Pajares (2006), the agentic perspective is fundamental in shaping self-efficacy beliefs. He adds that the agentic perspective is paramount as it increases leadership ability in adolescents. For instance, if youth do not believe their actions have merit, they will be less apt to work towards goals, persevere or attempt to make change. When the agentic perspective is used, adolescents appear to persist longer in the face of adversity and to resist negative social evaluations. Corey (2003) promotes the notion that contemporary behavioral therapies like SCT are worthwhile with angry youth. In short, he believes that contemporary behavioral therapies are indicative of what aggressive youth need in order to reduce negative behaviors and thought patterns. Understanding the agentic perspective, however, can be difficult and confusing. For instance, various terms define the purpose and significance of the agentic

perspective. In order to clarify subject matter for the reader, the operational definition of the agentic perspective follows shortly.

Social Cognitive Theory and Leadership Development

Blanton, Christensen, and Shakir (2006) postulated that developing leadership skills allows youth to problem solve, communicate, and cooperate with others better. Their postulations drew from Bandura (1986), who stated that personal control allows for a sense of certainty and an ability to shape life events in a way that is productive. In most cases, adolescents give proxy control to parents, administrators, and other adults. Stemming from this, youth may develop a sense of helplessness that can stifle youths' sense of self-efficacy, leadership and development (Seligman, 1991).

In order to prevent learned helplessness, Neisser (1976) suggested that counselors should positively support youths' personal expectations, beliefs, and goals. He further stated that if supported, adolescents' potential for social confidence might increase. Increasing social confidence gives form and direction to youths' behavior. This confidence may buffer against negative influences (e.g. social evaluations) that impede positive behavior (Bandura, 1986). Thus, it is imperative for counselors to support youth not only behaviorally, but socially as well. Similar to Neisser, Bandura (1986) advocated that social confidence gives form and direction to behavior, but adds that environment is influential as well. Specifically, he believes cognition (social confidence), behavior, and environment interact and influence one another. Bandura labeled this triadic interaction as reciprocal determinism. A bi-directional influence exists between the three, as each affects the other in varying magnitudes. An example of how cognition

(personal factors), behavior and environment interact is in the following excerpt taken from Bandura (1997) book on self-efficacy:

Efficacious people are quick to take advantage of opportunity structures and figure out ways to circumvent institutional constraints or change them by collective action.

Conversely, inefficacious people are less apt to exploit the enabling opportunities provided by the social system and are easily discouraged by institutional impediments.

(p. 6)

Developing leadership skills has the potential to immerse youth in an environment that positively affects their beliefs of self-efficacy and personal expectations (Bandura, 1986).

Furthermore, Bandura promoted the idea that a change in self-efficacy needs support by a rich social milieu, incorporating a high degree of positive modeling, social influence and tutoring. For angry youth conditioned not to believe in their abilities, a rich social milieu may assist in improving beliefs of control over their environment. Thus, these youth may be more readily able to overcome institutional constraints or impediments placed on them. SWPBSs, although helpful, lack a rich social milieu, and consequently, neglect the importance of social support for participants in the program (Orpinas & Horne, 2004).

Validity and Effectiveness of SCT

SCT is one of the most thoroughly researched and empirically based theories in the behavioral sciences (Cara, et al., 2006; Bandura, 2001; Martin, 2004). According to Rice and Dolgin (2005), SCT is critical in understanding the development of youth. For instance, modeling, reinforcement and self-efficacy are instrumental concepts not only in SCT, but also in

comprehending the behavior and nature of angry adolescents. Developing leadership skills parallels the growth and development process of adolescence (Avolio, Walumbwa, & Weber, 2009). To illustrate, adolescents require experiences that stimulate growth and development, as leadership models advocate (Zimmerman & Cleary, 2006). Furthermore, similarities between leadership and youth developmental concepts are numerous, such as autonomy, dependence, and rebellion (Havinghurst, 1972; Selman, 1980; Vygotsky, 1978).

SCT suggests that when youth are involved in leadership programs they are in constant movement and fluctuate between growth and development (Bandura, 2001). According to Selman (1980), adolescent development mirrors the fluctuation seen in leadership development programs. Furthermore, similar to leadership programs, adolescents' grow developmentally by placement with another who is more skilled in particular areas (Bronfenbrenner, 1987). An example of placement is youths' association with a teacher, mentor, or adult role model in which new skills or social roles are learned. In SCT, and for the purposes of this study, the agentic perspective is the operational definition of leadership. SCT research indicates that leadership programs are a vital component when working with youth.

Research indicates that increased behavioral self-efficacy, a primary objective in SCT, is a major contributor to a number of positive behavioral outcomes in youth and adults. Improved self-efficacy is associated with increasing struggling students' mathematical skills and development of complex physical abilities in athletes (Schunk, 1989; Carroll & Bandura, 1990). Furthermore, self-efficacy improves career exploration maturity with youth and assists in ability to manage conflict at work and with family (Duffy & Lent, 2008; Hennessy & Lent, 2008). Conversely, when self-efficacy is low, there is a significant reduction in gains and improvements

made among youth athletic competitors (Lindsley, Brass & Thomas, 1995). Accordingly, SCT has substantial research evidencing its legitimacy as a valid tool to increase self-efficacy with youth. Whether in the developmental stages of life, or in leadership development, SCT is imperative with youth (Pajares, 2002).

Triadic Reciprocal Determinism

SCT emphasizes the importance of external events (environment), mental processes and the interaction of external events and mental process on people's behavior (Bandura, 1986). Bronfenbrenner (1987) substantiated Bandura's belief, as he stated that youths' interactions with the environment are critical. Therefore, it is logical to infer that the principles of SCT would contribute to an effective leadership approach, which supports the development of adolescents. As Bandura (1986) theorized, a triadic interaction exists between personal factors, behavior, and the environment. In leadership programs, peers, friends, and adults are the environment, which influence behavior. Realizing this, a leadership model includes reciprocal influence into the plan of action (Cara et al, 2006). Thus, the expectations are the environment (adults) will have an effect on the adolescent. Sometimes this influence can occur by the adult simply being present, regardless of if the adult works well or poorly with youth (Bandura, Ross, & Ross, 1961a).

Myers (1992) noted, different people choose different environments such as music, friends, or choice of doctoral program. They are all environments chosen, based partially on dispositions. In schools, for the most part, adolescents have their choices taken from them. This may lead to learned helplessness in the young person (Seligman, 1991). The adolescent may express disappointment or frustration because decisions are without his or her consent. In some

youths, negative thoughts and behaviors cause them to respond aggressively stemming from a lack of control in their life. With constraints placed on youth in a critical developmental stage, aggression is a normal response (Bandura, Ross, & Ross, 1961b). It is a learned characteristic, and sometimes adolescents respond with despair and a lack of hope with aggression (Seligman, 1991).

Bandura (1986) postulated that thoughts shape how people interpret and react to events. An example of this is an angry youth who is experiencing problems. An angry, aggressive adolescent is more in tune to violent and stress provoking events. As such, that youth sees the world as threatening, and reacts based on his schema of the environment (Myers, 1992). Angry youth sometimes respond in this fashion, as they perceive the world as threatening, violent and unsafe (Twemlow & Sacco, 1998). If adolescents' perceptions are overly negative, it could stem from the fact they had poor experiences before, and focus solely on negative events. Adverse events then serve to reinforce their feeling of uneasiness and anxiety (Bandura, 2009). In the agentic perspective, negative thinking and its effects is a topic brought to the attention of youth. Similar to counseling, awareness is the first step in order to reduce aggressive, problematic behavior.

Agentic Perspective of Social Cognitive Theory

The leadership method of this study utilized concepts from the agentic perspective of SCT. Operationally defined, the agentic perspective is a person or group of people that intentionally influences one's own functioning and other environmental events (Bandura, 2008a). According to the agentic perspective, once a person or group acts intentionally, they are an active

determinant (Bandura, 1986). An active determinant is an individual or group that purposively shapes the environment to better suit their needs, as well as for others (Bandura, 1997). In the agentic perspective, there are four fundamental components. They are as follows: (a) intentionality, (b) forethought, (c) self-reactiveness (self-regulation), and (d) self-reflection. Intentionality focuses on a leader's active plans and implemented strategies to attain goals and objectives. In intentionality, a leader must negotiate and mediate with others in order to accomplish tasks. In order for a group to obtain goals, intentionality must be a joint or collaborative effort (Bandura, 2008a). Thus, group intentionality requires a shared commitment between members. Additionally, group intentionality requires leaders to work systematically through interdependent plans to achieve goals.

Forethought entails more than simply thinking about future oriented plans. In forethought, leaders set goals and anticipate the outcomes likely to come from their strategies. With forethought, leaders should be able to direct and predict their moves preemptively (Bandura, 2008b). In the agentic perspective, forethought gives purpose, direction, and coherence to decision making. According to Bandura, (2008a) self-reactiveness, or self-regulation, builds upon intentionality and forethought. Self-reactiveness includes not only being deliberate in decision-making, but also being able to constructively self-motivate and regulate oneself in executing the steps necessary in the decision making process. The fourth component, self-reflectiveness, states that leaders are not just thinkers, decision makers, and agents of acting. Bandura stated that leaders should self-examine their own functioning. Through self-reflectiveness, leaders reflect on their efficacy in judgments, soundness of decision-making, as well as the meaning of goals/objectives. If there is disconnect, leaders, through self-reflection,

can make corrections as needed (Bandura, 2006). In SCT, the ability to reflect on actions and thoughts is the most critical principle of the agentic perspective. In order for adolescents to develop the ability to self-reflect, socialization plays a significant part (Bandura, 2006).

Purposes of the Agentic Perspective

Zimmerman and Cleary (2006) stated that the agentic perspective assists in facilitating strategic planning and development in adolescents. This facilitation improves the action taken to acquire direction in life or obtainment of skills. According to Bandura (2006), the agentic perspective has a myriad of uses with young people. For example, Bandura believed that the agentic perspective serves to: (a) improve adolescents' social development, (b) increases educational development, (c) positively shapes career aspirations, (d) improves health promotion, (e) positively influences behavioral control and finally, (f) increases social commitment. The agentic perspective accomplishes these goals by actively incorporating self-efficacy beliefs into the foundation of SCT.

Self-Efficacy and the Agentic Perspective

Bandura (2006) stated that among the methods of the agentic perspective, none is more valuable or central than the concept of self-efficacy. Bandura (2001) suggested that other factors in SCT serve as facilitative guides. However, none has more influence than self-efficacy. The importance of self-efficacy stems from the fact that if young people do not believe their actions can generate positive outcomes, they have no incentive to act, or to persist through adversity. The belief in a person's own efficacy is a fundamental source for positive self-development and change (Bandura, 2008a).

Through the agentic perspective, youth can purposefully create social systems that organize and influence their lives. Within the agent method, adolescents are not simply products of their environments. In being a driving force, youth have a part in being producers of their environments, and are leaders in shaping their life (Bandura, 2006). In SCT, the agentic perspective is the foundation for growth and adaptation to negative influences (Bandura, 2001). Adolescents, acting as agents (leaders) intentionally influence the environment, while the changes in the environment affect their behavior. By being a leader, youth are not bystanders that must adhere to their adverse circumstances. In the agentic perspective, youth are proactive, plan, and create structure and meaning. Adolescents, as leaders, are contributing, and are no longer automatons that must conform to their situations (Bandura, 2008b). Thus, an adolescent that has been told they are not suited to be anything but an angry person, can take the initiative and actively shape his/her life (Bandura, 2005). According to Cara et al. (2006), being a leader allows youth to overcome negative social evaluations placed on them. This transformation, however, cannot occur without increasing self-efficacy (Bandura, 1986; Zimmerman & Cleary, 2006).

Modes of Agency

In SCT, there are three modes of the agentic perspective. They are individual, proxy, and collective (Bandura, 2006). In individual agency, leaders intentionally and directly influence environmental events. Succinctly stated, individuals have the power to do things themselves, and they directly influence others around them by acting. However, in all situations, people do not have the power directly to act, and have limited influence to make things happen that will benefit

them. When this occurs, leaders can then use proxy agency (Bandura, 1986). In proxy agency, a leader can influence a group, or another leader that has the power to make things happen positively. A prime example of this are youths who ask a parent to do something they have no power in obtaining such as driving, or purchasing a gift. In collective agency, leaders act as a unit to accomplish something that individually would be unreachable. An example of this phenomenon is a trade union. In unions, individuals pool their collective resources together and advocate for change, resources, or monetary increases in the workplace.

Modeling

SCT research has suggested that symbolic representation, reinforcement and modeling are salient factors that provide support in modifying aggressive behaviors (Bandura, Ross, & Ross, 1961a; Bandura & Walters, 1963; Bandura, 1971; Bandura, 1981, Bandura, 2001, Martin, 2004). Studies in SCT support the notion that modeling is one of the most fundamental influences that bear a great effect on adolescent behavior (Bandura, 1986). According to Day (2004) modeling and other contemporary behavioral techniques are the tools of choice when working with aggressive populations. With angry youth, SCT is critical, as social evaluations reflect a person's perception of themselves (Bandura, 1989). Modeling, therefore, has a significant role in the development of adolescents in the school, community and family environment (Bandura, 2005). Teachers, peers, and family members have a great impact on behaviors demonstrated by adolescents (Bandura, 2006). SCT states that modeling is a major influence on the actions, beliefs, and thoughts of children and adolescents. Individuals examine each other, and react according to their perceptions and observations (Bandura, 2001).

This interaction between interpersonal factors, behavior, and environment (in the form of modeling) has the potential to reduce egocentric views with angry youth (Fuller, 1988; Levine, 1991). By taking into account the needs of others, adolescents may think before they act, and as a result, reduce their negative behavior and responses (Skelton, Glynn, & Berta, 1991). Positive modeling, therefore, may not only benefit aggressive adolescents directly, but assist individuals that interact with the youth as well (Bandura, 1997). These persons would include peers, teachers, and family members (Zimmerman & Cleary, 2006).

Twemlow and Sacco (1998) suggested that in SWPBSs the behaviors that an adult displays has a tremendous effect on youth behavior. When stressful situations arise, youth observe adult behavior, attempting to determine the most suitable way of acting (Twemlow, Sacco, & Fonagy, 2008). SCT corroborates with other studies stating that modeling in SWPBSs can increase self-efficacy and reduce destructive behavior (Bandura, 1997; Daniels & Thornton, 1992; Finkenber, 1990; Kurian, Verdi, & Kulhavy, 1994). Modeling in SWPBSs is sometimes an afterthought, as the emphasis is on strict behavioral control and individual strategies (Kellner, et al., 2008). However, SWPBS inherently have therapeutic factors and may be an environment that teaches more than just behavioral strategies and control techniques (Coopersmith, 1967). Unfortunately, most SWPBSs do not deal with the environment that the behavior takes place in, while focusing solely on the behavior itself (Orpinas & Horne, 2003).

Bandura (1986) stated that a growth-oriented, flexible environment can produce a number of positive changes in angry youths' lives. Increases in self-efficacy, physical/mental wellness, and academics are a few of the many benefits responsive environments offer (Bandura, 1997). According to Coopersmith (1967), a responsive environment that adapts to aggressive

adolescents is a viable alternative. A responsive environment allows youths to go beyond self-imposed impediments created and reinforced by negative social evaluations. For instance, a receptive environment, containing positive modeling is critical in tapping the full potential of behavioral and academic functioning of youth (Coopersmith, 1967). Modeling creates a socialization effect/social sphere that influences the behavior of not only adolescents, but also others (Bandura, 1989). Lerner (1982) was a precursor to Bandura, as he stated modeling and socialization have a direct influence on interpersonal and behavioral change in youth.

Socialization

A defining characteristic that angry youth have are that they encounter problems in school settings (Shek & Wai, 2008). These problems may partially stem from unfair social practices based on race, culture, religion or socio-economic status (Bandura, 1997; Constantine, et al., 2007). According to Hawkins, Catalano, and Miller (1992), angry youth come from various backgrounds, but experience similar problems. Common difficulties experienced are as follows: (a) have low socio-economic status, (b) high accessibility to weapons, (c) experience inadequate academic preparation, (d) have poor familial relations, and (e) experience negative role models. These impediments mentioned correspond with Fondacaro and Weinberg's (2002) findings. Fondacaro and Weinberg further asserted that some institutions purposively label youth as angry.

Fondacaro and Weinberg (2002) stated that societal establishments do not allocate power equally and label youth based on a number of characteristics. In some social settings, labeling stems from immigrant status, race, or socioeconomic level. Society relegates these youth to

subordinate roles, and treat them accordingly (Bandura, 1989). Succinctly stated, society reacts to these individuals based on collectively created and given social roles (Lerner, 1982).

Stemming from this, there needs to be a solution that modifies the environment and proffers new societal roles (Bandura, 2001).

Interventions

In this segment, studies were reviewed which have implemented interventions with aggressive individuals in schools. First, the theoretical underpinning of the study was stated. Second, the independent and dependent variables of the study were documented. Third, methods of the studies were reviewed, including participants, assessments, and sample size. Fourth, statistical procedures utilized and results were stated. Fourth, meaning and implications of the study were discussed.

Besley (1999) employed a qualitative study using anger management intervention with aggressive adolescents. This design incorporated contemporary behavioral therapy in the form of SCT and cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT) principles. Before proceeding, however, a brief description of contemporary behavior therapy must be undertaken to avoid confusion.

Contemporary behavioral therapies, as stated by Day (2004) are therapies that combine traditional behavioral therapies with cognitive principles. As such, theories such as SCT, Beck's cognitive therapy, and Ellis's rational emotive behavior therapy (REBT) fall under the umbrella of contemporary behavior therapy (Day, 2004).

In Besley's (1999) study, the independent variable was contemporary behavioral therapy (SWPBS focusing on self-regulatory skills and environmental supports). The dependent variable

was aggressive behaviors (i.e. hitting others). Assessment instruments used were interviews with administrative staff, behavioral logs and self-report questionnaires. The sample consisted of two white, fourth-grade males from low socio-economic backgrounds with difficulties in controlling their anger were in this study. Both participants had exhibited difficulties with anger management in the past and had participated in individual and group counseling. This study by Besley, however, did not make sure of quantitative statistical procedures, as it solely relied on self report questionnaires, and qualitative measures, such as interviews and behavioral logs.

Besley's (1999) study suggested that participants involved in this design have significantly less feelings of intensive anger, although certain situations that they were involved in were perceived to be very provocative and emotionally driven. This study recommended that a contemporary behavioral program might have a positive effect on the aggressive behaviors of adolescent males. Her findings suggested that the environment of the school is crucial in assisting individuals with behavioral problems. She suggested that within this environment, having a school counselor as a coach allows for students (not only the ones with behavioral complications) to view the school counselor as helpful and beneficial to the overall functioning of the school environment. She further stated that within this environment, peers, teachers and counselors might work together so that adolescents with behavioral problems can see that they have support within the school system.

Kellner and Tutin's (1995) study utilized a qualitative design incorporating contemporary behavioral therapy (SCT and CBT). The independent variable was contemporary behavioral therapy (anger management intervention focusing on self-regulatory skills and environmental supports). The dependent variable was aggressive behaviors. The instruments employed in the

study were behavioral logs and self reports. The sample consisted of 4 emotional and behavioral disturbed adolescents (1 female and 3 male) between the ages of 15-28. The participants had diagnoses that included attention deficit disorder, pervasive developmental delays, autism, mental retardation, and depressive disorder. All of these participants were classified as emotionally disturbed. The results stemming from the qualitative study suggested that the behavioral logs and observations benefit developmentally disabled and emotionally disturbed adolescents. The study stated that young adults could benefit from an anger-management program in a group format, which is modified to meet youths' specific learning needs. Their results further stated that there are benefits to a group modality that include positive peer reinforcement and input.

Herrmann and McWhirter (2003) study implemented a quasi-experimental design that used contemporary behavioral therapy (SCT and CBT) with SWPBS. The independent variable was contemporary behavioral therapy (anger management intervention focusing on self-regulatory skills and environmental supports). The dependent variable was aggressive behaviors. Assessment instruments used were as follows: (a) State Trait Anger Expression (STAXI), (b) Missouri Peer Relations Inventory (MPRI), (c) Attitudes towards Guns and Violence Questionnaire (AGVQ), (d) incident reports, and (e) observations. The sample consisted of 207 (149 males and 58 females) participants from the sixth, seventh and eighth grades from an alternative school. The participants were considered "at-risk" due to aggressive behavioral problems. In their study, participants were 50% Hispanic, 40 % were Caucasian, 5 % were Black and 5% were identified as "Other".

Statistical procedures used were exploratory data analysis (EDA), multiple analyses of variance (MANCOVA), and multiple regression analyses. The STAXI state anger and Trait anger indicated significant results in the study with $F(1, 82) = 6.92, p = .01$ (STAXI state anger) and $F(1,82) = 4.96, p = .03$ (STAXI trait anger). According to Herrmann and McWhirter (2003), their study suggested that adolescents who participated in the intervention had significantly lower indications of aggressive behavior as compared to those who did not participate in the study. In addition, youth had lower levels of frustration with others, and were able to reduce the amount of times they became overtaken with anger.

Kellner et al.'s (2008) study implemented a quasi-experimental design using contemporary behavioral therapy (SCT and CBT). The independent variable was contemporary behavioral therapy (SWPBS focusing on self-regulatory skills and environmental supports). The dependent variable was aggressive behaviors. Assessment instruments utilized were as follows: (a) anger logs, (b) the child behavior checklist-Teacher version (CBCL) (c) school incident reports and (d) direct observations. The sample consisted of 45 adolescents who were middle school students that attended a therapeutic day school. Seventy-three percent of the students were male and 27% were female. The age of the students ranged from 12–16 years and the mean age was 13 years. Sixty-two percent of the students were White, 29% were Black, 7% were Hispanic, and 2% were identified as members of “Other” racial or ethnic groups. Nearly 38% of the students participated in the school’s subsidized lunch program. About 78% of the students were diagnosed with a behavior disorder; 11% with an anxiety disorder; about 2% with a mood disorder; 4% with a psychotic disorder; and 4% with a pervasive developmental disorder.

Statistical procedures used in this study were a one tailed t-test. Their study suggested that the experimental group significantly completed more anger logs than the control group ($t(44) \frac{1}{4} 4.24, p < .0005$) during the intervention, and after a 4 month follow up ($t(44) \frac{1}{4} 2.49, p < .02$). The adolescents who received the treatment also indicate being involved in fewer incidents than those whom did not receive the treatment, as specified by incident logs ($t(44) \frac{1}{4} 1.416, p < .08$). Kellner et al.'s (2008) study supported the notion that a classroom-based anger management program comprised of contemporary behavioral interventions helps aggressive adolescents. Through the program, young people learned to manage their angry feelings and aggressive behavior by substituting prosocial behavior in place. Additionally, they suggested that there needed to be less of a reliance on high affective behavioral control strategies and more on environmental opportunities (i.e. positive role models and peers). In this study, the researchers suggested that youths gained behavior generalization. This generalization, according to the literature, is missing in current anger management curricula. In Kellner et al.'s study, however, positive behavior gained was able to be generalized outside of the treatment setting into the classrooms.

Dwivedi and Gupta's (2000) study implemented a quasi-experimental design that utilized contemporary behavioral therapy. The independent variable was contemporary behavioral therapy (anger management intervention focusing on self-regulatory skills and environmental supports). The dependent variable was aggressive behaviors. The instruments used were behavioral logs and self-report questionnaires. The sample consisted of 15 white adolescent males at a local high school. These adolescents were purposively chosen stemming from behavioral problems in the classroom. The youths' problems focused on the lack of control of

anger. A major limitation in this study was that the statistical procedure used consisted solely of percentages.

The percentages indicate the following findings from testing pre-group to post-group when adolescents were faced with an anger provoking situation: (a) 60% reported responding “Poorly”, compared to 5% responding “Poorly” after the intervention, (b) 20% responding “Not Well”, compared to 5% responding “Not Well” post intervention, (c) 10% responding “Okay”, while 40% responding “Okay” post intervention, (d) 5% reported responding “Well” pre-intervention, while 10% responding “Well” post intervention, (d) 5% responding “Great” pre-intervention, while 40% responding “Great” post intervention.

The study suggested that adolescents involved in the intervention had significantly less feelings of intensive anger after the intervention was implemented. Furthermore, this change seemed to be generalized into different environments. This positive behavior change appeared to be robust, in that youth were able to work through stressful situations. Even though certain social milieus the young people were involved in were perceived to be very provocative and emotionally driven, the positive behaviors persisted. Youth were able to draw upon strategies and support from the environment. In addition, this study suggests that a contemporary behavioral program has a positive effect on the aggressive behaviors of adolescent males.

Langdon and Preble’s (2008) study was a design that looked at interventions that utilized a contemporary behavioral therapy framework. The independent variable was contemporary behavioral therapy (anger management intervention focusing on self-regulatory skills and environmental supports). The dependent variable was perceived levels of respect in aggressive adolescents in a school setting. The assessment instruments used were interviews and surveys.

One group received structured interviews, while the other received surveys. The sample consisted of data from 3,147 surveys and 315 interviews for a combined number of 3,462 participants. These adolescents were in the 5th- through 12th-grades encompassing 26 public schools. The survey sample was suburban/urban with 48% female and 50% male (2% undeclared). By grade, 45% were in 5th-8th and 55% in 8th-12th grades. By race, 90% of the sample was white and 7.5% of the sample was minority (2.5% did not indicate race). The interview sample (youth were purposively chosen as they were participants in a school leadership development program for aggressive adolescents) was 51% female, 38% male, and 12% not recorded. By grade, 44% were in 5th-8th and 50% in 8th-12th grade. Race and ethnicity was not assessed.

The statistical procedures used in the Langdon and Preble's (2008) study were multiple regressions. The study indicated significant results from respect scores and demographic variables. The multiple regressions produced the following scores ($F(6, 2214) = 72.92, p = .000$) with all of the variables entered in regards to bullying climate. Results from the study indicated that perceptions of bullying and respect were critical components of the school environment. These findings substantiated claims made in earlier studies. The study also suggested that there is a significant relationship between bullying and respect. This lent empirical support to the long-held assumption of a connection between those variables. Perceived respect from adults in the schools and between peers were significantly correlated with reported bullying at both the individual and school level of analysis. Individuals who perceived respect (from peers and adults) reported lower levels of bullying than those who perceived lower respect.

In order to fill the research gap,(i.e. generalizability), Langdon and Preble's (2008), findings were crucial. Current research is seeking to provide prosocial and leadership skills to aggressive adolescents. The reasoning behind this is that these types of positive abilities can shape the social milieu and environmental constraints within a school system, to aid aggressive youth, teachers, and other administrative staff. In order to do this, Langdon and Preble's study laid down an empirical foundation to implement this type of methodology.

Serin, Gobeil, and Peterson (2009) study looked at correctional facilities that implemented therapy consisting of high affective behavioral control, with no reliance on environmental supports, leadership or prosocial skills. Although not conducted in a school setting, the findings from this study were still useful to research with aggressive individuals. The independent variable was behavioral therapy (anger management interventions focusing solely on self-regulatory skills). The dependent variable was aggressive behaviors. The assessment instruments used were as follows: (a) the Aggression Questionnaire, (b) Impulsivity Questionnaire, (c) the Interpersonal Reactivity Index, and (d) reactions to provocation. The sample consisted of 256 presently incarcerated Canadian male violent offenders. Offences included murder, manslaughter, attempted murder, assault, robbery, and threatening with a weapon. The statistical procedure used was Chi-square. Their results indicated that there was not a difference between individuals that received the treatment ($\chi^2(3, N = 255) = 5.28$), and those who did not ($\chi^2(3, N = 202) = 2.88$).

Serin et al.'s (2009) study suggested that the lack of differences between offenders who complete the program did not differ from the offenders who did not complete the program. In addition, the results indicate that there are not any significant differences between interventions

as well, indicating that the type of program (contemporary behavior therapy compared to psychoanalytic) is not noteworthy. Results suggested that no significant gains in terms of measures of treatment targets or in terms of rates of return to custody were made by participants in either program. The researchers suggested that anger management programs are not helping the people that the intervention was designed to assist.

In conclusion, steps need undertaking to overhaul SWPBSs, similar to what Kellner et al. (2008) support. A model based on contemporary behavioral therapy (SCT), has indicated promise in changing aggressive behavior in youths (Orpinas & Horne, 2004). SCT has the potential to improve administrators' skills in reducing power struggles in schools, and to shape positively the environment for all. According to Orpinas and Horne, "very few programs have been specifically designed to reduce aggression by modifying the school environment through increased recognition and control of the problem by teachers" (p. 29). It is through this powerful methodology that systematic change can begin. Through this logical alteration of environments, negative behaviors and social climate can be transformed positively (Bandura, 2009).

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

This chapter explains the methods in a leadership driven anger management group (LAMG) used to reduce youth anger in a school setting. The research methods that follow include a discussion of the proceeding: (a) purpose of the study, (b) research questions and hypotheses, (c) institutional review board approval, (d) research design, (e) participants, (f) instrumentation, (g) procedures, and (h) data analysis.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to provide empirical evidence for the incorporation of prosocial skills such as leadership development into anger management groups (AMG) (Langdon & Preble, 2008). Studies report that some AMGs do not provide behavioral change outside of the treatment setting (Kellner, Bry, & Salvador, 2008). Thus, these AMGs are not meeting critical goals (Serin, Gobeil, & Peterson, 2009). For instance, a twenty-year meta-analysis encompassing hundreds of studies concluded that only 15 AMGs indicated a significant change in youth anger, anger control and relationships (Cooper, Lutenbacher, & Faccia, 2000). Thus, the intent of this study was to promote a LAMG that reduced anger, improved anger control and youths' relationships with others.

Despite very little research support, surveys of school staff and administrators have been overwhelmingly positive in regards to AMGs (Herrmann, & McWhirter, 2003). However, only rigorous scientific research may determine the efficiency of programs that require school funding and purport to assist students in the classroom (Gay & Airasian, 2003). Few LAMG designs have empirically tested the validity and effectiveness of these types of groups developed to reduce

anger (Kellner, et. al, 2008; Orpinas & Horne, 2004). To determine the usefulness of LAMGs, this study used a concept out of social cognitive theory (SCT) labeled the agentic perspective as a model of leadership. This study sought to determine if changes made in behavior, generalized to other areas outside the treatment setting, such as with peers and adults. This is in direct contrast to standard AMGs that rely on high control behavior strategies, which research indicates behaviors do not generalize to other situations (Sullivan, 2000). While certain limitations restricted this study (explained in further detail in Chapter 5), this was one of the few LAMGs to date that utilized a rigorous scientific design (Burt, Lewis, & Patel, 2010).

Research Questions and Hypotheses

In order to determine the efficacy of LAMGs in reducing youth anger in schools, three research questions were tested: (1) Does a short term LAMG reduce youths' overall anger? (2) Does a short term LAMG increase angry youths' ability to control anger urges? (3) Does a short term LAMG reduce youths' expressed anger with others? The hypotheses associated with each of these three research questions follows below.

H₁: A short term LAMG assists in reducing youths' overall anger ($p < .05$).

H₀: A short term LAMG has no effect on youths' overall anger ($p > .05$).

H₂: A short term LAMG increases angry youths' ability to control anger urges ($p < .05$).

H₀₂: A short term LAMG has no effect on youths' ability to control anger urges ($p < .05$).

H₃: A short term LAMG reduces youths' expression of anger with others ($p < .05$).

H₀₃: A short term LAMG has no effect on youths' expression of anger with others ($p < .05$).

Institutional Review Board Approval

The University of Central Florida's (UCF) institutional review board (IRB), granted approval for the Principal Investigator (PI) to begin this study. After IRB approval, two major protocols needed adherence before implementation of the study. First, IRB protocol states for studies conducted in schools, a PI must submit a research request form to the Orange County Public Schools (OCPS). The research request form indicates a number of items, such as the following: (1) project title, (2) purpose, (3) research problem, (4) instruments, (5) procedures, and (6) proposed data analysis. Second, a PI needs to acquire a signed letter from the principal at the school granting permission for the study to take place. The PI of this study obtained the approved documentation from UCF's IRB, OCPS, and the principal (See Appendix for approval letters).

Research Design

The intent of this quantitative study was to assess if an eight-week school based LAMG was effective in reducing anger in middle school students. This study employed a within subjects, one-group pretest/posttest design (Leedy & Ormrod, 2001). According to Heppner, Wampold, and Kivlighan (2008), within subject designs are effective and practical for research conducted in schools. In schools, there are barriers such as time and class schedules that limit the possibility of randomization (Lambie, 2009). Participants assessed their behavior via self-report instruments given pre and post intervention. The instrument used, the State Trait Anger Expression Inventory 2 (STAXI-2) (Spielberger, 1999), assessed participants' overall anger, ability to control anger urges, and anger expression with others.

Participants

Participants were students in the sixth, seventh and eighth grades identified through a standardized school documentation system as having anger issues and poor social relationships with adults and peers. Twenty-five received nominations for participation in the group. Out of twenty-five, twenty returned signed parental informed consents and were able to participate in the study. Participants were comprised of ten males and ten females, ages 12-14. The study consisted of four groups, with five members each. There were six fourteen year olds, seven thirteen olds, and seven twelve year olds. The groups consisted of eighty-five percent Latino/Hispanic (17), ten percent Black (2), and the remaining five percent as Caucasian (1). Attrition rate was low, as only two participants did not complete the study. Due to limited resources, the study did not include exceptional education or monolingual Spanish speaking students.

The setting for the study was a middle school in a large, southern metropolitan city. Through a standardized documentation system of in school suspension (ISS), out of school suspension (OSS), and behavioral referrals, the school nominated participants who displayed high levels of anger and poor social relationships. The documentation system contained a descriptive narrative indicating whether participants had problems with anger, poor relationships, or both. Additionally, the PI took deans', teachers', professional school counselors' and psychologists' recommendations into consideration to substantiate the nomination of participants into the group. The nominated group consisted of participants with a documented history of anger, fights, and legal procedures in the juvenile court system. Many of the participants were at

risk for developing future behavioral problems. Because of these behavioral problems, 19 out of 20 participants (95%) received prior therapeutic services, such as individual or group counseling.

This study's participants were experiencing difficulties in the school, home and community. These participants had at least one of the following criteria: (1) anger problems, (2) inability to control anger, and (3) poor social relationships, as identified by the school's standardized documentation system and administrative staff.

(1). Aggressive behaviors are actions that inflict bodily harm, through hands, feet, or any body movement that incorporates external objects (such as a bat, chair, or bottle). This also includes verbal acts, such as yelling, cursing, or insulting others (Twemlow & Sacco, 1998).

(2). Inability to control anger is youths who are unable to control outward and inward manifestations of anger. Outwards manifestations include slamming doors and hitting others. Inward manifestations include an inability to control angry feelings or calm oneself down quickly (Spielberger, 1999).

(3). Poor relationships are relationships marked by aggression, lack of coping mechanisms when agitated by others, and inability to handle disagreements with others positively (Spielberger, 1999).

Group Facilitator

The group facilitator was a doctoral candidate in Counselor Education, as well as being the PI of the study. He has worked in a variety of therapeutic settings, such as a counselor in a correctional facility, a mental health therapist in a behavioral school, and as a training liaison for anger management groups in the school system, teaching conflict resolution and peer mediation.

Additionally, he has experience as a supervisor in community clinics, as well as working with clients from a number of diverse backgrounds. The group facilitator worked from an integrative orientation, utilizing SCT and Cognitive-Behavior Therapy (CBT). He has experience working with groups, families, adults and children with depression, bi-polar, ADHD, schizophrenia, oppositional defiance disorder, sexual offenders, and anger management issues. Due to his years of clinical experience, the group facilitator's dissertation committee decided he was best qualified to facilitate the LAMG.

Informed Consent and Confidentiality Procedures

The professional school counselor, psychologist or teacher who identified the potential participant, explained the study in detail based on information given by the investigator. If they were interested, potential participants met with the group facilitator (investigator) who explained the purpose of the group again, as well as answering specific questions. Interested participants received an informed consent for parents to complete. The informed consent indicated to participants and parents/guardians their rights, privileges, and ability to decline participation and withdrawal at any time without fear of repercussions. The informed consent described the procedures, nature, and duration of the study. The informed consent indicated to participants and parents/guardians the method of data analysis (quantitative) and the reason for it chosen over alternative methods. Only those participants whose parents returned an informed consent were included in the study. IRB indicated that only one parent and/or guardian needed to sign the informed consent. Lastly, participants were not individually identifiable by a name on any form. A coding system designed by the group facilitator system identified participants. No other

individual identifying information existed. In addition, the records were kept locked in a filing cabinet, with only the investigator having access.

Instrumentation

This study used the STAXI-2 as a diagnostic tool. According to Spielberger (1999), the STAXI-2 is a behavioral ratings tool utilized to assess overall anger, anger control and anger expression with others. The STAXI-2 is an instrument used frequently as an outcome measure accessing anger in AMGs with youth and young adults. Herrmann and McWhirter (2003) used the STAXI-2 to provide empirical evidence for a student directed AMG with youth in a middle school setting. Chirichella-Besemer and Motta (2008) used the STAXI-2 to access anger in young adults with emotional abuse. According to Freeman (2004), the STAXI-2 is a sound instrument in order to guide clinical assessment of anger. His work draws from Feindler (1995), who stated the STAXI-2 is a valid instrument to use when working with angry youths and young adults.

The STAXI-2 contains numerous scales, such as the Anger Expression Index (AX Index), Anger Control In (AC-I), Anger Control Out (AC-O), Anger Expression In (AX-I) and Anger Expression Out (AX-O). All levels are measures of anger assessed by different conceptual scales. By providing a diversified view of youths' behavioral functioning, the STAXI-2 assists in accurately identifying anger and emotional problems (Spielberger, 1999). Additionally, the STAXI-2 is multidimensional measuring multiple levels of anger, such as participants' reactions to annoying or frustrating situations. Furthermore, the STAXI-2 measures participants' dispositional anger and includes how the behavior fluctuates in intensity over time. These

various levels include positive and negative elements, encompassing adaptive and clinical dimensions (Spielberger, 1999). These domains, used with individuals ranging in age from 9-18, provide clinicians with detailed information for clinical assessment and diagnosis. The behavior that the STAXI-2 measures (i.e., anger) is critical to know in order to reduce aggression in youth (Spielberger, 1999).

The STAXI-2 is a behavioral self report that measures the control, experience and expression of anger through six major scales and five subscales, consisting of 57 items. The six major scales are State-Anger (SA), Trait Anger (TA), Anger Control In (AC-I), Anger Control Out (AC-O), Anger Expression In (AX-I) and Anger Expression Out (AX-O). The subscales are State Anger/Feeling (SA/F), State Anger/Verbal (SA/V), State Anger/Physical (SA/P), Trait Anger/Temperament (TA/T), and Trait Anger/Reaction (TA/R). Additionally, there is a composite overall index of anger, labeled the Anger Expression Index (AE-I). For the purposes of this study, four of the major scales, and the composite overall index of anger were of importance. The AC-I measures how frequently an individual attempts to control anger by cooling off or calming down. AC-O assesses the occurrence of outward control exerted over anger towards others in the environment and in relationships. AX-I evaluates how regularly anger is experienced but not expressed with an individual, and is suppressed. AX-O measures how often an individual's anger expresses outwardly towards peers and others in relationships. Lastly, AE-I is an overall evaluation of an individual's expression and control of anger (Spielberger, 1999).

Test takers assess themselves on a four point Likert-type scale that has the respondent rate oneself on the intensity of angry feelings and the extent to which those feelings are

controlled, expressed, or experienced. In order to successfully complete the STAXI-2, respondents must have a minimal fourth-grade reading level (Spielberger, 1999). Raw scores convert to standard scores, and level of anger is indicated by higher scores (i.e. higher the score, the more anger expressed and experienced). However, with the AC scale, a higher score indicates that there is a greater control of anger (i.e. less anger expressed). Once scores are standardized, identification can take place to see where scores lie on percentile ranks. According to Chirichella-Besemer and Motta (2008), scores above the 75th percentile indicate a high level of clinical anger and expression. Spielberger (1999) stated that scores that lie between the 25th and 75th percentile are in the normal range. Spielberger further suggested that although a score may be in the normal range, the higher the percentile rank, the more a person is to express anger negatively.

Reliability and Validity

The STAXI-2 provided evidence of internal consistency reliability by using alpha coefficients. The alpha coefficients were as follows: .92, .88, .67, .70 and .58 for AC-I, AC-O, AX-I, AX-O, and AE-I, respectively. According to Freeman (2004), the alpha coefficients demonstrated by the STAXI-2 indicated a high degree of reliability for the four scales and composite overall index of anger. Construct validity was indicated by correlating the STAXI-2 with the Buss-Durke Hostility Inventory. A significant correlation existed between the two assessments, with a correlation of .71 (Spielberger, 1999). Additionally, there are significant correlations reported for the AE-I with other anger assessments. However, in the test manual those instruments are not identified (Freeman, 2004). In reviews of the STAXI-2, Feindler

(1995) evaluated the predecessor of the STAXI-2 and stated that it was a reliable instrument to use with adolescents. Freeman (2004) substantiated Feindler's claim, as he states that the STAXI-2 is a valid instrument for clinicians, backed by over 20 years of research. Herrmann and McWhirter (2003), as well as Chirichella-Besemer and Motta (2008) both promoted the STAXI-2 as a capable assessment to use with angry adolescents and young adults.

Procedures

This study involved a public middle school who provided the participants for this investigative research. The middle school serves approximately 2,000 students and includes grades 6th-8th, situated in a metropolitan city in a large southern state. A standardized documentation system of ISS, OSS and behavioral referrals nominated students who displayed high levels of anger and poor social relationships. Once a list of participants generated, the investigator consulted with the professional school counselor (school counselor), school psychologist, deans and teachers to substantiate participants' nomination in the study. Next, the school counselor, school psychologist, and deans met with and explained the study to participants in detail. After consultation with school staff, the investigator met with nominated participants and explained the study in more detail. If interested, the investigator gave participants an informed consent to give parents to sign, and return back to the school. Participants received an incentive of five "Pride Bucks" from the school for timely returned informed consents. Pride Bucks enabled participants to purchase goods in the school store during available times. Goods consisted of school related materials such as pencils all the way to a 12-

speed bicycle. For bringing back a signed informed consent, participants received five Pride Bucks, equivalent to five American dollars.

Purposeful Selection of Older Students

After the investigator consulted with school staff, they recommended that younger participants are more willing and easier to work in groups and with adults. Older students, according to staff, were reluctant and more prone to withdraw from the study. To compensate for this potential problem, the investigator asked school staff to nominate a higher number of older students, in case the problem school staff suggested was accurate. Participant nomination therefore, resulted from suspensions, behavioral referrals, school staff recommendation and purposeful selection of older students. For instance, for every sixth grader nominated, one seventh and eighth grader received nominations in order to have a higher number of older students.

Division of Participants into Groups

Twenty participants brought back signed informed consents. The investigator divided the 20 participants into 4 groups consisting of five participants each. The investigator divided the groups into 2 all female groups, one male group, and one mixed group (mix of males and females). Research indicates that all same gender groups have some benefits over mixed group designs (Twemlow, Sacco, & Fonagy, 2008). This study, however, wanted to include them all, and divided the participants due to gender and availability during class time. Each group met at a different time and was not aware of the existence of other groups. The investigator administered to participants the State Trait Anger Expression Inventory -2 (STAXI-2) in order to get

participant baseline behaviors pertaining to overall anger, anger control, and anger expression with others. The investigator administered the intervention (see Appendix) to the participants over an eight-week period (approximately 40 days).

After the completion of the eight-week intervention, the investigator gave participants the second and final administration of the STAXI-2. Additionally, because of the Family Education Right to Privacy Act (FERPA), the study was not able to use the school's standardized documentation system to see what effect the intervention had on suspensions and behavioral referrals. After the second administration of the STAXI-2, the investigator purchased refreshments for a celebration marking the completion of the groups. The celebration consisted of sodas, chips, and doughnuts. After the celebration, the groups officially ended.

Dependent Variables

Aggression is a multifaceted term, used interchangeably with a variety of other words, such as violence, anger, hostility, and negative behaviors (Rice & Dolgin, 2005). Seminal definitions, such as the one constructed by Myers (1992) define aggression as the intent to do harm physically, verbally, or mentally. Modern definitions delineate the construct as an act(s) that cause(s) physical damage, through parts of the body or devices. These acts and devices (such as a bat, chair, or bottle) must intend to do bodily harm to meet the operational definition of anger. Also encompassed within this description are verbal behaviors, such as yelling and cursing (Twemlow, Sacco, & Fonagy, 2008). The scales of the STAXI-2 (AX-O, AX-I, AC-O, AC-I) and overall composite index of anger (AE-I), measures different levels of anger assessed by varying conceptual frameworks. For example, the AX-O and AX-I measure the degree to

which an individual expresses anger outwardly or inwardly (towards others in the environment and in relationships). If people express anger negatively outwardly or inwardly, it affects relationships, as the person is generally irritable, and difficult to be around (Chirichella-Besemer & Motta, 2008). AC-O and AC-I measure the extent to which a person controls anger impulses and urges outwardly or inwardly. AE-I gives an overall indication of anger, combining AX-O and AX-I.

For the purposes of this study, AX-O and AC-O are dependent variables on if the intervention had a reduction in participants' anger in relationships with peers and others. As stated by Hawley, Little, and Card (2007), angry students are popular in schools, and followed by others, out of either fear or respect. However, they go on to stipulate that these types of relationships tend to deteriorate stemming from anger disrupting the relationship. Numerous bad relationships tend to socially isolate youth, and make adulthood recovery difficult (Leff et al., 2001). AX-I and AC-I are dependent variables to measure if the intervention had an influence on participants being able to control their angry urges and impulses. The AE-I is the dependent variable on if the intervention had an influence on reducing overall anger in participants.

Independent Variable

This study investigated the effect of a LAMG on the behavior of angry youth in a middle school. As was stated previously in this chapter, what differentiated the LAMG in this study from standard AMGs was the leadership component. In both (LAMG and AMG), participants learn similar curriculum focusing on anger recognition and cues. In this study, however, participants practiced leadership by teaching and leading their fellow group members in

behavioral lessons and games. Participants received the message from the group facilitator they are leaders, and their goal is to fine-tune their leadership ability. Moreover, in LAMG, participants received leadership instruction in the form of the agentic perspective, explained in greater detail in the preceding paragraphs. Research states that AMGs lack prosocial skill development such as leadership development (Langdon & Preble, 2008). In order to determine leadership's effectiveness with AMGs, this study combined leadership and AMGs together. For instance, the PI integrated leadership principles (agentic perspective) to an established AMG. The AMG used came from a manualized treatment by Blanton, Christensen, and Shakir (2006) labeled as "Empowering the Angry Child for Positive Leadership".

Structure of LAMG

LAMG is comprised of eight core counseling sessions, and two paperwork sessions (one pre-session and final paper work session). Program duration is ten weeks, as the group facilitator conducted each session weekly. Each core session contained four integral parts, as suggested by Blanton, Christensen, and Shakir (2006). First, there was an (1) opening question, followed by (2) a behavioral lesson (leadership/agentic practice), (3) a behavioral activity (leadership/agentic practice) and lastly, (4) appreciations and closings (leadership/agentic practice). More detailed information regarding the specificity of opening questions, behavioral lessons and activities are in the appendix section of this study. Each core counseling session lasted between 45-60 minutes. Opening questions take approximately 5-10 minutes, behavioral lessons last between 10- 25 minutes, behavioral activities range from 15-30 minutes, and appreciations and closing take 5-10 minutes. Pre-session and paperwork sessions take approximately 15-30 minutes.

Description of LAMG

Behavioral lessons and games were identical to standard AMGs, as was the sequencing of sessions and material covered. The LAMG, however, focused on the interactions between environment, personal, and behavioral factors. In contrast to purely teaching behavioral strategies to members, LAMG had participants focus on their strengths and weaknesses. Through a number of the behavioral lessons and games in the curriculum, participants were able to strengthen the decision making process through the agentic perspective. LAMG focused on those concepts.

In LAMG, participants learned lessons and games that did not focus solely on behavioral transformation, and recognition of triggers and cues. After learning lessons, participants practice leadership by teaching others in their group the same activities. Coupled with that, the group facilitator had participants systematically develop their style of leadership by using the four concepts of the agentic perspective: Intentionality, forethought, self-regulatory, and self-reflectiveness. By using the agentic perspective as the leadership instruction, SCT strongly supports LAMG. As stated previously, SCT incorporates personal factors, behaviors, and the environment into a cohesive modality. The power in LAMG is that it draws strength from the synergy of all three aspects of SCT (Blanton, Christenson, & Shakir, 2006). LAMG incorporates cognitive, behavioral, affective, and social strategies into a holistic psycho-educational method. By holistically treating youth, anger decreases (Burt, Lewis, and Patel, 2010).

Leadership as defined by the Agentic Perspective

What differentiated the LAMG from standard AMGs was the leadership component. As was stated previously, in both groups, participants learn the same lessons and activities that focused on anger, and recognition of triggers and cues. LAMG differed, as participants practiced leadership by leading fellow group members in behavioral lessons and games. Participants received the message from the group facilitator they are leaders, and their goal was to fine-tune their leadership ability. The group facilitator was merely there as a social support mechanism. Moreover, LAMG participants received leadership instruction in the form of the agentic perspective. Operationally defined, the agentic perspective is a person or group of people that intentionally influences one's own functioning and other environmental events (Bandura, 2008a). According to the agentic perspective, once a person or group acts intentionally, they are an active determinant (Bandura, 1986). Thus, the agentic perspective is when a leader purposively shapes the environment to better suit their needs, as well as for others (Bandura, 1997).

In the agentic perspective, there are four fundamental components. They are as follows: (a) intentionality, (b) forethought, (c) self-reactiveness (self-regulation) and (d) self-reflection. Intentionality focuses on a leader's active plans and implemented strategies to attain goals and objectives. In intentionality, a leader must negotiate and mediate with others in order to accomplish tasks. In order for a group to obtain goals, intentionality must be a joint or collaborative effort (Bandura, 2008a). Thus, group intentionality requires a shared commitment between members. Additionally, group intentionality requires leaders to work systematically through interdependent plans to achieve goals.

Forethought entails more than simply thinking about future oriented plans. In the forethought, leaders set goals and anticipate likely outcomes to stem from their strategies. With forethought, leaders should be able to direct and predict their moves preemptively (Bandura, 2008b). In the agentic perspective, forethought gives purpose, direction, and coherence to decision making. According to Bandura, (2008a) self-reactiveness, or self-regulation, builds upon intentionality and forethought. Self-reactiveness includes not only being deliberate in decision-making, but also being able to constructively self-motivate and regulate oneself in executing the steps necessary in the decision making process. The final component, self-reflectiveness, states that leaders are not just thinkers, decision makers, and agents of acting. Bandura states that leaders should self-examine their own functioning. Through self-reflectiveness, leaders reflect on their efficacy in judgments, soundness of decision-making, as well as the meaning of goals/objectives. If there is disconnect, leaders, through self-reflection, can make corrections as needed (Bandura, 2005). In social cognitive theory (SCT), the ability to reflect on actions and thoughts is the most critical principle of the agentic perspective. In order for adolescents to develop the ability to self-reflect, socialization plays a significant part (Bandura, 2005).

Data Analysis

The data analysis in this study used a statistical database. The significance level, in accordance with research protocols, was at the .05 level (Diekhoff, 1996). As stated previously, the purpose of this study was to determine the influence of a LAMG on youths' anger. This study, therefore, tested the outcome of one independent variable on three dependent variables.

Specifically, this study wanted to determine the effect of a LAMG on youths' overall anger (AE-I), anger control (AC) and anger expression with others (AX) of the STAXI-2. The statistical procedure used was a paired sample t-test. Use of the paired sample t-test stemmed from the investigator insuring the design met requirements dictating usage of the procedure. First, the data was continuously distributed, and the dependent variable was continuous in nature (Gay & Airasian, 2003). Secondly, the group was assessed more than once, and the dependent variables measured were the same characteristics (anger, anger control and anger in relationships) during different conditions (i.e. times) (Heppner, Wampold, & Kivlighan, 2008).

When two groups involve the same individuals (each individual gives two values, one for each group) then a paired-samples t-test may be the most appropriate statistical procedure to use (Field, 2009). A paired-samples t-test analysis compares the means between dependent or matched-pair groups. Additionally, a paired samples t-test can determine if two groups measuring the same variable are different from each other. As Field (2009) states, when two groups measure identical variables, and are from the same, or matched individuals, a paired-sample t-test is appropriate. A paired-sample t-test computes the differences between the two groups for the variables and tests whether the average differs from zero.

CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS

This chapter describes the data analysis of an eight-week leadership driven anger management group (LAMG) aimed at reducing anger, improving anger control and reducing anger in youths' relationships. The following research questions directed this study: (1) Does a short term LAMG reduce youths' overall anger? (2) Does a short term LAMG increase angry youths' ability to control anger urges? (3) Does a short term LAMG reduces youths' expressed anger with others? The null hypotheses associated with each of the three research questions are as follows:

H₁: A short term LAMG assists in reducing youths' overall anger ($p < .05$).

H₀: A short term LAMG has no effect on youths' overall anger ($p > .05$).

H₂: A short term LAMG increases angry youths' ability to control anger urges ($p < .05$).

H₀₂: A short term LAMG has no effect on angry youths' ability to control anger urges ($p > .05$).

H₃: A short term LAMG reduces youths' expressed anger with others ($p < .05$).

H₀₃: A short term LAMG has no effect on youths' expressed anger with others ($p > .05$).

This chapter begins with a description of the participants of this study, detailing race, gender, age and grade level. The chapter continues with descriptive data indicating the mean, standard deviation and number of participants involved in the study for each dependent variable. The statistical analysis conducted on each dependent variable concludes the chapter. A paired-sample t test was the statistical procedure conducted in order to determine the effect of the independent variable (LAMG) on each dependent variable. The dependent variables were overall anger measured by the State Trait Anger Expression Inventory-2 (STAXI-2). Selection of a

paired-sample t test was due to the following: (1) The study assessed the same participant characteristic (anger) more than once under different conditions. (2) Every participant took part in all conditions of the study (i.e. independent variable). (3) The dependent variable is continuous and measured at the interval or ratio scale. (4) There was only one independent variable involved.

Demographics of the Population Sample

Participants in the sixth, seventh and eighth grade received nominations to be in one of the four groups comprising the study. Twenty-five received nominations for participation in the group. Out of twenty-five, twenty returned informed consents and became participants in the study. Ten males and females, ages 12-14 comprised the participant group. There were six fourteen year olds, seven thirteen olds, and seven twelve year olds. The participants consisted of eighty-five percent Latino/Hispanic (17), ten percent Black (2), while the remaining five percent as Caucasian (1). Attrition rate was low, as only two participants did not complete the study. Table 1 provides demographic information related to gender, ethnicity and age pre-intervention. Table 2 provides demographic related to gender, ethnicity and age post-intervention.

Table 1 Description of Participants by Gender, Ethnicity and Age Pre-intervention

Characteristics	Percent	Number
Gender		
Male	50.0	10
Female	50.0	10
Ethnicity		
Black	10.0	2
Caucasian	5.0	1
Hispanic	85.0	17
Age		
Twelve	35.0	7
Thirteen	35.0	7
Fourteen	30.0	6
Total	100.0	20

Table 2 Description of Participants by Gender, Ethnicity and Age Post-intervention

Characteristics	Percent	Number
Gender		
Male	50.0	9
Female	50.0	9
Ethnicity		
Black	11.0	2
Caucasian	5.0	1
Hispanic	84.0	15
Age		
Twelve	33.4	6
Thirteen	33.3	6
Fourteen	33.3	6
Total	100.0	18

Participants in this study had difficulties with overall anger, controlling anger and expressing anger positively. Spielberger (1999), states one of the purposes of the STAXI-2 is to

give researchers and clinicians information on which to make professional/clinical judgments. The STAXI-2 allows researchers and clinicians to see percentile ranks that correspond with the STAXI-2 scale and subscale scores. According to Spielberger, scores that fall between the 25th and 75th percentile are ordinary, and fall into the normal range for people. However, he goes on to state individuals with higher scores in this range are more prone to anger problems. The higher the score, the more likely the individual may need professional assistance. By interpreting percentile ranks, researchers/clinicians can determine how an individual compares with others. Percentile ranks above the 75th percentile experience and/or express angry behaviors that impede behavioral functioning in life and in interpersonal relationships (Spielberger, 1999). The AE-I scale ranges from 0-96, with scores from 22 to 41 as normal. Spielberger states that high AE-I scores (above 41), correspond with percentiles above the 75th percentile. Individuals scoring in these ranges are more prone to having anger problems. Pre-intervention, 15 had high AE-I scores (above 41) and percentiles (above 75) indicating these individuals had anger problems. Table 3 provides information on the level of anger participants had pre-intervention that corresponds with STAXI-2 overall measure of anger, the Anger Expression Index (AE-I). Table 4 provides information on the level of overall anger (AE-I) in participants post intervention.

Table 3 Level of Participant's Overall Anger Pre-Intervention

Participant	AE-I Score	Percentile
Participant One	67	99
Participant Two	57	96
Participant Three	59	97
Participant Four	36	60
Participant Five	41	70
Participant Six	27	35
Participant Seven	74	99
Participant Eight	52	90
Participant Nine	51	90
Participant Ten	57	96
Participant Eleven	54	95
Participant Twelve	60	95
Participant Thirteen	67	99
Participant Fourteen	69	99
Participant Fifteen	60	98
Participant Sixteen	60	98
Participant Seventeen	50	85
Participant Eighteen	79	99

Table 4 Level of Participant’s Overall Anger Post Intervention

Participant	AE-I Score	Percentile
Participant One	60	98
Participant Two	50	85
Participant Three	62	98
Participant Four	23	50
Participant Five	50	85
Participant Six	29	40
Participant Seven	41	70
Participant Eight	54	95
Participant Nine	39	65
Participant Ten	47	85
Participant Eleven	50	85
Participant Twelve	53	90
Participant Thirteen	52	90
Participant Fourteen	45	80
Participant Fifteen	56	96
Participant Sixteen	54	95
Participant Seventeen	44	75
Participant Eighteen	53	90

Data Analysis Results

As stated in the beginning of this chapter, this study consisted of three research questions. A paired-sample t-test utilizing the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) (SPSS, 2006) computed the data analysis for the three research questions. Inspection of the data confirmed that a paired-sample t test was the appropriate statistical procedure to utilize. Field (2009), states that when the same, or similar groups measure identical variables then a paired-sample t-test is necessary. Field further states that a paired-samples t-test can determine if two means are

different from each other. When two groups came from the same sample, such as is the case in this study, then a paired-sample t test is necessary. The paired-samples t-test procedure compares the means of two variables for a single group. A paired-sample t test computes the differences between the two variables for each group and tests whether the average is different from zero.

Research Question One

The purpose of the first research question was to determine if a short term LAMG reduced youths’ overall anger. Here, the dependent measure for this question was, the STAXI-2 (Spielberger, 1999), which assesses overall anger through the anger expression index (AE-I).

Table 5 indicates descriptive statistics, such as the mean and standard deviation, for AE-I.

Table 5 Descriptive Statistics for Pretest and Posttest for AE-I

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Anger Expression Index (pretest)	56.67	12.975	18
Anger Expression Index (posttest)	47.89	9.988	18

The first research question stated a research and null hypothesis: (a) The research hypothesis postulated that a short term LAMG assists in reducing youths’ overall anger ($p < .05$). The null hypothesis affirmed that a short term LAMG has no effect on and does not reduce youths’ overall anger ($p > .05$). Table 6 indicates results from the paired-sample t-test. Results indicate there is a statistically significant reduction in youths’ overall anger pre and post

intervention $t(17) = 3.49, p = .003, \alpha = .05$. Thus, the null hypothesis was not accepted, and rejected for the first research question.

Table 6 Paired Sample T-Test for AE-I

Source	df	t	Sig.
Anger_express_index	1	3.485	.003
Anger_express_index	17		

According to Diekhoff (1996) in some instances, it is not enough to know simply that significance exists. Conversely, it is imperative to know where significant exists. Pairwise comparisons are similar to post hoc tests that detect significance between conditions. Since only two conditions existed, pairwise comparisons are not necessarily required (Field, 2009). It is understood that there is a statistically significant difference between the two due to the within subjects analysis. Thus, pairwise comparisons are not required for this study, and will not be included (Field, 2009).

Research Question Two

The purpose of the second research question was to determine if a short term LAMG short term LAMG increase angry youths' ability to control anger urges. The assessment utilized in this study, the STAXI-2 (Spielberger, 1999), defines anger control through the following: Anger control out (AC-O) and anger control in (AC-I). Table 7 indicates the dependent variable

for the second research question and descriptive statistics, such as the mean and standard deviation for AC-O.

Table 7 Descriptive Statistics for Pretest and Posttest for AC-O

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Anger Control Out (pretest)	15.56	4.047	18
Anger Control Out (posttest)	18.61	3.534	18

The second research question stated a research and null hypothesis: (a) The research hypothesis postulated that a short term LAMG increases angry youths' ability to control anger urges ($p < .05$). The null hypothesis stated that a short term LAMG has no effect on and does not increase angry youths' ability to control anger urges ($p > .05$). Table 8 indicates results from the paired-sample t-test. Results indicate there is a statistically significant increase in youths' ability to control anger pre and post intervention $t(17) = -3.361, p = .004, \alpha = .05$. Thus, the null hypothesis was not accepted, and rejected for the second research question. However, for AC-I (see table 10) there was not a statistically significant increase in youth being able to control their anger internally $t(17) = -1.84, p = .083, \alpha = .05$. A discussion explaining the possible reasons behind the discrepancy between AC-O and AC-I begins in Chapter 5 of this study in more elaborate detail.

Table 8 Paired Sample T-Test for AC-O

Source	df	t	Sig.
Anger_control_out	1	-3.361	.004
Anger_control_out	17		

Table 9 provides descriptive statistics, such as the mean and standard deviation for AC-I.

Table 10 indicates that for AC-I, there was not a significant relationship between the intervention and the dependent variable $t(17) = -1.84, p = .083, \alpha = .05$.

Table 9 Descriptive Statistics for Pretest and Posttest for AC-I

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Anger Control In (pretest)	17.11	4.351	18
Anger Control In (posttest)	19.11	3.628	18

Table 10 Paired Sample T-Test for AC-I

Source	df	t	Sig.
Anger_control_in	1	-1.84	.083
Anger_control_in	17		

Research Question Three

The purpose of the third research question was to determine if a short term LAMG short term LAMG improve youths' relationships by reducing anger. The assessment used in this study, the STAXI-2 (Spielberger, 1999), assesses reduced expressed anger with others through the following: Anger expression out (AX-O) and anger expression in (AX-I).

Table 11 Descriptive Statistics for Pretest and Posttest for AX-O

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Anger Express Out (pretest)	21.72	5.560	18
Anger Express Out (posttest)	19.06	4.531	18

The third research question stated a research and null hypothesis: (a) The research hypothesis postulated that a short term LAMG improves youths' relationships with others by reducing anger ($p < .05$). The null hypothesis affirmed that a short term LAMG has no effect on and does not improve youths' relationships with others by reducing anger ($p > .05$). Table 12 indicates results from a paired-sample t-test. Results indicate there is a statistically significant decrease in youths' expressed anger pre and post intervention $t(17) = 2.36, p = .03, \alpha = .05$. Thus, the null hypothesis was not accepted, and rejected for the third research question. However, as was the case previously, for AX-I (see table 14) there was not a statistically significant decrease in youths' expressed anger internally (i.e. calming themselves down) $t(17) = .370, p = .716, \alpha = .05$. A discussion explaining the possible reasons behind the discrepancy between AX-O and AX-I begins in Chapter 5 of this study in more elaborate detail.

Table 12 Paired Sample T-Test for AX-O

Source	df	t	Sig.
Anger express out	1	2.364	.03
Anger express out	17		

Table 13 provides descriptive statistics, such as the mean and standard deviation for AX-I. Table 14 indicates that for AX-I, there was not a significant relationship between the intervention and the dependent variable $t(17) = .370, p = .716, \alpha = .05$.

Table 13 Descriptive Statistics for Pretest and Posttest for AX-I

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Anger Express_In (pretest)	19.06	4.721	18
Anger Express_In (posttest)	18.67	3.565	18

Table 14 Paired Sample T-Test for AX-I

Source	df	t	Sig.
Anger_express_in	1	.370	.716
Anger_express_in	17		

Summary

This chapter presented demographic and pre and post intervention information on the participants that comprised the study. Additionally, the data analysis procedures, which included descriptive statistics and the paired-sample t-test concluded the chapter. The following chapter will continue with a discussion of results, modifications to research design that needed implementation due to extending circumstances, limitations of the study, and implications for professional counselors, counseling practice, and future research.

CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION

The primary purpose of this chapter is to discuss results and explain the implications of the study and its potential contribution to the field of counseling and anger management. The discussion consists of five major sections. The first section presents an overview, describing the purpose and rationale for the study. The second section includes a description of the limitations of the study, while the third section provides a summary and interpretation of results. The fourth section presents a modified procedures segment indicating changes that were made in the original design due to extenuating circumstances. The fifth and final section emphasizes the implications of the study for the field of counseling and anger management groups (AMGs).

Overview

The intent of this study was to determine whether youth in a leadership-driven anger management group (LAMG) would be able to reduce anger, increase anger control, and reduce anger expression with others. The treatment was an eight-week school based LAMG administered to angry middle school students. The State Trait Anger Expression Inventory 2nd Edition (STAXI-2) was administered to participants pre and posttest. The study was also intended to provide a potential enhancement for traditional AMGs by providing empirical evidence for a leadership driven method utilizing concepts from social cognitive theory (SCT).

This study involved a public middle serving approximately 2,000 students in grades 6th-8th. The school faculty and administration, through in-school suspension (ISS) and out-of-school suspension (OSS) records, behavioral referrals, report cards, teacher, school counselors' and psychologists' recommendations, nominated students who displayed significantly higher rates of

anger and less prosocial skills than peers. Twenty-five received nominations for participation in the group. Out of twenty-five, twenty returned informed consents and were able to participate in the study. Participants were ten males and ten females, ages 12-14. The study consisted of four groups, with five members each. There were six fourteen year olds, seven thirteen olds, and seven twelve year olds. The groups consisted of eighty-five percent Latino/Hispanic (17), ten percent Black (2), with the remaining five percent being Caucasian (1). The attrition rate was low, as only two participants did not complete the study.

Limitations

The purpose of this study was to improve AMGs by providing empirical evidence for a leadership driven method incorporating concepts from SCT. The study had limitations stemming from the research methods used, sample population, and research design. A discussion of how each limitation affected the results of the study follows in subsequent subdivisions of this section.

Limitations from Research Methods

This study had limitations stemming from research methods. First, the groups were limited to participants selected from a standardized school documentation system. The documentation system was a computer-generated list numbering the combined amount of participants' out of school suspensions (OSS), in school suspensions (ISS), and behavioral referrals. Although standardized and free from human bias, the documentation system did not discriminate between suspensions that were due to non-angry/aggressive behavior and those that involved anger. While it is true that participants had a number of anger-induced OSS or ISS

reports, the same participant could receive suspension for habitual tardiness as well as angry behavior. In school systems, grounds for suspension can range from fighting to not returning school documentation forms, such as signed report cards. Behavioral reports clarify this problem somewhat, as the behavioral referral indicates the behavior that earned the referral. However, due to the Family Education Right to Privacy Act (FERPA) the principal investigator (PI) was not able to see the behavior that earned the referral. Thus, the behavioral referral had the same limitation as suspensions, i.e., no information about aggressive or angry behavior.

In order to be certain that the study targeted the correct population for treatment, the investigator included professional school counselors, teachers, school psychologists, and deans' recommendations to substantiate nominations of participants. The attempt was to obtain a human indicator to prevent non-angry students from being included. It is possible that students were referred because they were behavior problems in the school. Additionally, school staff might have had biases such as personal dislike for participants' and their families. Parents and older siblings may have a history with members in the school and by their very nature, these biases are hidden and difficult to detect but may have affected the selection of participants. The investigator sought to curb this limitation somewhat by incorporating the standardized documentation method and human element in nominating participants in the study. Both methodologies, however, have inherent weaknesses and present limitations to the study.

School and Language Limitations

Data collection and analysis was from one school that provided the participants for the study. The school has a unique demographic composition that makes generalizing results to other

academic institutions problematic. The school is in a large urban city, located in a low socio-economic community. Additionally, a majority of the student population are also residents of the surrounding community. The school has a large number of Spanish speaking students and the curriculum and customs regarding language are different from many other schools. For instance, during some school wide assemblies, lectures and programs begin in English, and then switch to Spanish. Both students and staff accept this practice as normal.

In addition, the informed consent sent to parents/guardians to sign was solely in English, and did not contain a Spanish translation. School staff indicated to the investigator that some parents/guardians were monolithic Spanish speakers and did not understand English. Additionally, school staff stated that parents/guardians might not have understood what the informed consent was, or they may have been intimidated by reading English. According to school staff, although potential participants were fluent in English, some of the youth may not have provided an accurate description of the study to parents. These language problems potentially resulted in a lower number of participants in the study, as school staff would not nominate participants whose parents were monolithic Spanish Speakers.

Limitations of Gender

In regards to gender, this study consisted of an equal number of males and females. The investigator separated the population and had two female, one male, and a mixed gender group. The literature indicates that homogenous groups have advantages over heterogeneous ones (Twemlow, Sacco, & Fonagy, 2008). However, other studies debate the significance of homogenous versus heterogeneous groups (Fleckenstein & Horne, 2004). Having all female and

male groups presented a limitation in that participants did not get to practice leadership skills with opposite sex members. Although one out of the four (25%) groups did consist of a mixed gender design, the majority (75%) did not. A mixed gender group potentially merges different perspectives together, as males and females address and resolve problems differently (Fleckenstein & Horne, 2004). In most research investigating anger, the targeted population has been largely male (Brugman & Martine, 2010). In this study, however, there existed an equal number of males and females. The equal proportion in gender may mean that it is difficult to compare this study with studies heavily weighted towards male participants.

According to Taylor, Andersen, and Mudford (2010), there are a growing number of females in AMGs. Taylor, Andersen, and Mudford's work draws from Bemak and Chung (2005), who stated that social disparities based on gender, exist in schools, and that some students may not receive services needed due to unfair stigma associated with gender. Bemak and Chung further stipulated that unfair practices can be subtle and go unnoticed. An example of this is educators' beliefs that males are angrier, and require anger management services. This way of thinking, neglects females who may need the same type of services (Hermann & McWhirter, 2003). Although gender demographics of this study are equal, and deviate from the usual studies on anger management, the population may not be representative of current AMGs in school settings. Thus, it may be difficult to generalize this study to homogenous AMGs. However, this study meant to focus on students identified by faculty and staff rather than be representative of the usual demographic.

Limitations of Population Sample

In addition to research methods, limitations existed due to the study's population sample. For example, the investigator chose a school located in a lower socio-economic community. Caucasian participants were extremely low, which is consistent with the community's demographics. Although the population had racial limitations, the participants had several of the characteristics the investigator wanted to study. The investigator was interested in the effect of a leadership driven anger management group (LAMG) on Latino and Black youth who had experience problems with angry behavior. Second, the investigator wanted to explore the degree to which students from lower socioeconomic background would respond to a leadership curriculum. This study's participants came from a predominately Latino school in an economically disadvantaged neighborhood. Past research has indicated that the demographics of this study are consistent with other investigations looking at underserved populations in schools (Piquero, 2008; Alegria et al., 2007). Piquero (2008) stated that underserved youth, traditionally Black and Latino, suffer from inadequate mental health services, poverty and unfair social practices, such as racism. Similar issues affected the participants in the present study... Because participants in this study were not very culturally diverse, the results may not entirely generalize to other populations.

Although inter-racial diversity limited the study, intra-racial diversity existed. For instance, the groups consisted of a mix of different Latino subpopulations. In the study, Puerto Ricans, Cubans, and Dominicans had representation. It is important to recognize the cultural diversity within Latino populations in research of this kind (Alegria et al., 2007). In this study, there existed a lack of representation from Mexican and Central American Latinos. This study

had a strong concentration of Latinos stemming predominately from a Caribbean background (Puerto Rican, Cuban, and Dominican).

According to Villalba, Nathaniel, and Ohlms (2010), differences exist not only between cultures, but also among urbanized and rural Latinos. Furthermore, Algeria et al. (2008) stipulated that differences emerge between first, second and even third generation Latinos. Additionally, Villalba et al. corroborate Algeria et al.'s findings, and state a powerful disclaimer. They suggest that what may work with an urbanized Caribbean Latino may not be effective with a rural Latino from a Mexican/Central American background. As stated beforehand, this study consisted of. Not only were the participants in this study from a Caribbean background, they were also third or fourth generation, and born in large urban cities. This study potentially does not reflect an accurate depiction of all Latinos with anger issues, which may affect generalizability.

Limitations of Voluntary Participants

Another limitation concerns whether or not participants chose to be part of the study. All participants were volunteers and those that declined may have been different from the studied population. As stated previously, twenty-five participants received nominations to be in the study. Five declined participation, and two dropped out. The reasons for each of the five that declined participation varied. One stated that he did not have any interest, nor did he want to be a part of the study. The second received a suspension shortly after the study began, and was not physically available, and missed the deadline to bring back an informed consent. Another participant lost several informed consents given to him (three in total), and presented as apathetic

towards the study. Consequently, the potential participant never returned an informed consent, and missed the deadline. Once the study started, the participant approached the investigator and asked if he could be a part of the group. Apparently, several of his classmates were participants in the study, and spoke highly of the group. Once he heard positive affirmations from friends, he wanted to join. The investigator decided, however, that introducing a new participant to the study might disrupt group development. The investigator informed the potential participant that the time had passed, and he was unable to join the study. The fourth did not participate due to his parents refusing to sign the informed consent. The fifth participant was not able to participate due to an expulsion from the school where the study took place. This participant received the expulsion shortly after the investigator gave the informed consent to him.

In regards to those that participated, two dropped out of the study. One left because her family moved, and she could no longer be a student in the school due to busing protocols. However, that participant was one of the most resolute and enthusiastic members, and did not want to withdraw. Her participation lasted until the seventh week, and sixth core session. The second participant that withdrew from the study left based on the researcher's clinical judgment. This participant completed only two weeks of the study. After the second week, the participant informed his teacher he was leaving for the study but did not actually attend the group. This occurred two times before the investigator was able to contact the teacher. After this, the participant received two suspensions due to his behavior, unrelated to his failure to participate in the study. Hence, the participant was not available for a number of sessions. The investigator deemed it necessary to remove him from the group, after consultation with the teacher, school counselor, and dean of the participant's grade level. The investigator removed the participant

from the study in the fifth week, and fourth core session. Therefore, the factor of voluntarily participation may be a limitation to the study, in that participants who came regularly might have been more motivated to change, more responsible and potentially less severe in terms of their behavior. The next section discusses the final limitation of the study concerning the research design.

Limitations from Research Design

A small sample size ($N = 20$) restricted generalizability and transferability of results. Furthermore, lack of a control group and randomization are limitations stemming from utilizing a within-subject design (Lambie, 2009). However, a within-subject design method may be the most effective modality available in school settings (Heppner, Wampold, & Kivlighan, 2008). According to Diekhoff (1996), research integrity has increased in recent years, and many studies without a control group lack scientific rigor. However, he further stated that in certain situations, lack of a control group is acceptable, such when using within-subject designs. According to Gay and Airasian (2003), every research design has strengths and limitations. Specifically, this study had potential limitations, such as external threats to validity, due to not having a control group (Heppner, et al., 2008). The following sections go into detail describing the limitations that may have existed because of a lack of a control group.

Lack of Control Group

Due to this study not having a control group, data must be carefully examined. According to Leedy and Ormrod (2001), lack of a control group limits the number of conclusions a researcher can draw from results. In addition, studies lacking a control group are difficult to

interpret due to multiple threats to validity. Threats to internal validity, covered in subsequent sections of this chapter, discuss in more detail these potential threats. Leedy and Ormrod (2001) continued to state that a control group allows for elimination or compensates for most threats to internal validity. Lack of a control group also does not allow for transfer of effects between conditions and groups. For instance, a group may be different or predisposed to a particular characteristic such as anger, at the beginning of the study. If this is so, any significance or difference that may occur in test scores at the end of the study are difficult to interpret because there is not another group to compare it against. Furthermore, matching for variability between groups and range effects can be problematic (Leedy & Ormrod, 2001).

However, Leedy and Ormrod (2001) further stated that there is no perfect research design. As a result, there are times, depending on the situation, where a lack of a control group is permissible. Thus, the investigator was unable to state that a LAMG was more useful or efficient than a traditional AMG. At the same time the investigator suggested that the intervention as a whole (LAMG) was effective in reducing anger, increasing anger control and reducing youths' expressed anger with others.

Lambie (2009) suggests that certain contexts, such as schools, are not suited for particular research designs. Due to time constraints, monetary resources, confidentiality, and participant need, research in schools rarely have the means for rigorous research methods (Heppner, Wampold, & Kivlighan, 2008). This study originally proposed both a treatment and control group. However, due to extenuating circumstances, the investigator modified the original research method. A detailed explanation of what this modification entailed follows in the section labeled modified procedures. Thus, the investigator eliminated the control group and used

within-subjects, one group pretest/posttest design. Modification of research methods created new limitations and threats, unique to a within-subjects design. The following paragraphs discuss further the threats to internal and external validity.

Internal Threats to Validity

Internal threats potentially existed in this study due to the following factors: History, maturation, testing, and mortality. History may have been a factor due to events that occurred outside of the study's constraints. History includes personal, as well as community history, such as parents divorcing, or neighborhood schools closing. However, the fact that this study was brief (ten weeks total, with eight core sessions) limits history as an external threat to validity (Gay and Airasian, 2003). Maturation is another potential threat to validity. However, as stated by Leedy and Ormrod (2001), maturation is more of a factor with longitudinal, multi-year studies. As this study took place over approximately two months, it is unlikely that natural physical, intellectual or emotional changes affected the participants greatly. An example of maturation is participants continuing to develop normal cognitive functioning that allow them to better perceive their internal behavior. However, since the study was relatively short in nature, this threat was limited (Gay and Airasian, 2003).

Pretest Sensitization and Mortality

Testing was potentially a threat to validity in that improved scores may have been due to a phenomenon labeled pretest sensitization (Gay & Airasian, 2003). In pretest sensitization, scores taken on a posttest improve over scores taken from a pretest. This threat, however, is more prevalent on pretest/posttests measuring fact-based information, such as math (Leedy & Ormrod,

2001). Since this study examined behavior instead of fact-based information, this threat to validity is constrained to a certain extent (Diekhoff, 1996). Furthermore, this study, although short, had enough time between pretest and posttest so that pretest sensitization was probably limited (Gay & Airasian, 2003).

The last threat, *mortality* or attrition, may have been an issue due to the small population size. In short, subjects who dropped out may have been different from those who stayed in treatment. However, overall attrition was low, as ninety percent (18) of participants stayed for the full duration of the study. Additionally, Gay and Airasian (2003) stated that in order to limit mortality, researchers should rigorously document demographic information about participants. Demographic information should then be compared pre and posttest, to insure that the pretested group is similar to the posttest group. A researcher can also compensate for mortality by recording the type of participant (s) who left the study, and remove similar participant (s) from the rest of the group. This study included the two stipulations stated by Gay and Airasian (2003). One was through design, whereas the other through a fortuitous event. The following paragraph goes into further detail explaining what the investigator did by design, and which occurred through chance.

The demographics for the group pre and posttest remained virtually the same. Initially, in this study, the group consisted of six sixth graders, seven seventh graders, and seven eighth graders. School staff informed the investigator that seventh and eighth graders are harder to work with, and they were less likely to want to work with adults. However, school staff stated that sixth graders might be more receptive to participating in the study. Although all grades have anger issues, school staffs' belief is that younger participants respond better. Considering school

staffs' recommendations, the investigator had a higher number of seventh and eighth graders in the study. This design was purposively, just in case older students wished to withdraw from the study. This happened, in that a seventh and eighth grader withdrew from the study. However, the demographics and remained the same due to the design implemented by the investigator.

External Threats to Validity

Experimenter effects

In regards to external validity, there are two major threats that limited this study. They are as follows: experimenter effects and participant effects. Experimenter effects, according to Gay and Airasian (2003), can be passive or active (or a combination of both). In this study, passive experimenter effects such as the investigator's age, race and gender may be limitations.. For example, the school is predominately Latino and Black. During the study, many of the participants assumed that the investigator was from a Latin background, and would speak to him in Spanish. Additionally, the age and gender of the investigator may have been a limitation due to experimenter effects. For instance, the investigator appears young, and is a male. According to Yancy, Siegel, and McDaniel (2002) males have a strong influence with youth, especially ones of color. They further stated that age also plays a factor, as youth relate to young males, either in their lives or through surrogates in the media. These are factors that the investigator has, and as such, may be passive experimenter effects.

An additional experimenter effect that potentially limits the study is that the investigator is also the group facilitator, as well as being the creator of the LAMG. There exist potential experimenter bias effects due to the investigator having a dual role and being a proponent of the

curriculum (Gay & Airasian, 2003). Discussion of this potential limitation occurred between the investigator and his dissertation committee. The committee agreed, nevertheless, that the investigator was the best qualified to conduct groups, due to his years of clinical experience in schools, and with youth of color. Additionally, the investigator sought consultation on a weekly basis with Dr. Butler, co-chair of his committee, in order to reduce experimenter bias. The co-chair would process the groups with the investigator, in addition to providing clinical and research supervision.

Participant Effects

The second threat to external validity, participant effects, includes the following: (1) The Hawthorne effect, (2) and the novelty effect. The Hawthorne effect could always be a limitation due to the age of the participants. Research suggests that, developmentally, youth desire attention (Twemlow & Sacco, 1998). Youth may perform better because someone is paying attention to them and satisfying their need for attention. The novelty effect, similar to Hawthorne, increases performances of participants due to fresh, new or innovative treatments (Gay & Airasian, 2003). This study may have incurred these threats to external validity initially. However, due to the period of the study (a little over two months) the novelty and Hawthorne effects should have been reduced due to time (Gay & Airasian, 2003).

Although the preceding limitations related to methods, participants, and design suggests that the results should be interpreted with care, the study had the strength of being conducted in a naturalistic setting with students experience problems with anger and angry behavior. This study was one of the few to investigate a LAMG with school-aged youth (Burt, Patel, Lewis, Butler, &

Gonzalez, 2010). In addition, this study was among the first to include a leadership-driven model as supplement to traditional anger management groups. The next section will address the statistical procedures conducted in the study. Additionally, the section provides a summary and interpretation of results.

Summary and Interpretation of Results

This section discusses each research question in order to examine results and draw conclusions from the statistical results. Moreover, this section discusses the analyzed data and compares/contrasts findings with research studies in AMGs and counselor education.

Research Question One

The purpose of the first research question was to determine if a short term LAMG reduced youths' overall anger. According to Spielberger (1999), anger expresses in two primary ways: through physical and verbal behavior. The assessment utilized in this study, the State Trait Anger Expression Inventory-2 (STAXI-2) (Spielberger, 1999), assesses overall anger through the anger expression index (AE-I). The AE-I measures both verbal and physical behavior.

Results indicated a statistically significant reduction in youths' overall anger pre and post intervention. This result corresponds with Burt, Lewis, and Patel's (2010) assertions as well as Burt et al.'s (2010) findings that a LAMG can result in decreased angry behavior with youth. More specifically, the analyses revealed that nearly every participant had a reduction in anger, or stayed the same with none regressing. In the limited research conducted on LAMGs, results typically indicated that a focus on leadership results in decreased anger (Kellner, Bry, & Salvador, 2008). The results of this study provided support for studies conducted by Kellner

(2001), and Orpinas and Horne (2004). Additionally, the findings in this study are consistent with Pajares (2006), Zimmerman and Cleary (2006), and Bandura (2008a) who stated that adolescent programs with a leadership and environmental focus can reduce delinquent behaviors.

Research Question Two

The purpose of the second research question was to determine if a short term LAMG increased youths' ability to control anger urges. The assessment used in this study, the STAXI-2 defines anger control through the following: Anger control out (AC-O) and anger control in (AC-I) (Spielberger, 1999). According to Spielberger (1999), angry individuals are marked by an inability to control outward and inward manifestations of anger. Outwards manifestations include slamming doors and hitting others. Inward manifestations include an inability to control angry feelings or calm oneself down quickly. AC-O assesses the occurrence of outward control exerted over anger towards others in the environment and in relationships. AC-I measures how frequently an individual attempts to control anger internally by cooling off or calming down. Identical to research question one, this question also had a research and null hypothesis. The two hypotheses were as follows: (1) A short term LAMG increases angry youths' ability to control anger urges ($p < .05$). (2). A short term LAMG has no effect on angry youths' ability to control anger urges ($p > .05$).

Similar to the results from AE-I, the data analysis indicated that there was a statically significant increase in youths' ability to control outward expressions of their anger (AC-O) pre and post intervention. The intervention did have an effect on youths' ability to control outward expressions of anger. This result corresponds with Dwipedi & Gupta (2000) findings that a

LAMG resulted in an increase in anger control with youth. This study found that anger control increased for most participants, which is consistent with other leadership driven models (Shek & Wai, 2008). According to Bandura (2006), goal directed and purposeful behavior is incompatible with delinquent and pessimistic actions. Research conducted in leadership supports Bandura's ideals. For example, Avolio, Walumbwa, and Weber (2009) suggested that a developmental process begins with new leaders. Avolio et al. claim that as leadership develops, there is a reduction in negative behavior and thoughts. Through leadership development, leaders are better able to control their behavior in stressful situations.

However, the analysis indicated no significant increase in participant's ability to control anger internally. On the other hand, the study determined that almost every participant indicated either no difference or a non-significant increase in ability to control anger internally (AC-I). A potential reason for the lack of significance with AC-I may be due to the developmental level of participants. For instance, research suggests that interventions with an internal focus (such as psychoanalysis and Gestalt) may not be appropriate with youth (Fleckenstein & Horne, 2004). The reason being is that developmentally, youth are not cognitively ready to focus on implicit, subtle behavior. Youths' focus is to be aware on overt and outward behavior, such as dealing with others and people's reactions to them (Bandura, 1997). For instance, a youth may not be aware of the self-talk that he/she utilized in order to calm down and avoid trouble. What the youth concentrates on is the fact that they did not hurt someone, or get into trouble (i.e. overt, outward behavior). Therefore, AC-I would be much lower because youth are not aware or developmentally able to comprehend what they are doing internally (Rice & Dolgin, 2005).

Furthermore, some angry youth have egocentric views that focus solely on what people do to them, and largely ignore their impact on others (Burt & Butler, 2010). The population of this study may be predisposed to thinking more outwardly than internally. It may take more than an eight-week, short term, LAMG to shift their focus from outward to internal. In other words, the treatment may not have been long enough or powerful enough to create significant change in this area.

A third potential reason for AC-I not being significant is that the intervention itself (LAMG) focuses on targeting externalized anger much more than internal anger. In AMGs, there are three fundamental types of groups. They are psycho-educational, counseling, and psychotherapy groups. LAMGs, are primarily a psycho-educational AMG, and do not focus on the deep, internal reasons underlying anger (Fleckenstein & Horne, 2004).

Research Question Three

The intent of the third research question was to determine whether a short term LAMG reduced youths' expressed anger with others. The assessment used in this study, the STAXI-2 defines anger expression with others through the following: Anger expression out (AX-O) and anger expression in (AX-I) (Spielberger, 1999). AX-O measures how often an individual's anger expresses outwardly towards peers and others in relationships. AX-I evaluates how regularly anger is experienced but not expressed with an individual, and is suppressed. Operationally defined, anger expression with others involves relationships marked by anger, lack of coping mechanisms when agitated, and inability to handle disagreements (Spielberger, 1999). The third research question had one research hypothesis: (1) A short term LAMG will reduce youths'

expressed anger with others. (The data analysis indicated that there was a statically significant reduction in youths' expressed anger with others (AX-O) pre to post intervention. This matches with Pajares (2006) who stated that leadership assists youth in developing better social relationships with adults and peers. Bandura (2008b) agreed with Pajares, as he postulated that although youth may struggle with disruptive behavior, leadership could be a potential buffer against delinquency.

The analysis further revealed that AX-O decreased for almost every participant in the study, which is consistent with leadership driven models (Shek & Wai, 2008). Blanton, Christensen, and Shakir (2006), stated that for positive leadership to exist, expressed anger must decrease. This decrease corresponded with Bandura (1997), who believed that goal directed and prosocial behavior is incompatible with delinquent and angry actions. Succinctly stated, for leadership to exist, it must be commensurate with an ability to express emotions positively (Avolio, Walumbwa, & Weber, 2009). This study's results corroborated Kellner et al. (2008) and Shek and Wai's (2008) findings that a LAMG assisted in reducing expressed anger with others, and paves the way for more prosocial relationships. Better relationships allow youth to be more productive in their life, reduce delinquency and succeed through failures in life. For instance, healthy relationships can provide social support and encouragement through stressful situations and failures (Bandura, 2008b). Through social support and encouragement, Bandura (2008b) stated that youth receive the message from others to continue to persevere through obstacles and setbacks.

Similar to the analysis performed on anger control internally (AC-I), statistical procedures indicated no significant increase in participant's perception of their anger expression

internally (AX-I) with others. Furthermore, identical to AC-I, the study determined that almost every participant had no difference or a non-significant increase in AX-I. The potential reasons underlying the lack of significance may be the same to the ones behind insignificance for AC-I. Developmentally, participants may not be at the level where they are able to recognize internal measures of control. A LAMG may not be effective in reducing internal aspects of expressed anger. This is not to say that the intervention cannot ever be effective with AX-I. For instance, cognitive behavioral theorists (CBT) believe that behavior begins by internal thoughts that affect emotions, which influence behaviors (Day, 2004). Although people are unaware of the relationship, the processes, nevertheless, continues without their knowledge. The same potentially applies to youth in this study.

Fleckenstein and Horne (2004) stated that some interventions with an internal focus may not be appropriate with youth. The reason is that youth are lacking the cognitive development to focus on inherent, subtle behavior. The trend is to be aware and focus on overt and outward behavior, such as dealing with others and people's reactions to them (Bandura, 1997). For instance, a youth may not be aware of the self-talk that he/she did in order to calm down and avoid trouble. What the youth concentrates on is the fact that they did not hurt someone, or get into trouble (i.e. overt, outward behavior). As such, AX-I may be much lower due to youth who are not aware of themselves internally.

As stated previously in this chapter, angry youth tend to have egocentric viewpoints. Some youth primarily focus on what people do to them, and ignore their own effect on others (Burt & Butler, 2010). The population that this study included may have thinking more attuned to outward, rather than internal modes of behavior. To change this predisposition from outward

to internal may require a period longer than eight weeks. A third reason for AX-I not being significant is that LAMG is more psycho-educational in nature. As a result, the intervention focuses on targeting external behaviors much more than internal. Since LAMG is psycho-educational, the focus is not on deep, internal reasons behind anger (Fleckenstein & Horne, 2004). The aforementioned results suggest that LAMGS are a practical intervention to use with angry youth (Shek & Wai, 2008). Angry individuals, because of the fear or respect they engender, have an incredible amount of influence in schools (Lorion, 2000). For instance, Frey et al. (2005) postulated that fellow students follow angry youth. Because angry students are already in a leadership role, it makes sense to cultivate this population's strong points and transform it to something positive and constructive (Sullivan, 2000). The following section will provide a discussion regarding the modified procedures this study underwent, due to extenuating circumstances.

Modified Procedures

Due to circumstances that were out of the investigator's control, the principal at the school where the study took place unexpectedly left to pursue other interests. The principal's departure was approximately forty-five days before this study began. Upon his departure, a majority of the school faculty left as well, including teachers that were instructors of participants in the study. This principal's departure left a gap in social support for the program, and the principal's replacement was unfamiliar with the investigator and research in general. Although enthusiastic about the study, the principal's time and resources were spent in becoming acclimated, reassigning individuals, and hiring new personnel to staff vacant positions. Support

waned for the study, and consequently, so did human resources needed to operate the program. Instead of the 60-70 participants guaranteed for the study, the numbers drastically dropped, as only 25 potential participants received nominations to join the group. Out of the 25 nominations, 20 brought back signed informed consents allowing them to become participants in the study.

According to Orpinas and Horne (2004) whenever a fundamental staff member leaves unexpectedly, it has a negative reverberating effect throughout the school. Thus was the case in this situation. Fights between students escalated, coupled with staff reassignment and teachers leaving. Many new staff members came in, who were not familiar with the school, its history, or the students. A mass upheaval began, and the study, due to the fault of no one, suffered in that not enough subjects were available as controls. Originally, the study wanted to include teacher's evaluations of students using the Behavioral Assessment Scale for Children-2 (BASC-2). Teachers, who needed to evaluate students, were no longer at the school, which affected the administration of the BASC-2.

Reynolds and Kamphaus (2004) stated that in order for adults to be able to evaluate youth using the BASC-2, a period of at least one month of daily contact, or 6 to 8 weeks of observations was required. A number of the teachers, due to reassigning, did not have those characteristics. With the new teachers lacking these characteristics, it was not appropriate to have them evaluate youth. Additionally, teachers were not responsive in returning paperwork that was necessary for the study. Because of these administrative changes and diminished number of participants, the researcher consulted with his committee. It was then determined that an alteration in research design needed to accommodate for the changes. The following paragraphs

describe in detail the thought processes underlying the change in methodology, as well as the alternative research design.

Within-Subject Designs

Initially, a between subjects, treatment- control group, quasi-experimental design was in place for the study. After evaluating the number of participants involved, the group facilitator, on the recommendations of his dissertation committee, redesigned the study and removed the control group making it a within-subjects research design According to Kennedy (2005), a within-subjects design is a powerful and rigorous scientific method. For instance, behavior modification, long known for his dedication to scientific rigor, has utilized within-subject designs for over 70 years (Horner et al., 2005). Specifically, in the field of education, within-subject designs have provided useful information to practitioners in schools and academic settings (Horner et al., 2005). For example, recently Taylor, Anderson, and Mudford (2010) utilized a within subject design to determine the efficacy of checklists with underserved adolescent populations in drug and alcohol treatment facilities. On the other hand, a control group allows comparisons between those who did and those who did not receive treatment. It settles a number of threats to internal validity because issues such as history and test sensitivity are held constant.

Efficacy of Within-Subject Designs

According to Horner et al. (2005) within-subject designs are appropriate for a number of research purposes, particularly in determining the efficacy of interventions. For example, Mowery, Miltenberger, and Weil (2010) determined that a within-subject design was the best

approach to use in their work in residential facilities. The emphasis in their work dealt with evaluating a new method to increase positive interactions between residential workers. Similar to Taylor et al. and Mowery et al.'s research, their study utilized a new method. Thus, a within-subjects design, although not the first method of choice, may be the most practical to see if the intervention has merit and should continue in other settings (Anderson, 2001). Within-subjects research is experimental, and its intention is to document causal, functional, or directional relationships. Some of the most pertinent work in social cognitive theory (SCT) and other foundations of counseling and psychology were conducted through within-subject designs (Horner, et al., 2005). Furthermore, the American Psychological Association (APA) stated that over 45 professional journals now report within-subject designs in their research sections. This acknowledgment of the influence of within subject research no longer limits the design to purely educational settings (American Psychological Association, 2002).

Requirements for Within-Subject Designs

According to Horner et al. (2005), within-subject research must include a number of rigorous indicators to insure that a quality design exists. First, they stipulated that within-subject designs must have sufficient detail in describing participants /settings and possess a replicable process for selecting participants. Second, they stated that within-subject designs must have dependent variables described with a precise operational definition. Third, within-subject designs must have a dependent variable(s) that produces a quantifiable index. In addition, the study must measure the dependent variables more than once. Fourth, the independent variable has to be precisely described, so that the study can be replicated, and the independent variable must be

systemically manipulated and under the control of the researcher. Fifth, within-subject designs must have a baseline condition that has replication in mind, and the design must be able to document results that indicate a pattern of experimental control. Sixth, within-subject designs need to have a dependent variable that has social significance. For example, excessive anger, according to Feder (2007) is a socially important phenomenon that affects many people in society. In addition, implementation of the independent variable must be practical and cost effective. Lastly, the value of social validity increases by implementation of the independent variable over time, in different environments, genders, and ages (Horner et al., 2005).

This study satisfies all of Horner et al.'s requirements, as there are sufficient descriptions of participants as put forth in the participant section and demographics. The dependent variables have an operational definition, utilizing terms from the literature backed by over 20 years of research (Freeman, 2004). Additionally, the independent variable is replicable, and was fully under the control of the researcher when implemented. The results taken from experimental procedures indicated a pattern of experimental control, as results consistently stated that the intervention did have an effect on certain parts of the participants' behavior, but not other aspects. Finally, the study had a dependent variable that research deemed socially important (anger) (Feder, 2007). In addition, the implementation of the independent variable was practical and cost effective. Lastly, if the intervention is successful in other settings, it will have social value to schools and society in general. If schools could reduce anger faculty could concentrate more on academics rather than behaviors (Dahir & Stone, 2009). Thus, this study had all of the essential ingredients that are necessary in quality within-subject research design. The next

section will provide a discussion regarding the implications of the current findings, including the significance of AMGs to counselor education.

Implications for Counseling

According to Sugai, Prague, Horner, and Walker (2000) aggressive at risk students are youth potentially high for developing major anger problems in the future as adults. Additionally, at risk students are ones that do not currently meet the criteria for serious or severe anger problems, requiring hospitalization (Twemlow, et al., 2008). Sugai et al. stated that at risk youth require secondary prevention interventions, such as psycho-educational AMGs. This is in stark contrast to youth experiencing chronic and more intensive anger issues, involving counseling or psychotherapy AMGs. Participants in this study received labels such as disobedient, insubordinate, or behaviorally disruptive by teachers and staff. Similar to what Herrmann and McWhirter, (2003) suggested, these labels described at risk youth who are not yet at the stage necessitating intensive services. Thus, a LAMG (which is preventive in nature) is naturally designed to assist at-risk angry youth.

Implications for Counselors

This study's findings have several implications for counselors conducting AMGs in schools, and other academic settings. First, findings suggest that a LAMG increases anger control, a necessary component lacking in some groups geared towards angry youth (Herrmann & McWhirter, 2003; Kellner, et al., 2008). Second, results recommend that a LAMG potentially reduced overall anger. By not focusing primarily on high-affective behavioral control strategies as the only buffer against aggression, groups may be more beneficial for angry youth (Dwivedi

& Gupta, 2000). Third, research states that aggressive students have tremendous influence, as others follow them, out of fear or respect (Lorion, 2000, Shek & Wai, 2008). A LAMG offers counselors a strength-based approach that draws upon the strong points of angry youth (Langdon & Preble, 2008). Moreover, modifying adult perception (from a at risk youth to a potential leader) assists in systematically changing peoples' views of angry adolescents (Bandura, 2001; Kellner, et al., 2008; Martin, 2004). Lastly, a strength-based intervention can assist youths of color with problematic behaviors and issues (Vera & Speight, 2003).

Implications for Schools

This study's findings have several implications for schools. First, findings suggest that leadership programs for youth decrease overall anger (Bandura, 1997). Second, this study suggests that LAMGs reduce expressed anger with others, which can potentially increase prosocial behaviors. Through a reliance on others (members in the group) for leadership assistance, angry students begin to trust and develop healthy relationships with peers and adults (Bandura, 2001). Furthermore, students need to feel comfortable in the school environment in order to do well academically (Dahir & Stone, 2009; Ladson-Billing, 2009). Once comfortable, students can recognize that the school can be a powerful positive influence (Martin, 2004). However, before that can develop, youth need to build better social relationships with adults in the schools. Through a leadership focused approach relationships build that have the potential to buffer against negative circumstances (Bandura, 2008b; Hawkins, Catalano, & Miller, 1992). Third, Sullivan (2000) corresponded with Lorion (2000) and Shek and Wai (2008) that angry students have a place of power in schools, as well as society. Sullivan stated that it is logical to

reach out to youth who are angry and use what they have naturally as a positive trait. He believes that schools with bullying and anger issues can reduce the problem by turning negative leaders into positive ones. Vera and Speight (2003) substantiated Sullivan's viewpoint, by stating that a systematic approach to changing people's views of youth is beneficial. Additionally, an individuals' behavioral self-efficacy determines the magnitude of belief that their actions can accomplish goals (Bandura, 2006). In order for researchers to determine exactly how a LAMG assists youth as a strength-based approach, development of a self-efficacy scale looking at anger management may be necessary.

Implications for Future Research

Future research may want to determine if the principles of leadership development that increases anger control in angry individuals also have an effect on non-aggressive populations. Differences between cultures (e.g. Middle Eastern or European) or ethnicities (i.e. Black, Caucasian, and Latino) also demands further attention. Another focus that future research may examine is how leadership affects adults and youth differently who participate in anger management groups. This could be done in order to determine when it might be best in the life of an individual to receive a LAMG. Additionally, future research on group work may want to identify if leadership is effective with angry populations in non-academic settings, such as residential facilities. If future research continues to indicate significant results, a paradigm shift in AMG's may need attention. For instance, counselors may want to rethink the methods used in AMGs with individuals having anger issues (Kellner, et al., 2008).

Burt, Lewis, and Patel (2010) suggest that a LAMG was useful in increasing leadership ability and reducing aggression with elementary aged children. The population in the study conducted by Burt Lewis, and Patel had similarities to the populace in this study. A number of the youths were Black, Hispanic, or Other. Gender was even in this study, as the Burt Lewis, and Patel study had a slightly higher number of males. In this study, as well as Burt, Lewis, and Patel's the primary purpose of the LAMG was to reduce anger. Burt, Lewis, and Patel's findings support current research that AMGs need to focus more on leadership that allows for generalizability in other settings (Finn & Willert, 2006). Rather than relying on high affective behavioral control, understanding how environment, personal factors and behavior interact allows participants to have control in their lives (Bandura, 2008b). This reliance on synthesizing cognition, behaviors, and environment according to Day (2004) is as an evidenced base treatment. Similarly, literature has stated that all three of these components work well with AMGs and angry individuals (Dwivedi & Gupta, 2000; Kellner et al., 2008). This pro-social method of LAMG reflects the growing literature that AMGs may place too high of an emphasis on high affective behavioral control. Conversely, most AMGs do not stress environmental influences such as school resources, positive adults and peers (Kellner, 2001).

Implications for Research Gap

In regards to the research gap, this study provided an initial look at the effectiveness of a LAMG as an intervention to use with angry youth. Similar to research by Burt, et al. (2010), this study showed promise with LAMGs in reducing youth anger. However, in this study, similar to other AMG research, qualitative procedures were absent. Adding qualitative procedures may

potentially reveal findings not found in purely quantitative methods. For instance, a mixed mode could indicate if participants' changed the way they perceived themselves. An example would be a participant who, in a mixed mode, could say that he was not part of an anger management group, but of a leadership group. Commensurate with the change in perception, a change in behavior can occur as well. The participant may think that he/she is a leader now, and as such, a leader solves problems, instead of causing them. This change in self-perception, according to Bandura (2008a), is fundamental to initiating change within adolescents. Unfortunately, this study had the same complications as AMG research, and lacked qualitative procedures. In order to address the gap in the literature, more research needs conducting, coupled with studies combining a mixed mode approach.

Implications for Working with Underserved Populations

When designing interventions for underserved school aged- youth, there are challenges (Twemlow & Saco, 1998). One impediment is that many underserved youth are in schools with limited resources and special programs such as anger management are low on the list of priorities (Carpenter, Ramirez, & Severn, 2006; Thompson, Murray, Harris, & Annan, 2003). Due to costs of high stakes testing and teacher attrition, time and resources are more focused on getting teachers up to speed on what students need to learn for the tests (Dahir & Stone, 2009; Romo & Chavez, 2006). Even the present study suffered from a reduction in faculty time and administrative resources. As the study indicated, though, angry students can be helped with a very low-cost program that could improve overall school atmosphere and possibly improve academics.

Recommendations for Researchers Working with Underserved Populations

According to Dahir and Stone (2009), schools, especially ones with underserved populations, have limited resources for interventions. However, interventions are not very expensive and have potential rewards. Besides some minimum faculty time and space, interventions with underserved populations in schools need to be flexible, in both program structure and time. For example, schools have activities such as Spring Break, field trips, high stakes testing and mandatory school programs (such as testing preparation). Most of these activities demand that students be present during that time. Due to this conflict, the student cannot be in an anger management group and a classroom simultaneously. The investigator of this study looked over the academic calendar for the school system when planning this study. After insuring the study could accommodate expected impediments (Spring Break), a meeting took place with the school. The investigator asked school staff if there were other activities not printed in the academic calendar that he needed to consider but none were identified. However, once the study began, an unexpected delay occurred as the school prepared for mandatory standardized testing. The investigator had to ensure that the study could be adjusted in order to meet the demands of the school. Future researchers should be aware of these difficulties and plan accordingly.

Lastly, although there are a number of studies discussing the problems with underserved populations and youth, there is dearth in research aimed at assisting them (Butler, 2003; Roysicar, 2009). Programs tailored to youths of color are lacking and cultural differences among the participants are sometimes ignored (Villalba et al., 2010). For instance, Villalba et al. (2010), discuss the distinct differences between Latino populations, however in many programs all are

lumped together. Labeled as “rescaling” by Villalba et al., (2010), it “is the act of taking an intervention, treatment, curriculum, etc., that was designed with a particular population in mind and applying it to any group of individuals meeting the demographic criteria of the pilot sample without regards for place (location)” (p. 24). Their findings support the notion that many interventions use rescaling and lump underserved populations together, without taking into consideration unique cultural differences. As a result, interventions using rescaling are not as effective with the designated populations they purport to assist.

When it comes to Black youth, current programs may not be adequately meeting their needs (West-Olatunji et al., 2010). A leadership driven model, similar to the work conducted by Butler (2003) can potentially increase cultural pride by not focusing on deficits, but on strengths. In many Black and Latino cultures, being a strong leader and head of the family is important (Wade, 2006). An LAMG can potentially accentuate cultural leadership tenets and be a culturally sensitive treatment (CST) as described by Roysicar (2009), and Burt and Butler (2010).

Summary

The intent of this chapter was to interpret results and provide implications for this study. Limitations due to research methods, sample and research design were discussed. The chapter concluded with a discussion pertaining to the study’s implications in regards to AMGs, multicultural concerns, and future research. The next section will summarize the content and findings of the study in order to provide the reader with an understanding of the purpose, direction, and meaning behind the research.

CONCLUSION

This purpose of this study was to provide empirical evidence for the incorporation of prosocial skills such as leadership development into anger management groups (AMG) (Langdon & Preble, 2008). Studies report that some AMGs do not provide behavioral change outside of the treatment setting (Kellner, Bry, & Salvador, 2008). Thus, these AMGs are not meeting critical goals (Serin, Gobeil, & Peterson, 2009). For instance, a twenty-year meta-analysis encompassing hundreds of studies concluded that only 15 AMGs indicated a significant change in youth anger, anger control and anger expression (Cooper, Lutenbacher, & Faccia, 2000). Thus, the intent of this study was to test a novel, leadership driven anger management group (LAMG) that reduced anger, improved anger control and reduced youths' expression of anger with others.

While research may not have lent strong support for anger management groups, surveys of school staff and administrators have been overwhelmingly positive in regards to AMGs (Herrmann, & McWhirter, 2003). However, only rigorous, research can bolster the reputation of such programs and pave the way for funding (Leedy & Ormrod, 2001). Few LAMG designs have been empirically tested on their ability to reduce anger (Kellner, et. al, 2008; Orpinas & Horne, 2004). To determine the usefulness of LAMGs, this study used a concept out of social cognitive theory (SCT) labeled the agentic perspective as a model of leadership. This study found a leadership driven anger management group could have an effect on student anger.

Future directions in research, however, may want to take a number of steps in order to strengthen control and research design. For example, future studies need to have a control group, random assignment, more refined methods of participant selection, longitudinal analyses and larger population samples. The next step in leadership driven anger management groups is to

identify particular age groups and see if these interventions have more impact with individuals at various levels of maturity. In regards to multicultural sensitivity, investigating whether leadership driven anger management groups affect different cultures differently, such as urban Blacks compared to African immigrants is of interest. According to Sundstrom (2008), there is a “browning” of America, as many ethnic groups identified as non-white (Latin America, South Asia, Middle East and North Africa) are making a profound demographic change in the United States. Investigating whether culture makes a difference in response to these treatments is one of the next directions future research may want to go into.

Conclusions drawn from the study support the belief that a LAMG assisted in reducing behavioral problems in youth, while supporting healthy relationships. Research conducted by Shek and Wai (2008), Keller et al. (2008), and Finn and Willert (2006) back this study’s conclusions that LAMGs are a useful tool with angry youth. Rather than relying on high affective behavioral control this study give support to understanding how environment, personal factors and behavior interact, allowing participants to have control in their lives (Bandura, 2008a).

APPENNDIX A: IRB APPROVAL LETTER



University of Central Florida Institutional Review Board
Office of Research & Commercialization
12201 Research Parkway, Suite 501
Orlando, Florida 32826-3246
Telephone: 407-823-2901 or 407-882-2276
www.research.ucf.edu/compliance/irb.html

Approval of Human Research

From: **UCF Institutional Review Board #1
FWA00000351, IRB00001138**

To: **Isaac Burt**

Date: **December 10, 2009**

Dear Researcher:

On 12/10/2009, the IRB approved the following modifications/human participant research until 12/9/2010 inclusive:

Type of Review: UCF Initial Review Submission Form
Project Title: Addressing Aggressive Behaviors through the Agentic Perspective of Social Cognitive Theory: A Novel Context for Anger Management Groups
Investigator: Isaac Burt
IRB Number: SBE-09-06584
Funding Agency:
Grant Title:
Research ID: N/A

The Continuing Review Progress Report must be submitted 2 – 4 weeks prior to the expiration date for studies that were previously expedited, and 8 weeks prior to the expiration date for research that was previously reviewed at a convened meeting. Do not make changes to the study (i.e., protocol, methodology, consent form, personnel, site, etc.) before obtaining IRB approval. A Modification Form **cannot** be used to extend the approval period of a study. All forms may be completed and submitted online at <https://iris.research.ucf.edu>.

If continuing review approval is not granted before the expiration date of 12/9/2010, approval of this research expires on that date. When you have completed your research, please submit a Study Closure request in iRIS so that IRB records will be accurate.

Use of the approved, stamped consent document(s) is required. The new form supersedes all previous versions, which are now invalid for further use. Only approved investigators (or other approved key study personnel) may solicit consent for research participation. Participants or their representatives must receive a copy of the consent form(s).

In the conduct of this research, you are responsible to follow the requirements of the Investigator Manual.

On behalf of Joseph Bielitzki, DVM, UCF IRB Chair, this letter is signed by:

IRB Coordinator

APPENNDIX B: PRINCIPAL LETTER SIGNED



ORANGE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
STONEWALL JACKSON MIDDLE SCHOOL
6000 Stonewall Jackson Rd. • Orlando, FL 32807 • Phone 407.249.6430 • FAX 407.249-6438

Dr. Joseph Miller **Dr. Jhunu Mohapatra** **Dr. Christopher Benedetti** **Dr. Dalila Hernandez**
Principal Assistant Principal Assistant Principal Assistant Principal

December 8, 2009

Dear UCF Institutional Review Board,

I give Isaac Burt permission to conduct a dissertation research study entitled "Addressing Aggressive Behaviors through the Agentic Perspective of Social Cognitive Theory: A novel Context for Anger Management Groups" at Jackson Middle School. I understand that Isaac Burt is a doctoral candidate from the Counselor Education Program at the University of Central Florida.

The following points have been explained:

Isaac Burt has described the research project to me and the nature of the study, and entertained any questions or concerns.

I understand that Isaac will also conduct the research study with students, and will have a direct link of communication with the students, before, during, and after the study has been carried out. During the study he will give students a pre-test, as well as a post test that may touch upon information pertaining to students' psychological or emotional state.

No discomforts, stresses or risks are foreseen however, breach of confidentiality is a possible risk of participation. I understand that there is no deception involved with this study.

Any information obtained as a result of students' participation in this project including his/her identity, will be held confidential. Students' identity will be coded on all documentation, and all data will be secured in a locked briefcase/file cabinet. Students' identity will not be revealed in any publication and no individually identifiable data will be shared with the Orange County School District.

I understand the procedures described above. I agree to allow students at Jackson Middle School to participate in this study.

Sincerely,

Joseph Miller, PhD
Principal

Orange County Public School Board is an equal opportunity agency.

APPENDIX C: INFORMED CONSENT



Addressing Aggressive Behaviors through the Agentic Perspective of Social Cognitive Theory: A Novel Context for Anger Management Groups

Principal Investigator(s): Isaac Burt, MPA, M.ed

Faculty Supervisor: S. Kent Butler, PhD

Sponsor: University of Central Florida

Investigational Site(s): Jackson Middle School

Introduction: Researchers at the University of Central Florida (UCF) study many topics. To do this we need the help of people who agree to take part in a research study. You are being asked to allow your child to take part in a research study which will include about 60 people at Jackson Middle. Your child is being invited to take part in this research study because he or she is a student at Jackson Middle School and has been identified as having leadership potential. This leadership potential is hampered by some emotions, such as anger, which this study will address.

This study will use a research design based on a technique called random assignment. Random assignment is based on chance, similar to a coin toss. Your child may be randomly assigned to one of two groups, both of which are in the study. (1).The experimental group will have participants who receive leadership training and psycho-educational strategies how to deal with strong emotions, like anger. (2).The control group will only receive psycho-educational strategies on how to deal with strong emotions, such as anger.

A random assignment design allows researchers to measure leadership effectiveness by comparing participants who receive leadership training to those who do not. Because every participant has an equal chance of being assigned to one of the two groups, random assignment makes sure that the groups are similar in all characteristics. The only difference between the groups is that one receives leadership training and the other does not. You can read this form and agree now for your child to take part, or take the form home with you to study before you decide.

The person doing this research is Isaac Burt, MPA, M.ed. at the University of Central Florida.

Because the researcher is a doctoral student, he is being guided by S. Kent Butler, PhD, a UCF faculty supervisor in the Department of Child, Family, and Community Services.

What you should know about a research study:

- Someone will explain this research study to you.
- A research study is something you volunteer for.
- Whether or not you take part is up to you.
- You should allow your child to take part in this study only because you want to.
- You can choose not to take part in the research study.
- You can agree to take part now and later change your mind.
- Whatever you decide it will not be held against you.



- Feel free to ask all the questions you want before you decide.

Purpose of the research study: The study intends to enhance school based programs by providing justification for why the incorporation of leadership characteristics augments student personal development. Potentially this approach will lend itself to assist adolescents with leadership and emotional development.

What your child will be asked to do in the study: In this program, your child will learn psycho-educational activities which focus on leadership skills, and understand how to work with others to develop leadership abilities in groups. After learning activities, your child will practice leadership skills by teaching other students in their group. Your child and other members are the instructors, and their goal is to fine-tune their leadership skills with others. Before and after the program, your child will assess him/her self in regards to leadership and emotions that stop productive leadership from forming. Your child does not have to answer every question or complete every task. You or your child will not lose any benefits if your child skips questions or tasks.

Location: Jackson Middle School

Time required: We expect that your child will be in this research study for an hour a week for two months outside of class time.

Risks:

Discrimination is a possibility due to the fact that the participants will be in a group that others are not members of. There could be the possibility of discrimination due to this circumstance, however due to the dynamics of the school (there are several groups that meet separately from others) there is a low probability of this occurring.

Benefits:

The primary benefits of this study are to build leadership skills, identify emotional triggers, and increase empowerment with adolescents in dealing with stressful situations.

Confidentiality: We will limit your personal data collected in this study. Efforts will be made to limit your child's personal information to people who have a need to review this information. We cannot promise complete secrecy. Organizations that may inspect and copy your information include the IRB and other representatives of UCF. Additionally, if abuse or neglect is uncovered, this information may be disclosed to the appropriate authorities.

Study contact for questions about the study or to report a problem: If you have questions, concerns, or complaints, or think the research has hurt your child talk to: Isaac Burt, Doctoral Student, Counselor Education, College of Education, (407) 823-0421, or by e-mail at iburt@mail.ucf.edu, or S. Kent Butler, Faculty Supervisor, Department of Child, Family, and Community Services at (407) 823-4633, or by e-mail at skbutler@mail.ucf.edu.

IRB contact about you and your child's rights in the study or to report a complaint: Research at the University of Central Florida involving human participants is carried out under the oversight of the Institutional Review Board (UCF IRB). This research has been reviewed and approved by the IRB. For information about the rights of people who take part in research, please contact: Institutional Review Board, University of Central Florida, Office of Research & Commercialization, 12201 Research Parkway, Suite 501, Orlando, FL 32826-3246 or by telephone at (407) 823-2901. You may also talk to them for any of the following:

- Your questions, concerns, or complaints are not being answered by the research team.
- You cannot reach the research team.
- You want to talk to someone besides the research team.
- You want to get information or provide input about this research.

Withdrawing from the study:

You may decide not to have your child continue in the research study at any time without it being held against you or your child. If you decide to have your child leave the research, any information taken before that can be used in the study. If you decide to have your child leave the study, contact the investigator so that the investigator can remove him/her from the group.

The person in charge of the research study can remove your child from the research study without your approval. Possible reasons for removal include that some adolescents may not be a good fit for a group, and early removal may occur. We will tell you and your child about any new information that may affect your child's health, welfare or your choice to have your child stay in the research.

DO NOT SIGN THIS FORM AFTER THE IRB EXPIRATION DATE BELOW

<hr/>	
Name of participant	
<hr/>	
Signature of parent or guardian	Date
<hr/>	<hr/>
Printed name of parent or guardian	<input type="checkbox"/> Parent
<hr/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Guardian (See note below)

Assent
 Obtained

Note on permission by guardians: An individual may provide permission for a child only if that individual can provide a written document indicating that he or she is legally authorized to consent to the child's general medical care. Attach the documentation to the signed document.

APPENDIX D: DESCRIPTION OF SESSIONS

Session One (Paperwork)

In the pre-session, the objective was for the researcher to introduce the group to participants and begin the steps of creating the therapeutic alliance. Trust initiated through positive modeling and leadership demonstrated by the researcher. The group facilitator had participants fill out basic demographic information such as age, gender, grade and ethnicity. Administration of the STAXI-2 also occurred during this session. After completing paperwork, a short group was held in order to make group members more comfortable, and at ease with the group facilitator and other members.

Session Two

In this session, the goal was to establish trust between the group facilitator and members, as well as between members, which continues from the pre-session. First, the therapeutic relationship continues to strengthen through modeling of prosocial behavior by the group leader. An emphasis on communication, active listening skills and group participation is a focal part. Group members practice these skills through the psycho-educational activities in this session. The opening question focuses on the members to share an adjective that describes them. The behavioral lesson and activity deal with communication skills, while appreciations and closing centers on what the members would like to learn in the group.

Second, leadership in this session dealt with the first component of the agentic perspective, intentionality. In this session, the group facilitator had the members identify personal and collective intentions or goals for the group. Since plans of action involved other members, participants intentionally began collaborating with others to begin the process of accomplishing personal and group goals. Personal goals of action as well as group goals required

intentionality, coupled with a sense of firm commitment to coordinating interdependent plans of action (other member's ideals) to obtain goals. The behavioral lesson focuses on teaching listening skills and allowing members to begin to practice active listening abilities while creating plans for action. The behavioral activity complements the lesson, and allows members to practice basic communication skills and collaboration.

Session Three

In the third session, trust continued to build between members and the group facilitator, and between other members. Definition of general goals for members continued, as well as the group facilitator assisting participants in identifying personal goals. The opening question has members reflect on what they did last week as an icebreaker. An emphasis on listening, trust, and teamwork is the central point of the lesson and activity in this session. Appreciations and closings focuses on what group members believe makes them a good leader, allowing participants to accentuate strengths.

In the third session, leadership development continued through the agentic perspective concept of intentionality. Intentionality had members focus on personal and collective intentions about the group. The initial stages of leadership development begun, as participants practiced leading the behavioral activity learned the following week. A chosen member leads the group in the previous week's activity. The objective of the leadership practice is to understand how to negotiate and accommodate self-interests to begin the process of accomplishing personal and group goals. For instance, only one member can lead, and another may have wanted the opportunity. Since both cannot lead simultaneously, the group specialist allows them to negotiate possibilities (i.e. co-leadership) that directly affect the performance of the activity. The objective

of the behavioral lesson in this session was to practice repeating what others say, in a clear and concise manner, indicating active listening. In addition, recognition of how the body acts under stress began in this lesson. The goal of the behavioral activity was to enhance listening, collaboration, and team building skills.

Session Four

In the fourth session, establishment of trust continued as defensiveness, resistance, struggle for control, conflict and confrontation from group members increased (Corey & Corey, 2004). A group facilitator, in this session, needed to have personal affective control, and not allow oneself be drawn into a power struggle (Gladding, 2008). Recognition of emotions through non-verbal behaviors was the focal point of the behavioral lesson and activity in this session. Additionally, developing skills in detecting emotions in others and resolving them in positive ways was critical. The opening question dealt with participants answering what they would like to learn how to do in life. The behavioral lesson objective was to assist group members in increasing their emotional vocabulary. According to Twemlow and Sacco (1998), expansion of language that described affective moods helps in decreasing egocentric views. The objective of the behavioral activity was to practice listening, observing and identifying changes and behaviors in others. The behavioral activity allowed participants to practice becoming more aware of their environment by noticing others. Appreciations and closings consisted of group members identifying good leadership skills they see classmates exhibit. Acknowledgement of peers' leadership, according to Twemlow and Sacco (1998), increases positive role modeling and reduces egocentrism.

The leadership development in the fourth session dealt with the second component of the agentic perspective, forethought. In this session, the group facilitator assisted participants in developing goals and predicting the likely outcomes of their behaviors on events. Through symbolic representation, the group members focused on their current behavioral strategies and if these strategies are effective. Thus, it is important that the group facilitator had group members connect how intentionally and forethought combine to support directive and focused behavior (Bandura, 2008a). The goal of forethought in this session was to begin to assist participants in guiding and motivating their behaviors anticipatorily in order to accomplish goals and objectives. Leadership development practice continued in this session with the behavioral lesson and activity that focuses on strategies and problem solving. Additionally, members practiced leading the behavioral activity learned the previous week. In order to practice collaboration, the group specialist has the chosen individual from the previous week work with the other members in choosing a method that is fair to select the next person who will lead. The group facilitator, whose primary role in the collaboration is that of a facilitator, gives a time of five minutes to the members. The specialist allows the group to come to a resolution that is fair, without minimal intervening, in the allocated time span. Through experientially understanding how to work together in accomplish goals, this assists individuals in resolving complexities and problems better (Pajares, 2006).

Session Five

In the fifth session, there was an emphasis on recognition of emotions through non-verbal behaviors through the behavioral lessons and activities in this session. In addition, identification of group members' personal body cues and responses to anger began. The opening question

centered on the group members to tell about a time when they lost their temper. The opening question allowed members to use forethought and visualize how negative repercussions stemmed from their decision making. Closing and appreciations focused on members giving a new one-word reaction to the group. The emphasis on using one new word forces members to use novel affective words to describe their emotional state. The closing and appreciations activity draws upon the fourth session, which had group members expand their emotional vocabulary in order to describe their affective states.

As in previous sessions, members practiced leading the behavioral activity learned the preceding week. The group facilitator gave the individual chosen the week before two options. The member can choose the method utilized the previous week to pick a new person, or collaborate with fellow group peers to create a new methodology. The goal of the group facilitator was to decrease the groups' reliance on adults for decision making. The group facilitator wanted members to take ownership and develop strategies and improvements to existing methods of fairly choosing a new leader. Through this holistic approach to working through behavioral complications, leadership ability is improved (Avolio, Walumbwa, & Weber, 2009).

Leadership development focused on symbolic representation, and the fruition of future events through current behavior and strategies. The objective of leadership practice was for group members to comprehend how forethought is instrumental for purposeful, goal-driven behavior in leadership decisions. The behavioral lesson began group discussion on how anger affects the participants. However, the behavioral lesson allowed the participants to begin the discussion of anger in a safe manner, by focusing on an external object, and not on them

personally. For instance, members identified anger symbolically by comparing themselves to the degrees of temperature on a thermometer. The objective of the behavioral activity was to practice listening, observing and identifying changes and behaviors in others. In addition, the behavioral activity allowed participants to become more aware of their environment. Lastly, an introduction of the third concept, self-reactiveness, began through the behavioral lesson.

Session Six

In the sixth session, solidification of member roles was critical. Bonds of trust established, allowing for self-disclosure by group members as well as group facilitator. Cohesion and universality emerge, along with support mechanisms allocating for acceptance of confrontation (Gladding, 2008). How anger affects participants, and the physical, mental and emotional antecedents that precede aggression, were imperative in this session. Situations that cause aggressive behaviors, such as people, places or events were brought into the cognitive awareness of the group members. The group specialist needs to be receptive to the needs of members, as discussing sensitive emotions may lead to embarrassment on behalf of participants (Corey & Corey, 2004; Seligman, 1998). The behavioral lesson provided members with information on the physical, mental and emotional signs that accompany anger. Additionally, the lesson addresses situational occurrences that provoke anger, and detection of aggression in others. Being able to discuss anger begins, as well as strategies for calming down. The objective of the behavioral activity is to practice self-control, observation and collaboration with others.

The opening question had members to tell about a time when they saw someone else lose their temper. Coinciding with the behavioral lesson, the opening question led participants to

notice how anger looks in others. The group specialist linked the opening question to leadership, by emphasizing with members the importance of a leader to be able to identify anger in other people. Closing and appreciations has group members engage in a teambuilding exercise requiring collaboration in order to be successful. In the sixth session, members practice leading the behavioral activity learned the week before. By this time, group members should have a solidified strategy to pick a weekly leader, and be able to regulate oneself in order to follow the method easily. If problems persist, the group specialist can process the resistance with the participants to reveal where it stems from.

Leadership development focused on the third concept of the agentic perspective, self-reactiveness. In the agentic perspective, group members do more than to actively plan and predict possibilities. Participants also self-regulate in order to accomplish goals and objectives. Group members develop purposeful plans and systematically regulate self-execution of the plan (Bandura, 2008a). Self-reactiveness includes managing others, creating methods to avoid stress-provoking situations and regulating oneself to follow the method sequentially. This involves delaying gratification of short term temptations for more long term goals. The objective of leadership practice in this session is for members to set goals and focus on the steps needed to obtain goals. Furthermore, participants should be able to lead positively and work collaboratively in order to accomplish tasks.

Session Seven

In the seventh session, discussion of termination began, as well as what support mechanisms are in place for members once the group ends. Exploration of commonalities between members was encouraged, and how these similarities are helpful for support. In this

session, accentuation of strategies for calming down and problem solving were focal points. The group facilitator needed to be responsive to participants' emotions, as members dealt with feelings of abandonment (Fleckenstein & Horne, 2004). As in the preceding sessions, members practice leading a behavioral activity learned the previous week. The facilitator now allowed the group to rely on its own methods of choosing leaders. As the group facilitator's duties diminished, the members assumed the responsibility of leaders, taking ownership of the group.

Leadership development in the seventh session emphasizes the concept of self-reactiveness. The intent of this session was to have members continue to focus on developing suitable courses of action and regulating execution of actions systematically (Bandura, 2008a). Leadership development had members focus on understanding their cues and triggers, as participants create and practice methods to avoid stressful situations. Through practice, members continued to understand how to self-regulate and to follow those steps sequentially. The opening question had members tell about a good choice that they made this week. The question allowed participants to discuss how they were able to use their skills to avoid negative situations and further develop their leadership. Closing and appreciations focused on if members learned new things about someone in the group. The intent of closing and appreciations was to have members continue to practice noticing changes in others, thus decreasing egocentrism and increasing collaboration skills.

The behavioral lesson and activity increased in intensity in the seventh session, with an emphasis placed on members' personal aggressive behaviors. The objective of the behavioral lesson was to evaluate consequences of anger, and think of positive alternatives. Strategies that are practical, realistic, and structured towards the skill level of the participants were central

points. Bandura (1986), states that a realistic measure of a person's skill is imperative for generalization to occur. Thus, strategies that tailor to members' skill levels are essential for participants in stressful situations. The objective of the behavioral activity was for participants to understand how commonalities between members can be advantageous in supporting one another. Additionally, the behavioral activity explores diversity, as well as commonalities, and how both are important concepts in decision-making. Lastly, an introduction of the fourth concept of the agentic perspective, self-reflectiveness, began in this session.

Session Eight

In the eighth session, the group specialist continued to facilitate discussions surrounding termination, anger cues, triggers, and strategies for calming down. As in the previous session, there was an emphasis on problem-solving skills and alternatives to anger. Cooperating with others is stressed, as well as is the ideal that resolving problems are different for each problem and every individual (Blanton, Christensen, & Shakir, 2006). As termination approaches, the group specialist must consider two special properties. For instance, the group facilitator needed to be open to members' resistance to termination, which could manifest through anger (Gladding, 2008). Furthermore, the group facilitator provided to participants personal assessment in the form of praise and acknowledgments of their skill level in managing anger, if progression was made during the group (Fleckenstein & Horne, 2004). As in previous sessions, the behavioral activity from the preceding week was lead by a member. This process should be entirely member-led, and flow smoothly without the group facilitator's instruction.

Leadership development in the eighth session focused on the fourth concept of the agentic perspective, self-reflectiveness. In the agentic perspective, leaders not only actively plan,

predict possibilities and self-regulate, they self-examine their behavioral performance (Bandura, 2008a). Through personal behavioral analysis, group members reflected on self-efficacy, the validity of decisions made, and made adaptations to methods that are not working (such as coming up with new ways to avoid stressful and anger provoking situations). The opening question had the participants tell about a time when they stood up for someone. The importance of this icebreaker is for members to be able to speak to others on what it was like to be a positive influence. Moreover, participants can reflect on the times when they were the person that was the aggressor, or victim. Both examples incorporate environment, behavior, and interpersonal factors, which is at the core of leadership driven anger management group (LAMG). Closing and appreciations has members give a compliment to another person in the group, who is not the group facilitator. The objective was for participants to be able to share positive attributes with peers, and be genuine and congruent with their feelings. Although the emphasis of closing and appreciations is on peers, there may be a strong desire from group members to give compliments to the group facilitator. However, the focus is on peers, not the facilitator, who, as a potential role model, may be an easier person to compliment. The group facilitator needed to be cautious and use professional judgment in allowing the focus of the group taken off members.

Leadership practice continued in the eighth session by the behavioral lesson and activity. In this session, there was an emphasis on member comprehension of not only their behavioral cues and triggers, but also other's. The personal examination that took place during the lesson and activity looked at the soundness of decisions, self-efficacy in leadership, problem solving, and ability to work with others. The behavioral lesson and activity assisted in developing self-reflectiveness when working with others under stress. Furthermore, the lesson and activity had

participants reflect on what to do when conflict is unavoidable. The objective of the behavioral lesson was for participants to have a problem solving formula that is easy to remember, and can be readily accessed when needed. The goal of the behavioral activity was for group members to brainstorm alternatives to problems and to work collaboratively in putting together strategies.

Session Nine

In the ninth session, anger cues, triggers, and strategies for calming down continued, including de-escalation plans that correspond with members' skill levels. Termination was a primary focus, and more importance was placed on self-regulation and functioning outside of the group. Discussion of support mechanisms, as well as what members can do for assistance with behavior once the group terminates is a focal point. The group facilitator needed to convey to the participants that they may feel angry due to the group ending, and that this is normal (Fleckenstein & Horne, 2004). The group facilitator used humor and empathy to make the members feel more at ease with termination (Corey & Corey, 2004). Additionally, the group facilitator needed to communicate to participants that termination of the group is not an ending, but a new beginning (Corey & Corey, 2004; Fleckenstein & Horne, 2004).

The opening question had members tell what they do not like being teased about. This question, depending on the level of cohesiveness in the group, allows for deeper, more intimate disclosure of personal feelings. Appreciations and closing had participants focus on giving a compliment to another person in the group. This process repeated the previous week's closings, as research indicates for angry individuals, it is imperative that prosocial behavior increases, coupled with a decrease in egocentric views (Kellner, Bry, & Salvador, 2008). By acknowledging peoples' strong points, it forces participants to focus on others, rather than

themselves (Kellner, 2001). The ninth session, unlike the ones preceding, will not have a new behavioral activity. The final activity was one chosen by the participants, taken from the previous activities. The group facilitator processed the reasons the group members chose this particular activity as opposed to others in an effort to explore participants' values and belief systems. If there are connections to the activity and generalization of behaviors outside the group, the group facilitator would focus on the connections and makes this a central theme. Furthermore, freedom of choice allows participants to have a greater sense of empowerment and ownership (Pajares, 2006). Although there is not a new activity, there is still a member-led behavioral activity from the preceding week. The participants should be adept in leading this portion of the group, and not require the group facilitator's instruction.

In this session, leadership development continued through the concept of self-reflectiveness. Members examined their own, as well as others' behavior and decision-making (Bandura, 2006). Participants role-played and examined different solutions to problems, and decide which would be more appropriate in a given situation. If the solutions were not working, members use reflectiveness and suggest corrections. Additionally, self-reflectiveness increases by having members explore their personal beliefs in skill level. Through the behavioral lesson, members increased self-reflectiveness by understanding that diverse problematical situations call for different ways to solve the problem, and that skill level will be dependent on the situation, and level of problem. The objective of the lesson was to demonstrate how volatile situations can escalate or de-escalate, depending on a number of behavioral circumstances. Circumstances include the number of people watching, and the emotional and problem-solving level of the people involved.

Session Ten

In this session, the group terminated as the group facilitator assisted members in discussing progression made, and generalizing behaviors outside the group. The group facilitator needed to be firm, while emphasizing members' strengths. The group facilitator used empathy in conveying to participants that progression may be slower now. The group facilitator in this session can work with the group to establish contracts, or homework assignments that may be beneficial for the participants to carry on once the group completes. Any plans for follow-up, diagnostic tools, or referrals is a central focus point during this session. The final administration of the STAXI-2 began in this session as well. After completing paperwork, the participants received a small party, which included drinks, snacks and discussion of what they learned in the group and how to apply it once the group concludes.

**APPENDIX E: DESCRIPTION OF BEHAVIORAL ACTIVITIES AND
LESSONS**

Behavioral Lessons and Activities

Session Two

Lesson: Down/Up Listening- Duration is 10-20 minutes, depending on time needed to implement the lesson. The group is split into pairs. Members are brought through three stages, one stage in which both partners talk at once, another when they purposely ignore one another, and the third stage in which they practice active listening and repeat what their partner states to them. The objective of this lesson is to teach listening skills and allows participants to begin practicing active listening abilities. There are no materials needs for this activity.

Activity: Leprechaun- Duration is 15 minutes. The objective is to be able to practice basic communication skills, collaboration, and teamwork. In this activity, an individual is chosen to be seated in a chair with the rest of the group in chairs surrounding the student. A ball is placed underneath the chair of the student in the middle. The individual in the middle closes his/her eyes and a person from the group is told to come and attempt to take the ball. Any sounds made, the member in the middle can point and the participant attempting to take the ball will have to go back to their seat. To increase collaboration and teamwork, the group specialist can facilitate group discussions surrounding strategies to successfully obtain the ball, or stop the ball from being taken. Materials needed consist of a ball, or solid object that is lightweight and can be easily grabbed. In addition, chairs are required.

Session Three

Lesson: You Say, I Say: How do you know when you are mad? – Duration is 10 minutes. The objective of this lesson is for group participants to begin building their active listening skills and to become more aware of their behavioral and internal cues to stress. The counselor begins this lesson with an overview of the lesson and then discloses the physical and mental cues that occur in them personally. The next group participant repeats what the specialist says, then adds what their body does when they are angry. Each member repeats the process, until all have had a turn. No materials are required.

Activity: Rattlesnake- Duration is 10-15 minutes. The objective of this activity is to enhance listening, collaboration, and team building skills. The group forms a circle and a member is blindfolded. Another participant goes in the circle, makes noise with a rattler and attempts to not be touched. The blindfolded member attempts to touch the participant who has the rattler. In order to increase teamwork and collaboration, the blindfolded member can ask for verbal strategies in order to assist him/her in touching the person with the rattler. A small object that creates noise is required (such as container with paperclips inside or a rattler) and a blindfold.

Session Four

Lesson: Feeling Charades-Duration is 15 minutes. The objective of this lesson is for group participants to increase their emotional vocabulary. This lesson is similar to regular charades, in that one group participant will be responsible for acting out an emotion, while the other group participants guess the emotion being acted out. In order to process diversity, the counselor facilitates a discussion on how people express emotions differently. For example, sadness may appear to look like anger, and anger may look like sadness, depending on the person. An

emphasis on the importance of understanding different emotions and its connections to leadership is a focal point. The word of an emotion is written on the back of an index card, and a member has to act out the emotion. Index cards are required for this lesson.

Activity: Changes 1, 2, 3 - Duration is 15 minutes. The objective of this activity is for group participants to increase their listening skills, improve their prosocial behaviors, and become more skilled in identifying environmental cues. In this activity, the counselor will split the group participants into pairs. Each participant in the pair will then turn their back to one another, and changes up to three things about his/her appearance, such as removing an earring, untying a shoe, etc. After making the changes, the pair faces one another again and takes turns trying to guess the changes. This activity allows members to actively pay attention to another member. No materials are required.

Session Five

Lesson: Anger Thermometer- Duration is 20-30 minutes. The objective of this lesson is for group members to acknowledge their anger issues. The counselor utilizes an image of a thermometer to begin discussing the impact of anger on the participants. This lesson allows the participants to begin the discussion of anger in a safe manner, by focusing on an external object, such as a thermometer. The participants identify anger within them symbolically by comparing themselves to a thermometer. Different levels are assessed, and an emotional word is connected to each rising level of the thermometer. A chalkboard, dry erase board and markers to write and draw upon are required for this lesson.

Activity: Who is the Leader?- Duration is 15 minutes. The objective of this activity is for group participants to develop listening skills, improve prosocial behaviors, and increase an awareness of environmental cues. In this activity the counselor will ask one group member to momentarily step outside of the room. Once outside, the group specialist designates someone to be the leader. This leader will then choose a set number of movements (up to three) that the other group participants mimic. The leader can change movements at any time, as the rest of the group follows. The initial participant is brought back in, and the group specialist asks the participant to observe the actions of the group and identify the group leader. The counselor facilitates discussion with the group on strategies for observation, and how keen observation can be helpful in detecting emotions of others. No materials are required for this activity.

Session Six

Lesson: Anger Cues and Triggers- Duration is 10 minutes. The objective of this lesson is for group members to learn the physical, mental and emotional signs that accompany anger and aggression. The counselor facilitates a discussion surrounding situational occurrences that provoke anger and aggression in others. Additionally, the group specialist assists the group participants in identifying coping strategies that could be effective at solving aggressive behaviors.

Activity: Computer Virus- Duration ranges from 10-15 minutes. Duration ranges from 10-15 minutes. The objective of this activity is for group participants to become more skilled in self-control, observation and collaboration with others. The counselor instructs participants to close their eyes, and then the specialist selects a participant to “spread the illness”. The group is

instructed to walk around and greet one another by shaking hands. The participant that was chosen to spread the illness has a special handshake that gives people the sickness. Once “infected”, the ill member must calmly sit down, without drawing attention to oneself, and without noise. Participants that are not affected can guess who is spreading the illness by observing others quietly asking for permission to speak. If the participant is incorrect, then that member must sit down. The activity continues until someone guesses correctly or when two people are left. No materials are needed for this activity.

Session Seven

Lesson: Strategies for calming down- Duration is 20 minutes. The objective of this lesson is for group members to develop the ability to identify positive alternatives to aggression. The counselor assists the group in brainstorming coping strategies that are practical, realistic, and at the skill level of the participants. Specifically, the group specialist utilizes role-plays that are similar to situations that group participants may encounter in their lives. Materials needed are a chalkboard, dry erase board and markers.

Activity: Do you love your neighbor- Duration is 15-20 minutes. The objective of this activity is for group participants to develop an understanding of the benefits of a support system.

Specifically, this activity explores diversity, as well as commonalities, and processes the importance of decision making. The group specialist will instruct the group to form a circle of chairs that has one less chair than members. One group participant is selected to begin the activity. The participant stands in the middle and makes a statement, such as “I like people who like rap music”. Then all the individuals that like rap music, including the person who made the

statement, scrambles to find an empty chair. The person who is left standing repeats the process by making a statement that is true of him or her. The activity ends as the specialist purposively allows members to take a seat and be the one left standing.

Session Eight

Lesson: A B C D Problem Solving -Duration is 10-15 minutes. The objective of this lesson is for participants to have a problem solving formula that is easy to remember, and can be readily accessed when needed. The lesson focuses on resolving problems, utilizing an acronym that requires minimal cognitive processing. A stands for *Ask questions*, B stands for *Brainstorming*, C stands for *Choose the best solution*, and D stands for *Do it*. Materials required for this lesson are a chalkboard or dry erase board, and markers.

Activity: Cooperative Islands-Duration is 10-15 minutes. Duration is 10-15 minutes. The objective of this activity is for group participants to learn how to collaborate with others to identify problem-solving strategies. In this activity, the counselor splits the group participants into pairs or groups of three, and each group is then given a large, foldable piece of cardboard. The groups are informed that the cardboard represents an island surrounded by shark-infested waters. The groups are told that they must develop a strategy in which all must fit on the cardboard, and no one must be left in the water. After each trial, the cardboards are folded to become smaller. The groups must brainstorm ideas on how to keep each person from being left out in the water. Materials needed for this game are poster boards or large pieces of cardboard, folded into quarters.

Session Nine

Lesson: Conflict escalator-Duration is 20 minutes. The objective of this lesson is for group members to learn deescalating strategies that will enable participants to make appropriate and effective decisions in a given situation. The group is taught that when problems get worse, they are said to escalate. A symbolic representation of an escalator stresses the importance of problems escalating to where they are out of control. Role-plays allow participants to practice the strategies needed to deescalate their emotional reaction to a given situation.

Activity: The behavioral activity in this session is chosen by group members.

Behavioral lessons and activities were used from the manual *Empowering the angry child for positive leadership* by Blanton, E., Christensen, C. & Shakir, J. (2006).

REFERENCES

- Akos, P., Goodnough, G. E., & Milsom, A. S. (2004). Preparing school counselors for group work. *The Journal for Specialists in Group Work, 29*(1), 127–136.
- Alegria, M., Mulvaney-Day, N., Torres, M., Polo, A., Cao, Z., & Canino, G. (2007). Prevalence of psychiatric disorders across Latino subgroups in the United States. *American Journal of Public Health, 97*(1), 68-75.
- Alegria, M., Canino, G., Shrout, P. E., Woo, M., Duan, N., Vila, D., Torres, M., Chen, C., & Meng, X. I. (2008). Prevalence of mental illness in immigrant and non-immigrant U.S. Latino groups. *American Journal of Psychiatry, 165*, 359-369.
- American Psychological Association. (2002). Criteria for evaluating treatment guidelines. *American Psychologist, 57*, 1052-1059.
- Anderson, N. (2001). *Design and analysis: A new approach*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Apsler, R. (2009). After-school programs for adolescents: A review of evaluation research. *Adolescence, 44*(173), 1-19.
- Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, F. O., & Weber, T. J. (2009). Leadership: Current theories, research and future directions. *Annual Review of Psychology, 60*, 421-449.
doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.16321
- Bandura, A. (1971). *Social learning theory*. Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.
- Bandura, A. (1981). Self-referent thought: A developmental analysis of self-efficacy. In J. H. Flavell, & L. Ross (Eds.), *Social cognitive development: Frontiers and possible futures* (pp. 200-239). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*.

- Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall. W. H. Freeman and Company.
- Bandura, A. (1989). Social cognitive theory. In R. Vasta (Ed.), *Annals of child development*. Vol. 6. *Six Theories of child development* (pp. 1-60). Greenwich, CT. JAI Press.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: W. H. Freeman and Company.
- Bandura, A. (2001). Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 1-26.
- Bandura, A. (2002). Social cognitive theory in cultural context. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 151, 269-290.
- Bandura, A. (2005). Primacy of self-regulation in health promotion transformative mainstream. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 54, 245-254.
- Bandura, A. (2006). Adolescent development from an agentic perspective. In F. Urdan & F. Pajares (Eds.), *Self-efficacy beliefs of adolescents* (pp. 1-43). Charlotte, NC. Information Age Publishing.
- Bandura, A. (2008a). The reconstrual of “free will” from the agentic perspective of social cognitive theory. In J. Baer, J. C. Kaufman, & R. F. Baumeister (Eds.), *Are we free? Psychology and free will*. (pp. 86-127). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bandura, A. (2008b). Toward an agentic theory of the self. In H. Marsh, R. G. Craven, & D. M. McInerney (Eds.), *Advances in Self Research, Vol. 3: Self-processes, learning, and enabling human potential* (pp. 15-49). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Bandura, A. (2009). Social cognitive theory of mass communication. In J. Bryant & M. B. Oliver

- (Eds.), *Media effects: Advances in theory and research* (2nd ed., pp. 94-124). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Bandura, A., Ross, D., & Ross, S. A. (1961a). Transmission of aggression through imitation of aggressive models. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, *63*, 575-582.
- Bandura, A., Ross, D., & Ross, S. A. (1961b). Imitation of film-mediated aggressive models. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, *66*, 3-11.
- Bandura, A. & Walters, R. H. (1963). *Social learning and personality development*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Bemak, F., & Chung, R. (2005). Advocacy as a critical role for urban school counselors: Working toward equity and social justice. *Professional School Counseling*, *8*(3), 196-203.
- Besley, K. R. (1999). Anger management: Immediate intervention by counselor coach. *Professional School Counseling*, *3*(2), 81-92.
- Blanton, E., Christensen, C., & Shakir, J. (2006). *Empowering the angry child for positive leadership*. Louisville, KY: Peace Education Program.
- Bradshaw, C. P., Sawyer, A. L., & O'Brennan, L. M., (2007). Bullying and peer victimization at school: Perceptual differences between students and school staff. *School Psychology Review*, *36*(3), 361-382
- Britzman, M. (2005). Improving our moral landscape via character education: An opportunity for school counselor leadership. *Professional School Counseling*, *8*(3), 293-295.

- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Brugman, D., & Martine, D. B. (2010). Effects of the EQUIP peer intervention program on self-serving cognitive distortions and recidivism among delinquent male adolescents. *Psychology, Crime & Law, 1*, 1-14. doi: 10.1080/10683160903257934
- Bryson, J. M., Crosby, B. C., & Bryson, J. (2009). Understanding strategic planning and the formulation and implementation of strategic plans as a way of knowing: The contributions of actor-network theory. *International Public Management Journal, 12*(2), 172-207.
- Burt, I., & Butler, S. K. (In press). Capoeira as a clinical intervention: Addressing adolescent aggression with Brazilian martial arts. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*.
- Burt, I., Lewis, S. V., & Patel, S. H. (2010). *Increasing accountability in school-led anger management groups: A push for equity*. Retrieved from http://counselingoutfitters.com/vistas/vistas10/Article_56.pdf
- Burt, I., Patel, S. H., Butler, S. K., & Gonzalez, T. (2010). Integrating leadership skills into anger management groups: The LIT model. Manuscript submitted for publication (Copy on file with author).
- Butler, S. K. (2003). Helping urban African American high school students to excel academically: The roles of school counselors. *High School Journal, 87*(1), 51-57.
- Cara, G. V., Fida, R., Vecchione, M., Del Bove, G., Vecchio, G. M., Barbaranelli, C., & Bandura, A. (2006). Longitudinal analysis of the role of perceived self-efficacy

- for self-regulated learning in academic continuance and achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 100(3), 525-534.
- Carol, W. R., & Bandura, A. (1990). Representational guidance of action production in observational learning: A causal analysis. *Journal of Motor Behavior*, 22(1), 85-97.
- Carpenter, D. M., Ramirez, A., & Severn, L. (2006). Gap or gaps: Changing the singular definition of the achievement gap. *Education and Urban Society*, 39(1), 113-127.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control. (2008). *Youth violence: School violence*. Retrieved from cdc.gov/ViolencePrevention/youthviolence/schoolviolence/index.html
- Constantine, M. G., Hage, S. M., Kindaichi, M. M., & Bryant, R. M. (2007). Social justice and multicultural issues: Implications for the practice and training of counselors and counseling psychologists. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 85, 24-29.
- Cooper, W. O., Lutenbacher, M. L., & Faccia, K. (2000). Components of effective youth violence prevention for programs 7 to 14 year olds. *Archives of Pediatric & Adolescent Medicine*, 154, 1134-1139.
- Coopersmith, S. (1967). *The antecedents of self-esteem*. San Francisco: W.H. Freeman.
- Corey, G. (2003). *Theory and practice of counseling and psychotherapy* (6th ed.). Belmont, CA: Brooks/Coles
- Corey, M. S., & Corey, G. (2004). *Groups: Process and practice*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Chirichella-Besemer, D., & Motta, R. W. (2008). Psychological maltreatment and its relationship with negative affect in men and women. *Journal of Emotional Abuse*, 8(4),

423- 445.

Curtis, R., Van Horne, J. W., Robertson P., & Karvonen, M. (2010). Outcomes of a school wide positive behavioral program. *Professional School Counselor*, 13(3), 159-164.

Dahir, C. A., & Stone, C. B. (2009). School counselor accountability: The path to social justice and systematic change. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 87(1), 12-20.

Daniels, K., & Thornton, E. W. (1992). Length of training, hostility and the martial arts: A comparison with other sporting groups. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, 26(3), 118-120.

Day, S. X. (2004), *Theory and design in counseling and psychotherapy*. Boston: Houghton Mills.

Deffenbacher, J. L., Lynch, R. S., Oetting, E. R., & Kemper, C. C. (1996). Anger reduction in early adolescents. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 43(2), 149-157.

Diekhoff, G. M. (1996). *Basic statistics for the social and behavioral sciences*. Upper Saddle River, NY: Prentice Hall.

Duffy, R. D., & Lent, R. W. (2008). Relation of religious support to career decision self-efficacy in college students. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 16(3), 360-369.

Dwivedi, K. & Gupta, A. (2000). Keeping cool: Anger management through group work. *Support For Learning*, 15(2), 76-81.

Feder, L. (2007). Bullying as a public health issue. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 51(5), 491-494.

Field, A. P. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS (3rd ed.)*. Pasadena, CA: Sage Publications.

- Finkenbergh, M. E. (1990). Effect of participating in taekwondo on college women's self concept. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 71*, 891-894.
- Feindler, E. L. (1995). Ideal treatment package for children and adolescents with anger disorders. In H. Kassinove (Ed.), *Anger disorders: Definition, diagnosis, and treatment* (pp. 173-196). Washington, DC: Taylor Francis.
- Finn, K. V., & Willert, H. J. (2006). Alcohol and drugs in schools: Teachers' reactions to the problem. *Phi Delta Kappan, 88*(1), 37-40.
- Fleckenstein L. & Horne, A.M. (2004). Anger management groups. In J. L. Delucia-Waack, D. A. Gerrity, C. R. Kalodner & M. T. Riva (Eds.), *Group counseling and psychotherapy* (pp.547-562). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing.
- Fondacaro, M. R., & Weinberg, D. (2002). Concepts of social justice in community psychology: Toward a social ecological epistemology. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 30*, 473-492.
- Freeman, S. J. (2004). *Review of the State-Trait Anger Expression Inventory*. In B. S. Plake & J. C. Impara (Eds.), *The fifteen mental measurements yearbook* (pp. 1182-1183). Lincoln, NE: Buros Institute of Mental Measurements.
- Frey, K. S., Hirschstein, M. K., Snell, J. L., Edstrom, L. V. S., MacKenzie, E. P., & Broderick, C. J. (2005). Reducing playground bullying and supporting beliefs: An experimental trial of the Steps to Respect Program. *Developmental Psychology, 41*, 479-491.
- Fuller, J. R. (1988). Martial arts and psychological health. *British Journal of Medical Psychology, 61*, 317-328.

- Galambos, N. L., & Leadbeater, B. J. (2000). Trends in adolescent research for the new millennium. *Interpersonal Journal of Behavioral Development, 24*(3), 289-294.
- Gay, L. R., & Airasian, P. (2003). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and applications* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Prentice Hall.
- Gladding, S. T. (2008). *Groups: A counseling specialty* (5th Ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Gottfredson, D. C., Gerstenblith, S. A., Soule, D. A., Womer, S. C., & Lu, S. (2004). Do after school program reduce delinquency? *Prevention Medicine, 5*(4), 253-266.
- Grunbaum, J. A., Kann, L., Kichen, S., Ross, J., Hawkins, J., Lowry, R., Harris, W. A., McManus, T., Chyen, D., & Collins, J. (2004). Youth risk behavior surveillance- United States, 2003 (Abridged). *Journal of School Health, 74*(8), 307-324.
- Havinghurst, R. J. (1972). *Developmental tasks and education* (3rd ed.). New York: David McKay.
- Hawley, P. H., Little, T. D., & Card, N. A. (2007). The allure of a mean friend: Relationship quality and processes of aggressive adolescents with prosocial skills. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 31*(2), 170-180. doi: 10.1177/0165025407074630
- Hawkins, J. D., Catalano, R. F. & Miller, J. Y. (1992). Risk and protective factors for alcohol and other drug problems in adolescence and early adulthood: Implications for substance abuse prevention. *Psychological Bulletin, 112*(1), 84-105.
- Hennessy, K. D., & Lent, R. W. (2008). Self-efficacy for managing work and family conflict. *Journal of Career Assessment, 16*(3), 370-383.
- Heppner, P. P., Wampold, B. E., & Kivlighan, D. M. (2008). *Research design in*

- counseling* (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson Higher Education.
- Herrmann, D. S., & McWhirter, J. J. (2003). Anger and aggression management in young adolescents: An experimental validation of the SCARE program. *Education and Treatment of Children, 26*, 273-302.
- Horner, R. H., Carner, E. G., Halle, J., McGee, G., Odom S., & Wolery, M. (2005). The use of single-subject research to identify evidence-based practice in special education. *Exceptional Children, 71*(2), 165-179.
- Institute of Education Sciences National Center For Education Statistics (2009). *Crime, violence, discipline, and safety in U.S. public schools findings from the school survey on crime and safety: 2007-2008*. Retrieved July 31,2009 from <http://www.nces.com>.
- Kellner, M. H. (2001). *In control: A skill-building program for teaching young adolescents to manage anger*. Champaign, IL: Research Press.
- Kellner, M. H., Bry, B. H., & Salvador, D. S. (2008). Anger management effects on middle school students with emotional/behavioral disorders: Anger log use, aggressive and prosocial behavior. *Child & Family Behavior Therapy, 30*(3), 215-230.
- Kellner, M. H., & Tutin, J. (1995). A school-based anger management program for developmentally and emotionally disabled high school students. *Adolescence, 30* (120), 813-825.
- Kennedy, C. H. (2005). *Single case designs for educational research*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Kurian, M., Caterinio, L. C., & Kulhavy, R. W. (1993). Personality characteristics and duration of American Taekwondo training. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 76*, 363-366.

- Ladson-Billing, G. (2009). *The dreamkeepers : Successful teachers of African American children*. San Francisco, CA : Jossey-Bass.
- Lambie, G. W. (2009). The effect of a counseling ethics course on counselor education students' levels of legal and ethical knowledge, ethical decision-making, and social cognitive development. Manuscript submitted for publication (Copy on file with author).
- Langdon, S. W., & Preble, W. (2008). The relationship between levels of perceived respect and bullying in 5th through 12 graders. *Adolescence*, 43(171), 485-503.
- Leedy, P. D., & Ormrod, J. E. (2001). *Practical research: Planning and Design*. Upper Saddle River, NY: Prentice Hall.
- Leff, S. S., Power, T. J., Manz, R. H., Costigan, T. E., & Nabors, L. A. (2001). School-based aggression prevention programs for young children: Current status and implications for violence prevention. *School Psychology Review*, 30 (3), 344-362.
- Lerner, R. M. (1982). Children and adolescents as producers of their own development. *Developmental Review*, 2(4), 342-370.
- Levine, D. N., (1991). Martial arts as a resource for liberal education: The case for Aikido. In M. Featherstone, M. Hepworth, & B.S. Turner (Eds.), *The body, social process and cultural theory*, (pp. 209-224). London, Sage Publications.
- Lindsay , J. (2001). Sex, drugs and drinking: Health risks in the social lives of young workers. *Youth Studies Australia*, 20(4), 11-18.
- Lindsey, D. H., Brass, D. J., & Thomas, J. B. (1995). Efficacy-performance spirals. A multilevel

- perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 20, 645-678.
- Litt, M. D., (1988). Self-efficacy and perceived control: Cognitive mediators of pain tolerance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 149–160.
- Lorion, R. P. (2000). Exposure to urban violence: Shifting from an individual to an ecological perspective. In N. Schneiderman & M. A. Speers (Eds.), *Integrating behavioral and social sciences with public health* (pp. 97-113). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- Martin, J. (2004). Self-regulated learning, social cognitive theory, and agency. *Educational Psychologist*, 39(2), 135–145.
- Moran, P. B., & Eckenrode, J. (1991). Gender differences and the costs and benefits of peer relations during adolescence. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 6, 857-864.
- Mowery, J. M., Miltenberger, R. G., & Weil, T. M. (2010). Evaluating the effects of reactivity to supervisor presence on staff response to tactile prompts and self-monitoring in a group home setting. *Behavioral Interventions*, 25, 21-35.
- Myers, D. (1992). *Psychology* (3rd ed.). Holland, MI: Worth.
- Neisser, U. (1976). *Cognition and reality: Principles and implications of cognitive psychology*. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman.
- Newsome, D., & Gladding, S. (2003). Counseling individuals and groups in schools. In B. T. Erford (Ed.). *Transforming the school counseling profession* (pp. 209–230). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Orpinas, P., & Horne, A. M. (2004). A teacher-focused approach to prevent and reduce students' aggressive behavior: The GREAT Teacher Program. *American Journal*

- of Preventive Medicine*, 26(1), 29–38.
- Orpinas, P., Horne, A. M., & Staniszewski, D. (2003). School bullying: Changing the problem by changing the school. *School Psychology Review*, 32, 431–444.
- Pajares, F. (2006). Self-beliefs of adolescents. In F. Urda & F. Pajares (Eds.), *Self-efficacy beliefs of adolescents* (pp. 339-367). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Pajares, F. (2002). *Overview of social cognitive theory and of self-efficacy*. Retrieved from <http://www.emory.edu/EDUCATION/mfp/eff.html>
- Piquero, A. R. (2008). Disproportionate minority contact. *Future of Children*, 18(2), 59-79.
- Pullis, M. (1994). A model for helping teachers implement classroom-based anger intervention programs. In M. Furlong & D. Smith (Eds.), *Anger, hostility and aggression in children and adolescents*. Brandon, VT: Clinical Psychology Press.
- Reynolds, C. R., & Kamphaus, R. W. (2004). *Behavioral assessment scale for children-2*. Bloomington, MN: Pearson Publishing.
- Rice, F. P., & Dolgin, K. G. (2005). *The adolescent*. (11th Ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- Rosenthal, R. (1985). From unconsciousness experimenter bias to teacher expectancy effects. In J. B. Dusek, V. C. Hall, & W. J. Meyer (Eds.), *Teacher expectancies* (pp. 37-65). Hillsdale: Erlbaum.
- Romo, J. J., & Chavez, C. (2006). Border pedagogy: A study of preservice teacher transformation. *The Educational Forum*, 70, 142-153.
- Roskies, A. (2006). Neuroscientific challenges to free will and responsibility. *Trends in*

- Cognitive Sciences*, 10(9), 419-423.
- Roysircar, G. (2009). Evidence-based practice and its implications for culturally sensitive treatment. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, 37(2), 66-82.
- Schunk, D. H. (1989). Self-efficacy and cognitive skills learning. In C. Ames & R. Ames (Eds.) *Research on motivation in education*. Vol. 3, Goals and cognitions (pp. 13-44). San Diego: Academic.
- Schunk, D. H., & Meece, J. L. (2006). Self-efficacy development in adolescents. In F. Urdan & F. Pajares (Eds.), *Self-efficacy beliefs of adolescents* (pp. 71-96). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Seligman, L. (1998). *Selecting effective treatments: A comprehensive, systematic guide to treating mental disorders*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Seligman, M. E. P. (1991). *Learned optimism*. New York: Knopf.
- Selman, R. L. (1980). *The growth of interpersonal understanding: Development and clinical analysis*. New York: Academic Press.
- Serin, R. C., Gobeil R., & Peterson, D. L. (2009). Evaluation of the persistently violent offender treatment program. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 53(1), 57-73.
- Shek, D. L., & Wai, C. Y. (2008). Training workers implementing adolescent prevention and positive youth development programs: What have we learned from the literature? *Adolescence*, 43(172), 823-845.
- Skelton, L., Glyn, M. A., & Berta, S. M. (1991). Aggressive behavior as a function of Taekwondo training. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 72, 179-182.

- Spielberger, C. D. (1999). *State trait anger expression inventory-2*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc.
- SPSS. (2006). *SPSS 15.0 for Windows*. Chicago: SPSS Inc.
- Strom, P., Strom, R., & Wing, C., Beckert, T. (2009). Adolescent learning and the internet: Implications for school leadership and student engagement in learning. *NASSP Bulletin* 93(2), 111-121.
- Sugai, G., Sprague, J. R., Horner, R. H., & Walker, H. M. (2000). Preventing school violence: The use of office discipline referrals to assess and monitor school-wide discipline interventions. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, 8, 94-101.
- Sullivan, K. (2000). *The anti-bullying handbook*. New York: Oxford.
- Sundstrom, R. R. (2008). *The browning of America and the evasion of social justice*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Taylor, S. A., Anderson, K., & Mudford, O. C. (2010). Effects on textual response prompts for adolescents in a substance abuse treatment program. *Behavioral Interventions*, 25, 145-155.
- Thompson, C. E., Murray, S. L., Harris, D., & Annan, J. R. (2003). Healing inside and out: Promoting social justice and peace in a racially divided U.S. community. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling*, 25, 215–223.
- Thompson, A. A., & Strickland, A. J. (1987). *Strategic Management: Concept and Cases*. 4th ed. Plano, TX. Business Publications, Inc.
- Twemlow, S. W., Biggs, B. K., Nelson, T. D., Vernberg, E. M., Fonagy, P., & Twemlow,

- S. W. (2008). Effects of participation in a martial arts-based antibullying program in elementary schools. *Psychology in Schools, 45*(10), 947-959.
- Twemlow, S. W., & Sacco, S. W. (1998). The application of traditional martial arts practice and theory to the treatment of violent adolescents. *Adolescence, 33*(131), 505-518.
- Twemlow, S. W., Sacco, F. C., & Fonagy, P. (2008). Embodying the mind: Movement as a container for destructive aggression. *American Journal of Psychotherapy, 62*(1), 1-33.
- Vera, E. M., & Speight, S. L. (2003). Multicultural competence, social justice, and counseling psychology: Expanding our roles. *The Counseling Psychologist, 31*, 253–272.
- Villalba, J. A., Nathaniel, N. I., & Ohlms, A. B. (2010). Cuento group work in emerging rural Latino communities: Promoting personal–social development of Latina/o middle school students of Mexican heritage. *Journal for Specialists in Group Work, 35*(1), 22-43.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher mental processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wade, J. C. (2006). The case of the angry Black man. In M. Englar-Carlson & M. A. Stevens (Eds.), *In the room with men: A casebook of therapeutic change* (pp. 177-196). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Ward, A. & Dockerill, J. (1999). The predictive accuracy of the violent offender treatment program risk assessment scale. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 26*, 125-140.
- West-Olatunji, C., Shure, L., Pringle, R., Adams, T. A., Lewis, D., & Cholewa, B. (2010).

Exploring how school counselors position low-income African American girls as mathematics and science learners. *Professional School Counseling*, 13(3), 184-195.

United States Department of Education. (2000). *Indicators of school crime and safety 2000*. Washington, DC. U.S. Government Printing Office.

Yancy, A. K., Siegel, J. M., & McDaniel, K. L. (2002). Role models, ethnic identity, and health risks: Behaviors in urban adolescents. *Archives of Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine*, 156 (1), 55-61.

Zimmerman, B. J. & Cleary, T. J. (2006). Adolescents' development of personal agency: The role of self-efficacy beliefs and self regulatory skills. In F. Urban & F. Pajares (Eds.), *Self-efficacy beliefs of adolescents* (pp. 45-69). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.