Volume 19 Issue 38
Originally issued as A10



Global Journal of human-social science: A
Arts & Humanities - Psychology
Volume 19 Issue 10 Version 1.0 Year 2019
Type: Double Blind Peer Reviewed International Research Journal
Publisher: Global Journals
Online ISSN: 2249-460x & Print ISSN: 0975-587X

The Effectiveness of Positive Peer Culture with Youth at Risk

By Larry K. Brendtro & Michael Caslor

Abstract- Youth in conflict with adults often gravitate to friends who support high-risk behavior. Various group treatment programs have sought to reverse this negative peer influence with two different strategies. In peer pressure programs, youth discipline one another to reinforce behavior norms. In peer helping programs such as Positive Peer Culture (PPC), youth support one another by solving problems and building strengths. While both approaches have been shown to improve short-term behavior, peer-helping creates long-term change in prosocial values, thinking, and behavior. This article reviews relevant research on the effectiveness of Positive Peer Culture and reports a study comparing recidivism of a residential PPC program in corrections with matched controls. Differences were apparent after 12 months as PPC groups had significantly lower recidivism at each quarterly interval of the 24-month follow-up period.

GJHSS-A Classification: *FOR Code: 200299*



Strictly as per the compliance and regulations of:



© 2019. Larry K. Brendtro & Michael Caslor. This is a research/review paper, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial 3.0 Unported License http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/), permitting all non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

The Effectiveness of Positive Peer Culture with Youth at Risk

Larry K. Brendtro [α] & Michael Caslor [σ]

Abstract- Youth in conflict with adults often gravitate to friends who support high-risk behavior. Various group treatment programs have sought to reverse this negative peer influence with two different strategies. In *peer pressure* programs, youth discipline one another to reinforce behavior norms. In *peer helping* programs such as Positive Peer Culture (PPC), youth support one another by solving problems and building strengths. While both approaches have been shown to improve short-term behavior, peer-helping creates long-term change in prosocial values, thinking, and behavior. This article reviews relevant research on the effectiveness of Positive Peer Culture and reports a study comparing recidivism of a residential PPC program in corrections with matched controls. Differences were apparent after 12 months as PPC groups had significantly lower recidivism at each quarterly interval of the 24-month follow-up period.

I. Research on peer Group Influence

Troubled youth often gravitate to like-minded peers who reinforce one another's anti-social behavior. This process called *peer deviancy training* can disrupt education, treatment, and correction programs (Dodge, Dishion, & Lansford, 2006). Peer problems are not unique to settings for youth at risk since bullying research shows that cultures of harassment are common in many schools (Bradshaw & Waasdorp, 2009).

Researchers on *peer deviancy* argue that grouping youth at risk together has "iatrogenic effects", meaning the treatment makes the problem worse (Dishion, McCord, & Poulin, 1999). Yet networks of *peer support* can be a powerful positive influence when young people who experience similar challenges can empathize with and encourage one another (Karakos, 2014). A growing body of research shows that well-designed group programs do not have iatrogenic effects (Huefner et al., 2009; Weiss et al., 2005).

Positive Peer Culture reverses negative peer influence by enlisting youth in helping one another and building respectful bonds with adults. PPC has roots in Europe and the United States. August Aichhorn (1935) of Austria piloted democratic approaches to group work and trained Fritz Redl who came to the U.S. to escape the Nazi occupation. Redl established a therapeutic group milieu at the University of Michigan Fresh Air Camp which trained youth professionals for three decades. Redl and Wineman co-authored the classic books *Children Who Hate* (1951) and *Controls from Within* (1952).

During World War II, army psychologist Lloyd McCorkle used peer groups in a Kentucky military prison. Subsequently, he developed Guided Group Interaction (GGI) with court-referred youth at Highfields in New Jersey. With only six employees and 20 boys, Highfields developed close relationships with staff and peers. This model was described in two major books (McCorkle, Elias, & Bixby, 1958; Weeks, 1958).

Psychiatrist Richard Jenkins (1958) concluded GGI at Highfields could succeed with two types of youth. *Maladjusted* delinquents act out because of emotional frustration; the warm relationships at Highfields reduced inner stress and distrust of authority. *Adaptive* delinquents were socially competent but gravitated to antisocial gangs; the group process helped them build prosocial values and relationships. Criminologist Walter Reckless (1958) observed that involving peers in problem-solving results in rapid treatment, producing a change in only a few months. Resilience researchers Werner and Smith (1992) have described effective programs for youth at risk as more like a supportive family than a treatment intervention. The Highfields program was both.

II. From GGI to PPC

Harry Vorrath completed his social work internship at Highfields in the 1960s. Prior experience as a seminary student and a Marine gave him a dual perspective—nurturing youth and demanding accountability. Vorrath saw how the military could take a group of young soldiers and in a few months prepare them to risk their lives for one another. Vorrath implemented GGI in several group homes and correctional facilities.

Vorrath gained prominence in the book *Children in Trouble: A National Scandal* by Pulitzer Prize author Howard James (1970). Vorrath was called to the Red Wing Minnesota State Training School after residents had rioted. Instead of punishment, he created "a culture of caring—what one finds in a strong happy family" (p. 125).Students worked in small groups to help solve their problems and develop prosocial values.

As GGI proliferated, the original Highfields spirit sometimes shifted from democratic to authoritarian relationships (Polsky, 1970). Group members became enforcers with the power to discipline peers. Vorrath

Author α: e-mail: larry.brendtro@gmail.com

© 2019 Global Journals

opposed using peer pressure for behavior modification, believing youth were only empowered to help. Thus, he split from GGI to create Positive Peer Culture, highlighting this distinction in his initial PPC publication:

> Do group members punish? Absolutely not! In fact, the group may not even recommend punishment; their only function is to help. If a serious situation arises which the group cannot handle, the staff will decide what to do. (Vorrath, 1972, p. 4)

While this is a clear statement, the challenge would be maintaining a caring climate.

The initial Positive Peer Culture manual (Vorrath & Brendtro, 1974) described key elements of PPC which correspond to principles of positive youth development:

- *Relationships of trust*. Youth feel safe to share concerns and challenges.
- *Problems as an opportunity.* Overcoming difficulty builds strength and resilience.
- *Responsibility instead of obedience*. Young people learn to control their lives.
- *Cultures of respect.* No one hurts another person, and all are responsible for helping.

Thus, while some group programs use peers for behavior control, PPC builds respectful relationships which meet developmental needs for belonging, mastery, independence, and generosity (Giacobbe, Traynelis-Yurek, & Laursen, 1999).

III. Caring Versus Coercion

A critical distinction in group treatment programs is whether youth are empowered by caring or coercion. The peer group literature can be confusing when researchers fail to make this distinction. While GGI and PPC each use problem-solving meetings, they may have different goals: While GGI typically targets managing behavior, PPC seeks to build prosocial values, thinking, and behavior (Fatout, 2017). One should not romanticize any model since the most positive philosophy can mutate into malpractice.

Using youth as behavior enforcers merely shifts coercion from adults to peers. Whatever its source, power-based discipline impedes empathy and moral development (Hoffman, 2000). The distinction between caring and coercion is dramatic. Grissom and Dubnov (1989) describe a *normative* model of GGI which requires the "painstaking manipulation of peer group pressure" (p. 15) whenever a norm is violated—and they list over 200 norms. This requires hundreds of daily confrontations by staff and peers. In contrast, Positive Peer Culture expects hundreds of daily acts of care and concern.

The most extensive survey of peer group treatment is from Gary Gottfredson (1987) of Johns Hopkins University. His research shows how Guided Group Interaction drifted from the relationship-based Highfields model to a culture of confrontation. Here are examples he cites from two studies by prominent GGI researchers:

Collegefields (Pilnick et al., 1967) was a community-based treatment program using GGI and academic experiences with teen boys. Peers were charged with detecting and controlling deviant behavior. The term "caring" was distorted to mean enforcing norms with group confrontation. Cult-like methods included repeating a litany of required responses to gain the group's forgiveness. "When confronted with evidence of holding back information about transgressions, a boy might be badgered, humiliated, made to kneel, and finally confess to the transgressions" (Gottfredson, 1987, p. 691). In this toxic environment, 42 percent of the boys failed to complete the program.

The Provo Experiment (Empey & Erickson, 1972) also operated in the community. In group meetings, youth were forced to disclose their delinquent history and those who were guarded met ridicule and attack; this contrasts with PPC where the groups seek to create a climate of trust rather than attacking defenses. Provo youth were told if they did not make progress, they would be sent to the state reformatory. Peers had the power to impose sanctions ranging from derision, locked detention, and exclusion from the group; none of these are permitted in PPC. Staff wielded power by keeping youth in the dark about their decisions, a classic authoritarian ploy.

Gottfredson (1987) also found that various peer group programs in schools had limited effectiveness and sometimes made matters worse; this is consistent with a meta-analysis of bully-prevention in schools (Juvonen & Graham, 2013). Researcher Dan Olweus (1996) of Norway found that the antidote to bullying is a democratic school culture. But in U.S. schools, most bully-proofing policies are coercive and fail to change either the school culture or student values (Edmonson & Zeman, 2011).

IV. Preventing Harm

The measure of status among youth in PPC is using one's abilities to help each other (Tate & Copas, 2010). But some programs called PPC are counterfeit imitations of a caring culture. Brendtro and Ness (1982) studied ten PPC programs to identify misuse of peer group methods. These included hostile peer confrontation, discipline by peers, and distant staff-student relationships. As proposed by Gottfredson (1987), this study of potential abuses is now used to establish program fidelity standards.

Certain persons face more challenges in peer-group approaches, including *beset* youth whose relational trauma made it hard for them to trust either adults or peers (Gold & Osgood, 1992). Robert Lee (1996) found that youth who failed in PPC had problems

© 2019 Global Journals

with openness to relationships. Joseph Ryan (2006) reported that those with histories of maltreatment had higher rates of recidivism following PPC; this mismatch of personality and treatment model is greatest in confrontive group settings. While all youth can benefit from positive peers, those with histories of trauma need additional relational and therapeutic support (Bath & Seita, 2018). Best practices in PPC now include training both staff and young people to be trauma-informed since the most powerful forces for healing are natural caring relationships (Greenwald, 2017).

V. The evidence Base of Positive Peer Culture

Positive Peer Culture drew on the practical experience of its authors. Vorrath was trained in the Highfields tradition and Brendtro at the University of Michigan Fresh Air Camp. They collaborated when Brendtro directed Starr Commonwealth in Michigan and Ohio which became a laboratory for refining and researching PPC (e.g., Brendtro & Ness, 1983; Seita & Brendtro, 2005; Tate, Copas, & Wasmund, 2012).

While PPC emerged from practice, decades of research have grounded this model in evidence from sociology, resilience, trauma, neuroscience, and youth development (Brendtro & Mitchell, 2015; Caslor, 2003). The core goals of PPC are expressed in the Circle of Courage resilience model and include the universal growth needs for belonging, mastery, independence, and generosity. Research shows that these needs are hard-wired into the human brain (Brendtro, Brokenleg, & Van Bockern, 2019) and are essential in developing resilience to successfully cope with adversity (Werner, 2012).

The comprehensive evidence base for Positive Peer Culture is summarized in several sources. Three *Positive Peer Culture* manuals review PPC research (Brendtro, 2020; Steinebach et al., 2018; Vorrath & Brendtro, 1985). Strength-Based Services International surveyed research on PPC programs (Giacobbe, Traynelis-Yurek, & Laursen, 1999). Positive Peer Culture is a model strength-based program (Ellis, 2009). Children Australia lists Positive Peer Culture as a research-supported therapeutic residential care model (Clark, 2011). Finally, the California Evidence-based Clearing House lists PPC as highly rated on the Scientific Rating Scale (James, 2011).

Erik Laursen (2010) summarized PPC studies which report these outcomes:

Student and staff safety, bonding to adults, problem-solving skills, reduction in crisis, internal locus of control, increased self-worth, prosocial values, school engagement, positive youth and family evaluation, and reduction in recidivism. Since many studies of PPC are not widely disseminated, we highlight representative research below:

Treatment Environment. Mitchell and Cockrum (1980) found PPC more effective than a Level System at decreasing runaways, physical aggression, property destruction, and self-injurious behavior. The most striking difference was physical aggression towards staff; in a six-month period there were 19 such incidents in the Level System and none in PPC. Bill Wasmund (1988) compared the social climates of two peer group and two non-peer group residential programs using treatment environment questionnaires. PPC students reported a more orderly climate with greater support, involvement, and freedom for expression of feelings.

Moral Development. Moshe Sherer (1985) studied the impact of PPC on moral development of "distressed" Israeli teens. Peers known to street-corner gang workers were randomly assigned to either a PPC group or a control group. A third control group included youth from other street-corner gangs who did not have personal contact with members of the first two groups. There was a significant positive difference for PPC participants and on some indices for their friends in the related group. Gold and Osgood (1992) assessed youth in Michigan PPC programs and found the level of delinquent values related to adjustment after returning to the community. The closer youth were to caregivers and teachers, the less they embraced delinquent values.

Academic Gains. Students with emotional and behavioral disorders have high levels of educational deficits (Nelson, Benner, Lane, & Smith, 2004). Among 1,000 consecutive students in PPC programs at Starr Commonwealth, the mean achievement score was .65 years across the students' educational history (Brendtro, Mitchell, & McCall, 2008). Thus, a typical tenth grader could be expected to achieve at the sixth or seventh-grade level. However, during enrollment in Starr's alternative schools, PPC students averaged between 1.5 and 2.0 years gain for each year in attendance.

Elk Hill Farm in Virginia also assessed academic achievement gains in PPC. A study of 40 students showed 2.15 months of academic gain for each month between pre- and post-test (Giacobbe & Traynelis-Yurek, 1993). Traynelis-Yurek (1997) notes that the group process enhances problem-solving, reflective thinking, and listening skills, making PPC a wholistic education and treatment strategy.

Reducing Recidivism. Researchers evaluated 140 males who completed a PPC program at Elk Hill Farm in Virginia (Giacobbe & Traynelis-Yurek, 1992). They found significant positive change on all 14 factors scores on the Jesness Behavior Checklist. Subsequent research found recidivism was significantly reduced by offering follow-up services for a year after release (Giacobbe, Traynelis-Yurek, Powell, & Laursen, 1994).

Leeman, Gibbs, and Fuller (1993) evaluated a PPC program that equipped youth in peer helping

© 2019 Global Journals

strategies. Boys at an Ohio youth correctional facility were randomly assigned to experimental or control groups. Experimental groups showed positive changes based on staff incident reports, self-reports, and school attendance. Twelve months after release, the experimental group's recidivism rates were significantly lower at 15 percent while recidivism of controls were 40 percent.

VI. The Michigan Peer Influence Study

The most extensive research on PPC was conducted by Martin Gold & D. Wayne Osgood (1992) of the University of Michigan. Their quasi-experimental study compared 45 self-contained PPC groups, each with its own staff team. All groups were nominally using PPC but there were natural differences in implementation of the model. Researchers tracked a myriad of factors related to success in the program and community. Here we highlight key findings concerning developmental needs:

Attachment. Most students formed positive bonds with both staff and peers. Research shows that traumatized or *beset* youth need close personal relationships to reconstruct their lives. This support can come from staff, peers, and family. Staff who do not form close bonds diminish their influence, but young people who like their staff and peers engage in more prosocial behavior in the program and the community.

Achievement: Many troubled youth have difficult school experiences; research shows that much delinquent behavior is provoked by failure and conflict in school. Teachers in successful schools give students at risk uncommonly warm emotional support and prevent them from failing by fostering success. Youth who are engaged in school make achievement gains and have better adjustment to the community.

Autonomy: In successful programs, youth share responsibility for decisions affecting them. Staff teams that give students autonomy form closer bonds with youth, which in turn develop more prosocial group cultures. In contrast, adult domination and coercive control feed negative peer subcultures, which in turn sabotage educational and treatment progress. The most robust predictor of positive groups is a positive staff team.

Altruism: Caring is the core value in peer helping groups. Student behavior is assessed against the standard of whether it displays concern for the well-being of others. This ethos counters the peer abuse typical in traditional correctional settings as well as many community schools. In addition to participation in peer-helping, caring for others is generalized beyond the group through service-learning activities.

Effective PPC programs require trained staff and measures to ensure fidelity in implementation. Misapplication of this methodology is most likely to occur in authoritarian settings where peer groups are used as agents of control instead of resources for helping. In the simplest of terms, no program qualifies for the designation Positive Peer Culture unless it creates a caring climate among staff and youth; this is essential if young people are to experience change.

VII. Effects of Positive Peer Culture on Recidivism

For PPC to be a total system for building transformational change, it requires strategies to impact relationships in the ecology of family, school, peer group, and community (Bronfenbrenner, 2005).The key question is whether these group interventions have a lasting positive impact; this was the focus of a previously unpublished study of recidivism of Canadian youth in a well-established Positive Peer Culture program.

VIII. Context

The research was completed as a Master of Social Work thesis (Caslor, 2003) which sought to evaluate the following research question: Do participants in the PPC program have a lower recidivism rate than a matched sample of offenders who do not attend the program while incarcerated?

PPC has been the primary programming at the Agassiz Youth Centre (AYC) in Portage La Prairie, Manitoba, since the mid-1970's. Other youth correctional facilities in Manitoba did not run PPC, with the exception of Ridge Point that had started a pilot at the time of the original research.

Recidivism was operationally defined as a) the length of time (ratio) before a subsequent charge, b) length of time before a subsequent incarceration, c) the number of subsequent charges (ratio), convictions (ratio), and length of the subsequent incarceration (ratio), d) the number of subsequent charges (ratio), convictions (ratio), and length of subsequent incarcerations (ratio) after multiple placements, and e) the seriousness of the most serious offense. *Breach of conditions* of probation (like being out past curfew or consuming alcohol) was *not* defined as recidivism.

IX. Design

Methodology. This evaluation utilized the quasi-experimental method known as the "non-equivalent groups design" (Maxfield & Babbie, 1998, p. 162). The treatment group included a sample of male youth discharged from the Agassiz Youth Centre in Portage la Prairie during the calendar year 2000. The comparison group included a sample of all-male youth discharged in the same time period from all other Manitoba youth institutions. Ridge Point was excluded since it was using parts of PPC and did not fit into either the treatment or comparison group.

© 2019 Global Journals

Sampling. An aggregate matched sampling strategy selected a treatment group (youth who were first incarcerated at AYC) and a sample comparison group (youth who were first incarcerated at an institution other than AYC) that were non-significantly different across the following control variables: Aboriginal or Non-aboriginal, Rural or Urban Residence, Gang Association, Parental Living Arrangement, Type of Primary Offence (property / personal / other), Child and Family Service Involved, History of Suicide Attempts (Yes / No), Type of Reintegration (standard supervision/intensive supervision), Education, Most Serious Offense, Primary Risk Assessment, Number of Charges, Number of Convictions, and Age at First Incarceration. Where significant differences existed between the original populations, case records were randomly removed focusing on those significantly different attributes until the samples were non-significantly different.

X. Results

a) Length of time before a subsequent charge.

The analysis was able to assess how many months elapsed after the end of the first incarceration before the next charge occurred. The differences were not statistically significant at the 3-month, 6-month, 9-month, or 12-month intervals, although AYC did have lower re-charge rates at the 6-month, 9-month, or 12-month intervals. After the one-year interval, AYC re-charge rates are significantly lower at 15 months ($p < .05$); 18 months ($p < .01$); 21 months ($p < .05$) and 24 months ($p > .05$) than the comparison group. For example, at the 24-month interval AYC's re-charge rate was 66.7%, while the comparison group's rate was 82.7%.

b) Length of time before a subsequent incarceration.

Similar analysis was undertaken to assess how many months after the end of the first incarceration had elapsed before the next incarceration occurred. At the 3-month interval, AYC had a significantly higher re-incarceration rate than the comparison group ($p < .05$). Non-significant differences were seen at the 6-month, 9-month, or 12-month intervals, with AYC having slightly lower re-incarceration rates at each interval. AYC discharges have significantly lower re-incarceration rates at the 15-month, ($p < .05$); 18-month, ($p < .01$), 21-month; ($p < .05$); and 24-month intervals ($p < .05$) than the comparison group. At the 24-month interval, AYC's re-incarceration rate was 64%, while the comparison group's rate was 80%.

c) Subsequent charges, convictions, and length of incarcerations.

The study tracked recidivism for 24 months after release. The number of subsequent charges and convictions were lower for AYC but did not reach statistical significance. However, AYC students had significantly fewer ($p > .01$) incarcerations (2.1 versus 2.7) and were sentenced to significantly fewer ($p < .01$) months of incarceration (9.7 versus 15.7) over the two years than the comparison group.

d) Subsequent charges, convictions, and length of incarcerations after multiple placements in PPC.

From all youth who were re-incarcerated, a subsample was identified who were placed in the same group as initially (AYC, N=44 and Other, N=40). What was the impact of more than one experience of PPC? Those with multiple placements in AYC continue to have significantly fewer ($p < .05$) incarcerations (1.69 versus 2.20). AYC youth also had significantly fewer ($p < .05$) months of incarceration (5.91 months versus 10.71 months). Also, those with multiple PPC placements had significantly fewer ($p. < .01$) charges (8.16 versus 16.47), and significantly fewer ($p < .05$) convictions (4.54 versus 7.32) than the comparison group.

e) Seriousness of the most serious offense.

PPC also seems to affect the seriousness of the youths' most serious offense. This was assessed using the Manitoba Department of Justice's three-level classification system of all criminal law offenses, namely Low, Medium, or High. Repeated-measures MANOVA identified that youth with multiple discharges from a PPC program have somewhat less serious convictions than youth with multiple incarcerations in the comparison group, although it didn't reach the level of statistical significance ($p = .08$).

XI. Limitations

While the matching strategies helped mitigate potential sample variations, some differences remain. Other potentially significant variables may include youth alcohol/drug abuse and the strength of the youth family/support network. Data on participation in other programs (like anger management or cultural experiences) were not available and therefore were not controlled for in sampling.

Second, the information came from the Province's Criminal Offender Management System (COMS), which was phased in just before the timeframe of the original sample. Other researchers (Bacon & Bracken, 2002) had noticed some errors in the COMS data during similar timeframes; this current study did not cross-reference recidivism data from COMS with official court records to identify any potential errors.

Third, while AYC was a well-established PPC program, the research did not assess the fidelity of PPC being offered or differences in fidelity between the peer-helping groups as did the Michigan research by Gold and Osgood (1992).

XII. Discussion

At-risk youth behavior emerges over time from experiences of trauma, disconnection, mistrust, a lack of opportunities, oppression, and disrespect. PPC

© 2019 Global Journals

attempts to intervene and counteract each of these by building climates of safety, connection, trust, opportunity, empowerment, and respect.

The findings suggest differences in recidivism between AYC and comparison group were not immediately apparent in the short term although AYC consistently had a lower re-charge and re-incarceration rate (at virtually every 3-month interval) than the comparison group over a 24-month follow-up period. These differences in recidivism reach statistical significance after the 12-month interval.

Comparing youth who were re-incarcerated and had multiple placements in AYC with youth who were re-incarcerated and had multiple discharges in another institution demonstrated AYC discharges had significantly fewer charges, convictions, number of months incarcerated and number of incarcerations. Changing habits and attitudes, referred to as 'habitudes' by John Dewey (1916), takes time and multiple experiences with PPC have a cumulative long-term positive impact.

More sustained change seems likely if similar peer helping programs could be more broadly used within youth, family, and community support services (including education, treatment, mental health services, child protection, diversion, and probation).

References Références Referencias

1. Aichhorn, A. (1935). *Wayward youth*. New York, NY: Viking Press. First published in German in 1925.
2. Bacon, B., & Bracken, D. (2002). *Evaluation of the Partner Abuse Short-Term (PAST) program* Winnipeg, MB: Child and Family Services Research Group, University of Manitoba.
3. Bath, H., & Seita, J. (2018). *The three pillars of care: Trauma and resilience in the other 23 hours.* Winnipeg, MB: University of Winnipeg Faculty of Education Publishing.
4. Bradshaw, C., & Waasdorp, T. (2009). Measuring and changing a culture of bullying. *School Psychology Review, 38*(3), 356-361.
5. Brendtro, L. (2020). *Respectful Alliances: Positive peer cultures & inspired staff teams*. Lennox, SD: The Resilience Academy and Reclaiming Youth at Risk.
6. Brendtro, L., Brokenleg, M., & Van Bockern, S. (2019). *Reclaiming youth at risk: Futures of promise*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.
7. Brendtro, L., & Mitchell, M. (2015). *Deep brain learning: Evidence-based essentials in education, treatment, and youth development.* Albion, MI: Starr Commonwealth.
8. Brendtro, L., Mitchell, M., & McCall, H. (2008). *Deep brain learning: Pathways to potential with challenging youth*. Albion, MI: Starr Commonwealth.
9. Brendtro, L., & Ness, A. (1982). Perspectives on peer group treatment: The use and misuse of Guided Group Interaction/Positive Peer Culture. *Children and Youth Service Review, 4*, 307-324.
10. Brendtro, L., & Ness, A. (1983). *Re-educating troubled youth: Environments for teaching and treatment.* New York, NY: Aldine Publishing Company.
11. Bronfenbrenner, U. (Ed.). (2005). *Making human beings human: Bioecological perspectives on human development.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
12. Caslor, M. (2003). *The effects of Positive Peer Culture on the recidivism rates of male young offenders in Manitoba.* Thesis for Masters of Social Work, University of Manitoba, Canada.
13. Clark, A. (2011). Three therapeutic residential care models, The Sanctuary Model, Positive Peer Culture, and Dyadic Developmental Psychotherapy and their application to the theory of congruence. *Children Australia, 36*(2), 81-87.
14. Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*. New York, YK: Macmillan.
15. Dishion,T., McCord, J., & Poulin, F. (1999). When interventions harm: Peer groups and problem behavior. *American Psychologist, 54*(9), 755–764.
16. Dodge, K., Dishion, T., & Lansford, J. (Eds.). (2006). *Deviant peer influence in programs for youth: Problems and solutions.* New York, NY: Guilford Press.
17. Edmonson, L., & Zeman, L. (2011). Making school bully laws matter. *Reclaiming Children and Youth, 20*(1), 33-38.
18. Ellis, R. (2009). *Best practices in residential treatment*. New York, NY: Routledge.
19. Empey, L., & Erickson, M. (1972). *The Provo experiment: Evaluating community control of delinquency.* Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
20. Fatout, M. (2017). *Models for change in social group work*. New York, NY: Routledge.
21. Giacobbe, G., & Traynelis-Yurek, E. (1992). Attitudinal changes as measured by the Jesness behavior checklist in a residential peer group program. *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth, 3*(3-4), 345-351.
22. Giacobbe, G., & Traynelis-Yurek, E. (1993). *Elk Hill: A successful residential treatment program for young men.* Richmond, VA: G & T Publishing.
23. Giacobbe, G, Traynelis- Yurek, E., & Laursen, E. (1999). *Strengths based strategies for children & youth: An annotated bibliography.* Richmond, VA: G & T Publishing.
24. Gibbs, J., Potter, G., & Goldstein, A. (1995). *The EQUIP Program: Teaching youth to think and act responsibly through a peer-helping approach*. Champaign, IL: Research Press.

© 2019 Global Journals

25. Grissom, G., & Dubnov, W. (1999). *Without locks and bars: Reforming our reform schools*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
26. Gold, M., & Osgood, D. (1992). *Personality and peer influence in juvenile corrections*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
27. Gottfredson, G. (1987). Peer group interventions to reduce the risk of delinquent behavior: A selective review and a new evaluation. *Criminology, 25*(3), 671-714.
28. Greenwald, R. (2017). *Child trauma handbook: A guide for healing trauma-exposed children and adolescents.* New York, NY: Routledge.
29. Hoffman, M. (2000). *Empathy and moral development: Implications for caring and justice*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
30. Huefner, J., Handwerk, M., Ringle, J., & Field, C. (2009). Conduct disordered youth in group care: An examination of negative peer influence. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 18*(6), 719-730.
31. James, H. (1970). *Children in trouble: A national scandal*. Philadelphia, PA: David McCay Publications.
32. James, S. (2011). What works in group care? A structured review of treatment models for group homes and residential care. *Child and Youth Services Review, 33*(2), 308-331.
33. Jenkins, R. (1958). Treatment considerations with delinquents. In H. Weeks, *Youthful offenders at Highfields* (pp. 149-156). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
34. Juvonen, J., & Graham, S. (2013). Bullying in schools: The power of bullies and the plight of victims. *Annual Review of Psychology, 65*(1), 159-185.
35. Karakos, H. (2014). Positive peer support or negative peer influence? The role of peers among adolescents in recovery high schools. *Peabody Journal of Education, 89*(2), 214-228.
36. Laursen, E. (2010). The evidence base for Positive Peer Culture. *Reclaiming Children and Youth, 19*(2), 37-42.
37. Lee, R. (1996). FIRO-B scores and success in a positive peer culture residential treatment program. *Psychological Reports, 78*, 215-220.
38. Leeman, L., Gibbs, J.,& Fuller, D. (1993). Evaluation of a multi-component group treatment program for juvenile delinquents. *Aggressive Behavior, 19*(4), 281-292.
39. McCorkle, L., Elias, A., & Bixby, F. (1958). *The Highfields story: An experimental treatment project for youthful offenders*. New York, NY: Henry Holt and Company.
40. Maxfield, M., & Babbie, E. (1998). *Research methods in criminal justice and criminology (2nd ed.).* Belmont, CA: West Wadsworth.
41. Mitchell, J., & Cockrum, D. (1980). Positive Peer Culture and a level system: A comparison in an adolescent treatment facility. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 7*(4), 399-406.
42. Nelson, J., Benner, G., Lanne, K., & Smith, B. (2004). Academic achievement to K-12 students with emotional and behavioral disorders. *Exceptional Children, 71*(1), 59-73.
43. Olweus, D. (1996). Bully/victim problems at school. *Journal of Emotional and Behavior Problems, 5*(1), 15-22.
44. Pilnick, S., Allen, R., Dubin, H., Youtz, A., Treat, R., White, J., Rose, F.,& Habas, S. (1967). *College-fields: From delinquency to freedom*. Newark, NJ: Newark State College, Laboratory for Applied Behavioral Science.
45. Polsky, H. (1970). Changing delinquent sub-cultures: A social-psychological approach. In H. Polsky, D. Claster, & C. Goldberg (Eds.), *Social system perspectives in residential institutions* (pp. 683-699). East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press.
46. Reckless, W. (1958). The small residential institution. In H. Weeks, *Youthful offenders at Highfields: An evaluation of the effects of short-term treatment of delinquent boys* (pp. 157-164). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
47. Redl, F., & Wineman, D. (1951). *Children who hate.* Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
48. Redl, F., & Wineman, D. (1952). *Controls from within.* Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
49. Ryan, J. (2006). Dependent youth in juvenile justice: Do Positive Peer Culture programs work for victims of child maltreatment? *Research on Social Work Practice*, *16*(5), 511-519.
50. Sherer, M. (1985). Effects of group intervention on moral development of distressed youths in Israel. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 14*(6), 513-526.
51. Seita, J., & Brendtro, L. (2005). *Kids who outwit adults*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.
52. Steinebach, C., Schrenk, A., Steinebach, U., & Brendtro, L. (2018). *Positive peer culture: Ein Manual für Gruppengespräche*. Weinheim Basel, Switzerland: Beltz Juventa.
53. Tate, T., & Copas, R. (2010). Combat or cooperation? *Reclaiming Children and Youth, 18*(4), 32-36.
54. Tate, T., Copas, R., & Wasmund, W. (2012). *Partners in empowerment: A practitioner's guide to implementing peer group treatment models.* Albion, MI: Starr Commonwealth.
55. Traynelis-Yurek, E. (1997). Thinking clearly through Positive Peer Culture. *Reclaiming Children and Youth, 6*(2), 87-89.

© 2019 Global Journals

56. Vorrath, H. (1972). *Positive Peer Culture: Content, structure, process*. Lansing, MI: Michigan Center for Group Studies.
57. Vorrath, H., & Brendtro, L. (1974). *Positive Peer Culture*. New York, NY: Aldine de Gruyter.
58. Vorrath, H., & Brendtro, L. (1985). *Positive Peer Culture (2nd ed.).* New York, NY: Aldine de Gruyter.
59. Wasmund, W. (1988). The social climates of peer group and other residential programs. *Child and Youth Care Quarterly, 17*(3), 146-155.
60. Weiss, B., Caron, A., Ball, S., Tapp, J., Johnson, M., & Weisz, J. (2005). Iatrogenic effects of group treatment for anti-social youths. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 73*(6), 1036-1044.
61. Weeks, H. (1958). *Youthful offenders at Highfields: An evaluation of the effects of the short-term treatment of delinquent boys.* Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.
62. Werner, E., & Smith, R. (1992). *Overcoming the odds: High-risk children from birth to adulthood*. New York, NY: Cornell University Press.
63. Werner, E. (2012). Risk, resilience, and recovery. *Reclaiming Children and Youth, 21*(1), 18-23.

© 2019 Global Journals