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ABSTRACT

THE MAKING OF A MEDIATOR:
WHAT LIFE CIRCUMSTANCES OR EVENTS DO MEDIATORS IDENTIFY AS BEING INFLUENTIAL IN THE CAREER CHOICE TO BECOME A MEDIATOR?

Betty Mae Smith Marshall, M.A.

George Mason University, 1981

Dissertation Director: Dr. Wallace P. Warfield

This dissertation explored the background of mediators and what circumstances and events are identified as being influential in their career choice to become a mediator. The research also explored why individuals choose to become mediators and how events and circumstances experienced by a mediator impacted on the choice to become a mediator and the types of cases the mediators choose to handle. In the process of researching and writing this dissertation, the author conducted a literature search and an on-line survey of mediators who practice in various arenas and graduate students in the conflict resolution field. Telephonic interviews of "High-Profile" mediators were also conducted.

This exploratory study with input from multiple perspectives in the conflict resolution field may serve as a reference and resource for individuals with a desire to join or study the conflict resolution field in the context of the understanding of the development of the profession of conflict resolution and whether they shared similar experiences with current practitioners. It may also assist them in engaging in self-reflection of how prior events and circumstances impact on their conflict resolution practice.
1. Introduction to the Research

Rationale for the Study

When this researcher began taking classes in conflict resolution and undergoing mediation training, it was noted that the backgrounds of mediators, facilitators, intermediaries and other conflict interveners were extremely varied. It was also observed that the styles across and within the types of conflict interveners varied tremendously. In informal discussions with fellow students, professors, and conflict interveners about their variety of backgrounds, repeatedly the researcher heard that such a variety is to be expected since conflict resolution is a multidisciplinary field that has its foundations in many of the other social sciences. Such dialogues, as well as a search of the conflict resolution literature for information on why people became mediators, still left the researcher wondering whether there are any factors, circumstances, or events that propelled individuals toward the field of conflict resolution in general and towards careers as mediators specifically.

Some writers have made suggestions about what motivates or influences conflict interveners and mediators (see for example, Goettler, Herrman & Gale, (1999); Sarat, (1994); Touval, (1982)). Although specific motivators or incentives for mediators are rarely cited, Sarat (1994), Touval (1982), Kolb and Kressel
(1994), and Goettler, Kolb and Krussel (1999) touched on the issues of mediator motives or incentives.

Touval (1982) in discussing the influences on the international mediator, noted possible motivators for mediators. Touval observed that we assume mediators, “like all other actors in international politics, are motivated by some interests, whether humanitarian or materialistic or some combination of the two” (p. 15). He further noted that another researcher, Young, had “mentioned among possible self-interested motives the expectation of benefits to be derived from the performance of a mediator’s role (such as enhanced status, influence, salary), and the avoidance of costs—damage to oneself that might ensue if the conflict between the protagonists were to continue” (p. 15).

In the book *When Talk Works: Profiles of Mediators*, Kolb and Kressel (1994) emphasized that each mediator has different motivations. They identified three types of mediators (the field builders, the “pros”, and the outsiders) and that each of whom has a niche. They noted that each niche represents somewhat different motives on the part of the mediator for doing mediation, exposes its members to somewhat different stresses, and contributes differently to the field.

Goettler, Herrman, and Gale (1999) examined the background characteristics and incentives of mediators who practice in public, private, and government agencies in the state of Georgia in the U.S. The researchers did not cite specific motivations or incentives but noted that each mediator has different motivators. Based on a review of the works of other researchers, Goettler, et. al.
also noted that “growth in the practice of mediation increases the need for better understanding of who mediates and their motives for continuing to practice, because different types of people may be drawn to different settings” (p. 221). They added that “if mediators working in different settings have varying educations and occupations, they may have different incentives for mediating and may use different styles of conflict resolution” (p. 222).

In discussions about mediators, Kolb (1983) suggested that interpretive theory is the lens to study human activities like mediation and the activities of mediators. Central to the theory is a view of individuals as self-conscious, creative, and active. In interpretive theory, Kolb stated that the concept of social interaction is that “people enter social situations with certain goals in mind and develop lines of action in response to these situations based on the meanings they apply to them. In other words, action, meaning, and purpose are intertwined” (p. 5). She added “that when we apply that interpretive theory to mediation, it highlights the mediator as the creative force in the mediation process. The mediator has considerable discretion in determining how he/she will interact with the parties and arrange the major case elements. How the mediator structures the case will be based on his/her own meanings and definitions of personal aims and objectives” (p. 5).

In When Talk Works: Profiles of Mediators, mediators are presented who practice in various arenas. One of the mediators profiled in the book, Patrick Phear, stated that “that all the ‘good mediators’ he knows come from what he
calls ‘complicated’ childhoods in which they grew up ‘desperately needing to make sense of a world of conflict’ (Sarat, 1994, p. 236). Since mediator Phear did not explain “complicated childhoods”, readers were left to create their own definition. Some adults might indicate that most childhoods are complicated, however, as this researcher contemplated the definition of “complicated childhood,” she ruminated that, if the statement held any truth, then why do some individuals who experience “complicated childhoods” chose as adults to enter the field of conflict resolution and others do not.

**Definitions**

As we begin the exploration of why individuals chose to become interveners in conflicts and more specifically mediators, one must first define the nature of the very situations into which they are intervening – i.e. conflicts. The history of conflict interveners will also be discussed in this section. This section concludes with an overview of the type of interveners that is the subject of the current research -- mediators.

**Conflict**

Conflict has been defined in many ways (see for example: Hocker & Wilmot, (1995); Mitchell, (1981)), but generally speaking, the various definitions indicate that it is an expressed or manifested struggle or situation between at least two interdependent social entities or ‘parties’ who perceive mutually incompatible goals, scarce resources, and interference from others in achieving their goals. Most individuals who work with social conflicts would indicate that
nearly every word in the above definition needs to be explained or “unpacked.” However, since definitions of conflict frequently used in common speech and in academic analysis include words used in this definition, this researcher will utilize the above stated definition in this research.

This definition does not address the means by which these social entities, parties, or actors pursue these perceived mutually incompatible goals. Sandole (1993) in his definition of conflict indicates that the actors (parties), or their representatives, “try to pursue their perceptions of mutually incompatible goals by undermining, directly or indirectly, the goal-seeking capability of one another” (p. 6). The means with which parties pursue their goals, while undermining others, produces conflict that varies in intensity and range. One continuum that has been used to describe the intensity of conflict, indicates that it may range from a mild difference, to a disagreement, to a dispute, to a campaign, to litigation, to a fight or war (Hocker & Wilmot, 1995). Boulding (1987) (see Figure 1), described a continuum that showed an even wider range with a war of extermination on one end to integration and union at the opposite end.

---

**Figure 1 – The Conflict Continuum**

Conflict Interveners

As long as there has been conflict, there have been individuals who helped others handle or address conflict, regardless of where it occurs on the continuum (see for example, Moore, (1986); Ury, (2000); and Kolb, (1994)). Under a variety of labels, these conflict interveners, third parties, or what Ury calls the “third side”, range from serving in a very informal role to formal roles, communal conflicts to international conflicts, violent to non-violent conflicts, and/or interpersonal to multi-party. These conflict interveners are part of those conflict management techniques that come into effect once conflict avoidance and prevention have failed to stop a conflict from reaching the stage of destructive behavior (Mitchell, 1981). As we think about conflict and more specifically these interveners, questions come to mind for this researcher as to what type of person becomes an intervener in conflicts. Others, such as Mitchell, framed the question as “what types of third parties become involved in peacemaking and what are their appropriate qualities?” (1981, p. 286). The appropriate qualities are subjective to the mediator and the conflict in which the mediator is intervening. In this study, mediators will be asked what they determine to be appropriate qualities in their practices; this is one of the principal questions this research will explore.

A third party is an individual or collective that is external to a dispute between two or more people or groups that tries to help them reach an
agreement (Rubin, 1980). Third parties or conflict interveners can be contracted or non-specialists who emerge in the midst of the conflict. They may serve in individual or representative roles, invited or non-invited roles, advisory or directive roles, interpersonal or intergroup roles, resolution-oriented or relationship roles (see for example: Rubin, Pruitt and Kim, (1994); Mitchell, (1981); Bush and Folger, (1994)).

Mitchell (1981) went on to state that

“In everyday language, the concept of an intermediary conjures up a picture of an individual who acts as a ‘go-between’ for two individuals in an intense conflict between whom communication has broken down. A third party is needed to restore communication and, perhaps, to suggest a compromise or a way out of the dispute that enables both parties to profit. So firmly is this image of ‘the’ mediator held, that the basic assumption about intermediary activity (especially at the international level), is that it involves a single, usually prestigious figure traveling between capital and capital with a briefcase full of peace plans, compromise solutions and face-saving formulae, ready to produce these as soon as he confronts the leaders of the parties in conflict and hoping that, by use of ingenious arguments and the force of his prestige, one or other of his schemes will provide the long-sought-for solution.

There is some truth in this caricature. At some social levels the mediator often is an individual, and does fulfill the functions of a physical
go-between, communicator, or provider of compromise schemes. In many societies, for example, single prestigious individuals are often recognised as possessing a formal, accepted role as intermediary in conflicts, helping the parties towards a compromise settlement without using any coercion, save the expectations of the rest of the community that his activity will not be lightly ignored” (Mitchell, 1981, p. 287).

Laue (1994) also conjures up a colorful image of the mediator when he described those who intervened in national issues in the 1960s in the United States as “a kind of flying squad who, like the CRS, could go into cities on request and deal with racial conflicts (p. 23).” Fisher and Keashly (1988) described the mediator as a competent and trusted intermediary who facilitates a negotiated settlement on a set of specific, issues through reasoning, persuasion, the control of information and the suggestion of alternative compromises.

Susskind and Cruikshank (1987) noted that the “neutral can allow all parties to maintain the appearance of “toughness” while still supporting the search for integrative outcomes” (p. 140). They added that “this is accomplished by allowing the parties to communicate cooperative messages through the helper while maintaining a less cooperative “public” stance in meetings of the full group” (p. 140).

The intervention does not need to be conducted by an individual but in fact could be conducted by a team of several interveners or intermediaries working independently of each other (Mitchell, 1981). The intervention does not
necessarily need to be in the form of mediation. “Intervention modes differ according to the *degree to which conflict parties determine the final outcome*. In some forms of third party intervention, the intervener serves as a facilitator to the parties who make their own decisions, whereas other forms impose a resolution to the conflict upon the parties” (Hocker & Wilmot, 1995, p. 214). Hocker and Wilmot listed some of these interventions, ranging from high degree of determination by the parties of the solution to their conflicts to a low determination by the parties (facilitation, mediation, counseling and therapy, organizational development, conciliation, quasi-judicial bodies, informal tribunals, arbitration of all types, and criminal and civil justice system). The list provided by Hocker and Wilmot shows pure types whereas in many interventions, combinations of approaches are used (Hocker & Wilmot, 1995). Hocker and Wilmot referenced the prior research of Buzzard and Eck, (1982), Coogler, (1978), and Moore (1986) that examined some of the combinations. Some forms of conciliation use both mediation and arbitration, usually decided by the third party who is assisting the parties to reach agreement. “Contracts between labor and management often specify a sequence of steps such as (1) negotiation, and if necessary, (2) mediation. If that fails, (3) arbitration of the contract terms begin. Divorce mediators often specify that if the mediation breaks down on a specific issue, that particular issue is taken to an arbitrator, thus allowing mediation to continue” (Hocker & Wilmot, 1995, p. 215).
While recognizing that all these types of conflict intervention have been effective in “peacemaking,” and that interveners may use a variety of approaches and skills when intervening in a conflict, the focus of this research is on mediation and the third party who is a mediator and/or the third party who utilizes the skills typically used in mediation (“mediative skills”) or techniques to resolve/transform conflicts.

**Mediation**

Moore stated that “mediation involves the intervention of an acceptable, impartial, and neutral third party who has no authoritative decision-making power to assist contending parties in voluntarily reaching their own mutually acceptable settlement of issues in dispute” (1986, p. 6). Rubin, Pruitt and Kim (1994) noted in their definition of mediation that it is “a form of outside intervention” since the mediator is not a part of the dispute (p. 256). Hocker and Wilmot (1995) defined mediation as “a process in which an intervener helps parties to change their positions so they can reach agreement (p. 221).” They go on to add that “in more elaborated form, mediation is the ‘art of changing people’s positions with the explicit aim of acceptance of a package put together by both sides, with the mediator as listener, the suggestor, the formulator of final agreement to which both sides have contributed’ ” (p. 221).

The Mennonite Conciliation Service defined mediation as “a process, facilitated by a third party, by which disputants discuss their concerns and issues and explore possible options for mutually satisfactory solutions to differences.
Typically, the process is a voluntary one and the parties have selected the third party” (Price, 2000a, p. 157). Susskind and Cruikshank noted that “the mediator plays a transforming role—helping the parties out of a zero-sum mindset into an integrative bargaining framework” (1987, p. 163). Jeong stated that “mediation techniques help reduce differences in opinions and contending interests” (2000, p. 35). Jeong also noted that “mediation has widely been seen as an alternative to resorting to violence at both a communal and international level” (p. 181). He further explained that “mediation supports primary parties’ own efforts to manage conflict but is distinct with the intervention of a third party in the negotiation process” (ibid, p. 181).

From these definitions we are informed that mediation involves a third party, not involved in the conflict, who intervenes in the conflict with a process to help others change positions, explore options, move from zero-sum mindsets, reduce differences, and hopefully avoid violence. Rather than use this combination definition, in this research when “mediation” is used, the researcher will be referring to Moore’s definition of mediation which stated that “mediation involves the intervention of an acceptable, impartial, and neutral third party who has no authoritative decision-making power to assist contending parties in voluntarily reaching their own mutually acceptable settlement of issues in dispute” (1986, p. 6).

Kolb explained that “mediation is one of the oldest and most ubiquitous forms of conflict resolution in American society and throughout the world. As
long as people have had disputes with each other, mediators have counseled the use of reason over arms and the benefits of compromise over adjudication. While the role is an old one, only in the last ten to fifteen years has mediation become a formal complement to dispute resolution in a wide array of social arenas” (1994, p. xiii).

Mediation has been praised as an effective technique or process for resolving conflicts at the interpersonal, community, organizational, national, and international levels (see for example: Lederach, (1995); Kriesberg, (1998); Ury, (2000); Pruitt et al., (1993); Carpenter and Kennedy, (1988); Bush and Folger, (1994); and Hocker and Wilmot, (1995)). Numerous articles and books have been written on the mediation process, the parties who participate in the process and the outcomes of the mediations in various settings (see for example: Kolb, (1994); Moore, (1986); Kreisberg, (1998); Carpenter and Kennedy, (1988); Pruitt et al., (1993)). Some research has been done on the roles of mediators, their influence on the process and their neutrality and/or impartiality. Professional organizations such as The Association for Conflict Resolution (ACR), among others, have talked extensively about the qualifications and the training of mediators (see for example: Kolb and Kressel, (1994); Moore, (1986); SPIDR-Commission-on-Qualifications, (2000); Conbere, (2000); Price, (2000b)).

Possible Contributions of this Study to the Field of Conflict Resolution

As the interest in mediation increases, it is becoming more and more imperative that the Conflict Resolution discipline begin to examine the issue of
the effectiveness of mediation (definitions of mediation were presented earlier in this chapter). The interest in the effectiveness of mediation and an increasing interest in mediation as a profession plus the corresponding rising demand for high quality mediators (Brett, Drieghe, & Shapiro, 1986), will focus the spotlight more and more on mediators. Questions about mediator selection, mediation training, and assignment of mediators to cases are linked to the topic of quality of mediation. Questions that the field should anticipate regarding mediators include the following: Who are the mediators? What are their backgrounds? Why do individuals choose to become mediators? Are mediators “born,” “environmentally created”, and/or “trained”? Do certain types of backgrounds, characteristics, personalities, or traits produce a better quality of mediator? Do divisions in the field of conflict intervention reflect divisions in backgrounds of mediators? Do certain aspects of a mediator’s background make him/her better in certain roles or conflict situations? Is the quality of the intervention the result of an interaction between the mediator’s background characteristics, personalities and/or traits, and the dynamics of the case?

Information about mediator backgrounds, characteristics, or traits may assist those who select individuals to be trained as mediators and those who train mediators. Research on the backgrounds of mediators may provide some criteria for those who assign mediators to cases, i.e. to assist in better matching mediators to disputants and types of cases in order to maximize the chance of successful outcomes. Such research may also provide information that will
assist mediator mentors and other coaches of mediators in providing feedback to
junior mediators. In addition, the information may assist companies and
individuals who provide career coaching or guidance to individuals considering
the pursuit of the work of conflict interveners, mediators, or allied
occupations/vocations. Lastly, the information may assist mediators who
practice “reflection” in their profession, as espoused by Schön (1983, 1987) and
Birkhoff and Warfield (1996), to continue to improve their skills and become more
aware of biases, traits, and characteristics that could impact their mediations or
use of mediative skills.

Using the concepts identified in career choice, psychology, personality,
and human development literature, the researcher proposes to examine which
factors influenced the individual’s decision to become a mediator. The
researcher plans to use Conflict Resolution theories and other general social
science theories to help examine the findings.

Statement of the Problem to Be Explored In this Research

In summary, a review of the literature of Phear, Touval, Kolb, Goettler,
Kolb and Krussel, and Herrman and Gale suggests that the personal background
of the mediator is a factor in why people become conflict interveners and
mediators. Their research seems to imply that in order to understand the
motives of mediators or other conflict interveners; one needs to examine the life
circumstances, factors, and/or life events encountered (“backgrounds”) by the
mediators. If the “backgrounds” of mediators are the basis for the motivation to
become a conflict intervener, this researcher is still left with the lingering questions of what life circumstances, events or factors do mediators and other conflict interveners believe were significant in leading them to make the choice to become a conflict intervener.

Another question that the researcher would like to explore is what impact does the “background” of mediators and other conflict interveners have on the arena or types of conflicts in which the mediator/conflict intervener practices, e.g. does the individual practice at the interpersonal level, microsystem (families, communities, or workplaces), or macrosystem level (societal, national, or international) as a matter of choice because of his/her “background.” Lastly, the researcher has an interest in whether there is any relationship between the identified background factors/events and the arena or types of conflicts in which that mediator intervenes. Although other research has explored what intervention techniques the mediator uses while intervening in conflicts and/or whether he/she serves as a cultural translator in conflicts based on his or her background (see for example: Warfield (1993); Woodrow and Moore (2002)), this research is interested in the factors and decision making process the individual utilized to decide to become a intervener or mediator.

The central questions of this research focus on:

(1) What life circumstances, events, or factors do mediators and other conflict interveners believe were significant in leading them to make the choice to become a conflict intervener?
(2) What (if any) impact does the “background” of mediators and other conflict interveners have on the arena or types of conflicts in which the mediator/conflict intervener practices?

(3) Is there any relationship between the identified background factors/events, the arena or types of conflicts in which they intervene? These questions would be displayed graphically as shown in Figure 2.

![Figure 2: The Impact of Background on Mediator Career Choice](image)

**Theoretical Framework for the Proposed Study**

A central question of this research is why do individuals choose to become conflict interveners? The researcher believes that conflict resolution theories may shed light on why mediators choose to become conflict interveners. Conflict resolution theories of basic human needs theory, world-view theory, and nested conflict theory, in particular, seem relevant to this research question since they focus on the individual’s drives, needs, and perceptions.

Basic human needs theory proposes that there are a number of basic universal human needs. These needs are unalterable and nonnegotiable. Their satisfaction is imperative. If these theorists (Burton, (1990); Burton and Dukes,
among others) are correct in that all humans strive to satisfy these needs, mediators would also strive to satisfy these needs. The striving to fulfill these needs could potentially be occurring in the decision to become a mediator. The proposed explorative research may reveal whether basic human needs are impacting the choice to become a mediator. It also may be discovered that some mediators are people who want to satisfy others’ needs through a helping type profession.

World-view research indicates that one’s placement in the world relates to one’s sense of reality, that people have a need to make sense of who they are and how they relate to others and that we use metaphors (stories and myths) to order our world. If, according to world-view theory, mediators need to make sense of who they are and how they relate to others, the theory may shed light on why individuals chose to become mediators (see for example: Nudler, (1993); Docherty, (2001)).

Based on the basic human needs theories and world-view theory, the central question of why individuals choose to become conflict interveners may be articulated as: Do individuals choose to become conflict interveners to (1) strive to fulfill their own basic needs, and/or (2) make sense of who they are and how they relate to others (e.g. to keep their world-view consistent)? This fourth central question would modify the initial diagram of the research question as shown below.
Figure 3: Theoretical Frames for the Impact of Background on Mediator Career Choice

The career choice decision-making literature along with the literature of the social sciences will be reviewed to discover the theories of career choice and how decisions about career choices are made. It is anticipated that the literature will also provide insights into factors that impact career choice and the age at which individuals start to make such choices. In an attempt to discover what other factors may influence the decision to become a mediator and shape the dissertation parameters, the author will review social science literature on birth order, class, race, gender, culture, and the educational levels of parents as it relates to career choices of offspring.

The researcher will conduct a search of the literature on human development (child, adolescent, and post-adolescent) to ascertain what psychological and cognitive factors affect career choices. The researcher will
also review the literature for information on how personality and self-concepts in childhood development modify career choices. Lastly, the researcher will review literature for information on the impact of exposure to conflict or violence on development of self, personality, and career choice. The author will also look for articles on the significance of exposure to conflict on decisions to become a mediator and mediator's and conflict interveners’ styles.

**Research Questions to be Explored**

The researcher is interested in the reason individuals choose to become conflict interveners in general. In spite of an interest in the collective of interveners, the researcher proposes to explore the backgrounds of the intervener who utilizes a particular set of skills – the third party who serves as a mediator or the third party who utilizes mediative skills or techniques to resolve/transform conflicts. The research is focusing on mediators to the exclusion of other types of third party roles to permit a homogeneous sample of individuals who have some shared qualifications or skills that can be compared and contrasted.

This researcher is expanding the definition of mediator to include those who use mediative skills, recognizing that many individuals use a combination of skills of which mediation is only one. The definition is also being explained because, over the course of the ten years that this researcher has been studying this field, she has observed that many individuals who originally self-identified as mediators are now describing themselves as interveners who use "mediative
skills” among other skills. The researcher plans to explore: (a) how the backgrounds\(^2\) of mediators impact on their career choices, and (b) affect their decision of types of cases to mediate or the arenas in which mediation occurs.

The purpose of the study will be primarily exploratory and descriptive.

In review, the six primary questions the researcher plans to explore are:

1. Why do individuals choose to become mediators?
2. What are the one or two primary or dominant reasons why individuals choose to become mediators?
3. What life circumstances or events influenced the individual’s decision to become a mediator?
4. Do individuals choose to become conflict interveners to strive to fulfill their own basic needs or to make sense of who they are and how they relate to others (e.g. to keep their world-view consistent)?
5. Is there a relationship between the level of the environmental system in which significant career decision-making background events occurred (intrapersonal, microsystem, mesosystem, exosystem, or macrosystem), and the arenas or levels of conflict (intrapersonal, societal, national, transnational, international, or global) in which mediators choose to intervene?
6. Does the mediator perceive that he/she has more to offer in arenas of conflict or levels of conflicts which correspond to the environmental system level in which identified significant life circumstances or events occurred that shaped the choice to become a mediator?

\(^2\) Background, as used in the research, references two categories of experiences – life circumstances and life events. Life circumstances are being used to encompass events that the individual did not voluntarily choose, i.e. place of birth, birth order, socio-economic class of family of origin, etc. Life events references events in which the individual made a choice, i.e. where to live as an adult, causes to support, etc.
The central questions and the hypothesis are discussed in greater detail in Chapters 5 and 6. There are numerous secondary questions to these five primary questions which will also be discussed.

Summary

This project presents a research approach for systematically examining one aspect of the mediation process that has not been addressed in much detail, namely the mediator’s background and its impact on career choices to become a mediator, and types of cases mediated. A literature review of the conflict resolution fields and other allied social science fields will be conducted to ascertain the identified factors as to why individuals choose to become mediators. A review of biographical and autobiographical materials and/or interviews of prominent or “high-profile” mediators will be conducted to identify circumstances/events which were influential in their decision to become a mediator. A survey will be conducted of mediators, students of academic institutions specializing in conflict resolution studies, and students of mediation training programs to identify circumstances/events that were significant in their decision to become a mediator.

Demographic statistics along with analysis and tabulation of data (a joint distribution between the discrete variables) will be utilized to analyze the numeric data. Content analysis will be used to analyze the narrative data collected. A summary will be provided of the results in conjunction with any conclusions. The researcher will discuss evidence found that supports or fails to support each of
the elements, hypothesis, or research questions as well as any unanticipated results or findings. The discussion will include alternative explanations for the findings, the impact of the study in terms of what was learned as well as the strengths, weaknesses, and limitations of the study. Lastly, there will be a discussion of the implications for professional practice or decision making, scholarly understanding of the field, theory building and/or future research studies along with recommendations for changes in selection of mediators and their professional practices.
2. Review of Literature on How Career Choices Occur

Introduction

Before proposing a research plan to explore why individuals become involved in the field of conflict resolution in general and towards careers as mediators specifically, the researcher conducted a review of the relevant literature. The review for this research covers three categories of literature as directed by the major questions of the research (discussed in Chapter 1). The literature review examined: (1) careers and how they are selected; (2) how and why individuals became conflict interveners/mediators; and (3) what theories provide insight into why individuals became mediators. The literature review is summarized by topic in the Chapters 2, 3 and 4.

The first part of the literature review, as stated above, focuses on careers and how career choices occur. Although careers have been studied extensively in a wide range of disciplines, including sociology, various subfields of psychology (industrial, organizational, developmental and social), gender and race studies, vocational and educational counseling, organizational theory, and organizational behavior (Arthur, Hall, and Lawrence (1989)), in this review, the researcher focused primarily on the literature about careers across three disciplines -- Career Choice Decision-Making, Psychology, and Conflict
Resolution. Using the concepts identified in the career choice literature in conjunction with psychological, personality and human development theories, the researcher examined what factors have previously been explored as influencing the individual’s career decisions.

The second part of the literature review examined mediators’ characteristics (Chapter 3) in conflict resolution and other social science literature (psychology, sociology, and anthropology) to ascertain what insight was provided into the types of individuals who become mediators or conflict interveners and why. Specifically, research and theories related to the mediator roles, characteristics, styles, training and “stories” of individuals who were conflict interveners and/or mediators were examined to ascertain if any patterns have been explored for how decisions were made to become interveners and/or mediators or if any analysis had been conducted of any events experienced by these individuals which may have contributed to their career decision. The researcher also studied the backgrounds of prominent or “High Profile” mediators to ascertain what circumstances or events influenced their decision to become mediators or conflict interveners.

Lastly, the researcher examined literature and theories in the field of Conflict Resolution (in Chapter 4) to ascertain what insight they provide into the types of individuals who become mediators or conflict interveners and why. It is anticipated that the conflict resolution theories that help explain why conflict occurs may also help explain why individuals wish to become involved in
attempting to resolve conflict (the topic of this present research) and help examine the findings of the present research.

**Career Choice Literature**

In this chapter, articles were reviewed that addressed the career choice decision-making literature and the theories of human and personality development as it relates to the development of occupational choices. The literature on human development (child, adolescent, and post-adolescent) was reviewed to ascertain what psychological and cognitive factors affect career choice. Literature was also examined to obtain information on the age at which the choice is made, culture’s impact, parental influences, and gender, race, and class influences on career choice. In addition, the researcher also examined the literature for information on how personality and self-concepts in childhood development modify career choice.

The literature of other social sciences was also reviewed to obtain further insight into factors that impact career choice, the age individuals start to make such choices and how decisions about career choices are made. In an attempt to discover what other factors may influence the decision to become a mediator, the author examined social science literature on birth order, class, race, gender, culture and the educational levels of parents as it relates to career choices of offspring to ascertain what factors impact on career choices. Although the

---

3 Literature on career choice decision-making is typically addressed in education and career counseling but has also been addressed in sociology and psychology.
author was unable to locate specific articles on the significance of exposure to
crash on decisions to become a mediator, she reviewed the limited literature for
information on the impact of exposure to conflict or violence on development of
self, personality, and career choice.

**Definition of Career**

Career is defined as “one’s progress through life or in a particular vocation
or a profession or occupation which one trains for and pursues as a lifework”
(Gurainik, 1980, p. 53). Researchers who focus on career development have
elaborated on the definition of career. With reference to careers, Arthur and
Careers—sequence of work experiences over time—unfold. A career depicts the
person, the elementary unit in work arrangements. Careers invoke relationships
within and among firms… Put simply, everyone who works has a career. And
everyone’s life outside work is connected to the career. As lives are lived, a
focus on careers, rather than on jobs, insists that we account for time and its
implications” (p. 3). Feldman (2002a) defined careers as “the sequence of a
person’s work experiences from formation of career interests through retirement”
(p. 5). Later Feldman (2002b) expanded his definition of careers to “the
sequence of occupations and jobs we hold over a forty- or fifty-year period of
work. Most of us will spend eight or ten hours a day—over ten thousands days
of our lives—at work and much of the time not at work, thinking about it, worrying
about it, reveling in it, or recouping from it. How successful we are in our careers
and how positively we feel about them has a tremendous impact on the quality of our lives” (p. xv).

Arthur and Rousseau’s (1996) definition of careers and Feldman’s (2002a), shared the same basic underlying concepts as found in Super’s definition of conflict. Super (1961), as cited by Herr, said that “a career is the sequence of occupations, jobs, and positions in the life of an individual whether these are or are not vertically and laterally related” (Herr, 1970, p. 10). These various definitions suggest that thoughts of careers begin early and continue throughout life and that careers reflect various aspects of life experiences and change over time. Feldman (2002b) summarized the concept that careers are fluid when he said that “careers need to be examined as they unfold over time. Most researchers agree that career dynamics can be understood only by examining individuals’ experiences over time. Individuals’ decisions about their career moves are not solely determined by current skills and interests. Instead, career plans are shaped by previous work histories and long-term plans for the future as well. Careers, then, are neither static nor self-encapsulating in nature. Rather, they evolve over time and are influenced by both past events and future aspirations” (p. 7).

The Study of Careers

“Career development theories are explanations of how people develop certain traits, personalities, self-precepts and how these developments influence decision making. The theories are also about how the contexts in which people
live and how the variables in those contexts interact with personal characteristics to influence development and decision making” (Brown, 2002, xi).

Although the efforts to help people identify appropriate careers can be traced to the fifteenth century, Duane Brown and Associates (2002), along with others (Patton & McMahon, 1999) believed that the roots of career development theory did not emerge until Parson developed a conceptual framework (schema) for career decision making in 1909. He stated that “in the wise choice of vocational there are three broad factors: (1) a clear understanding of yourself, your attitudes, abilities, interests, ambitions, resources, limitations, and knowledge of their causes; (2) a knowledge of the requirements, conditions of success, advantages and disadvantages, compensation, opportunities, and prospects in different lines of work; (3) true reasoning on the relations of these two groups of facts” (Parsons, 1909, p. 5).

Although Parson’s view of career selection “was simplistic compared to today’s thinking about career development, most of the current work in career counseling and career education for career choice remains structured around these three elements” (Patton & McMahon, 1999, p. 2). While Parsons’ schema seemed to emphasis the interaction of the individual to the environment, initially the study of career was very narrowly focused. Historically, the field of work and career development reflected theoretical notions about the task of vocational choice, while emphasizing the imparting of occupational information. Studies of people in various careers were conducted to look for patterns or trends of interest
among people in a profession. Interests were perceived as major in vocation choice. There was considerable evidence that persons in the same occupational groups manifest congruent interests, which were often different from the major interests of persons in other occupational groups. There have been some theoretical discussions of the development of occupational interests, chiefly as part of theories of vocational choice (Darley & Hagenah, 1955).

Although some studies during the 1950s were essentially descriptive of the vocational choices (Ginzberg, Ginsburg, Axelrad, & Herma, 1951), others examined internal and external factors and interests that impacted on vocational choices. In the early 1950s, a new trend emerged. The major focus was to explore the dynamics and motivations of clients with an eye towards exploring his/her self-concept⁴. This resulted in the application of psychodynamic therapeutic theories and practices (psychoanalytic, client-centered, etc.) to vocational concerns (Burck, 1984). This change in focus expanded the field to include the factors that enter into career decision-making and the interpretation of those choices. Developmental theories, which placed more emphases on the stages and process of career development, began to appear (Patton & McMahon, 1999) (see for example: Bordin (1943); Burck (1984); Super (1957).

⁴ Self object, as term coined by followers of Freud (neo-Freudians) occurs when the individual has established within their mental structures, negative perceptions of self based on hostile characteristics of caregivers and others. The individual will defend these views as their own. As defined by Kohut (1971) self-object means the experience of another – more precisely, the experience of impersonal functions provided by another – are as part of the self. Horney (1950) was the first neo-Freudian to talk about self-concept. She believed that problems are considered to stem from a “basic anxiety” that may be produced in individuals if they are not reared in an accepting environment.
Bordin (1943) was concerned primarily with internal dynamics of choosing a career. Still others, such as Carter (1940) and Super (1957), considered the external realities of the familial and social situation and the influence of the self-concept. Later theorists broadened the ideas of career and career development to include numerous influences.

Burck (1984) believed that “career development refers to the total constellation of psychological, sociological, educational, physical, economic, and chance factors that combine to shape the career of any given individual….Career development considers the importance of feelings, attitudes, prejudices, opinions, and values of individuals, as well as measured aptitudes, achievements, interests, intelligence, and other personality traits in order either to explain their career progression or to help them in career development life-stages” (p. 5).

Sloan (1987) stated that the area labeled as career decisions is a vast terrain. It covers major self-initiated rearrangements of a person’s involvement in the vocational domain. It includes the initial vocational choice, job or career switching, and retirement decisions. It also includes the subjective resolutions taken in order to resolve major dilemmas connected to the sphere of work. Career decision can thus be analyzed as a subset of the domain of life choices (p. 168). Sloan (1987) argued that:

“The understanding of any life dilemma or decision necessarily involves several moments of interpretation. A first moment
exposes the complexity of the practical situation in which a decision seems to be called for. A second moment unravels the role of a person’s life history and character structure in producing the decision dilemma and its particular meanings as well as imagined resolutions. A third moment initiates reflection on the sociohistorical, cultural, and ideological processes that intersect in the consciousness of the deciding subject. Often these social processes are central in locking the deciding subject into a particular decision frame or in constituting the compulsiveness or anxiety with which a decision is made” (p. 169).

He goes on to explain that:

“These three moments are, of course, interwoven. In fact, they can be understood as facets of two simpler structures. Following Sartre (1968), [Sloan] argues that it is useful to interpret dilemmas and decisions in terms of interaction between life project and a field of possibilities centered in the personal life structure. The dimension of life project includes character structure, socialization, early family experiences, life goals, identity, vocation, and any other elements of what is usually lumped into the category of personality. The life structure is the collection of personal involvements at any given stage that produces the routine of everyday life (Levinson, 1978). It also incorporates contemporary socioeconomic and political events
as they impinge on the life course (either consciously or unconsciously). In a compelling synthesis, Sullivan (1990) recently interpreted this realm in terms of Bourdieu’s concept of the habitus. Life projects and life structures could be seen as playing themselves out in the broader field of history, culture, and ideology” (p. 169).

Sloan seems to be in agreement with Burck (1984) and others that we must consider the intersecting role of the individual’s history, character structure, socialization, early family experiences, life goals, identity, vocation, and any other elements of what is usually lumped into the category of personality character structure, as well as the socioeconomic and political events in life career choices.

Although the study of careers originated with a narrow focus on traits or interests of individuals in an occupational group, currently the approaches to the study of vocations or careers are very varied and broad along with the definitions of what should be included as factors in shaping careers, and the use of testing in the field (Darley & Hagenah, 1955). More recently, according to Patton and McMahon (1999) theories have focused on both content and process, including the interaction between these and the role of cognition in the process. Collins and Young (1986) seemed to reflect the same view as they suggested that in addition to considering the factors that enter into career decision-making and the interaction of those factors, recent authors of career literature have encouraged the use of interpretive approaches that gain access to the ecological and
subjective dimensions of career. Collin and Young (1992) argued that the “interpretive approach yields rich material for career theorists and counselors and for researchers in cognate fields, and it is peculiarly appropriate for the study of lives in context” (p. ix). They believed that “the current context in which careers and lives are followed and lived is one of economic and political upheaval, postmodernist culture, technological development and demographic change” (Collin & Young, 1992, p. ix). In addition these researchers argued that career can no longer be adequately conceptualized solely in terms of objective and intra-individual factors. The context of the career and the individual’s subjective experience must be taken into account (Collin & Young, 1992).

Young and Borgen (1990) stated that the nature of the environment and the individual’s response to it are significant to an understanding of career. They suggest that a system model of “career” needs to be considered. This approach states that the social class, education, occupational opportunities and many other factors can be construed as inputs that are transformed by the self-concept into outputs of career activities, which in turn change the environment and hence generate new inputs. Collin (1990) developed a system model of “career.” Figure 4 shows the levels of the environment that Collin believed shaped career choices. The researcher proposes to use this system model with its levels of environmental inputs to explore whether life circumstances and events that may have influenced the mediator to choose such a career.
The idea of perceiving careers as a system suggested that career choice may be a part of or impacted by an individual’s world-view. According to Gysberg, Heppner and Johnston (2003), the construct of world-view “is defined as a ‘frame of reference through which one experiences life. It is the foundation of values, attitudes and relations’ (Fouad & Bingham,(1995), p. 335). World-view is typically acquired via the enculturation process. That is, a person learns how to perceive his or her relation to self, community, and the world via ethnic and racial socialization. Although world-view consists of several components, such as group identity (cultural consciousness), individual identity (individual vs. collective self-concept), beliefs (shared assumptions), and language (communication patterns) (Dana, 1993), critical elements of world-view consistently discussed in the literature concentrated on value dimensions. According to noted anthropologist Florence Kluckholm (1960), values orientation reflects cultural components of the problem-solving process” (p. 41). Gysberg, Heppner and Johnston (2003) went on to add that, the common value dimensions or solutions to broader human problems discussed in the literature (See for example: Dana (1993); Sue & Sue (1990)) included the belief of human nature as inherently good, evil or both; views about the dimensions of social relations (consist of one of three dimensions - lineal or vertical (leaders and followers), collateral (collective and consultation with significant others), and individual (individualistic control of destiny)).
Figure 4 – A System Model of “Career”


(individualistic control of destiny); person/nature relationship that involves one of the three affiliations: mastery, subjugation, or harmony with nature; and time that consist of one of the three foci of human life: past, present, and future orientations.

Assessments of components of world-views can assist in comprehending between and with-in group differences. Gysberg, et. al. (2003) believed that additionally, these broad world-view differences may well influence many aspects
of the career development process. For example, Gysberg, et. al. (2003) believed that the tenets of the world-view embraced by many western European cultures (individualism and autonomy, affluence, structure of opportunity open to all, the centrality of the work in people's lives and the linearity, progressiveness and rationality of the career development process), “consequently shaped current career research theory and practice. It is also important to examine one’s worldview or conceptual framework as it may influence the pace and timing of career choice and the actual occupational content of job choices” (p. 41). An individual’s world-view is believed to also impact one’s approach to conflict. The world-view as it applies to conflict resolution will be discussed in the Chapter 4 which reviews the theories of conflict resolution.

As summarized by the above section, many approaches have been used to study careers and the research of vocations has moved from a focus on trait and factor analysis to considering careers as part of the numerous systems that influence the individual. Career discussions have also proposed that systems influence encompass the individual’s world-view.

**Overview of Major Career Choice Theories**

Before discussing career decision making, the researcher provides an overview of the major theories of career choice literature to afford a shared understanding of the basic concepts in the field. There are many approaches that have been used to classify the theories of career development and choice. According to Osipow (1983), there appeared to be five distinct approaches to
thinking about career (counseling) based on the focus of the theories. He felt that the major approaches in career choice literature are grouped into those that focus on trait-factor theories, those that focus on sociology and career choice, developmental/self-concept theory, vocational choice and personality theories and behavioral approaches. As noted by Brown (2002), Osipow (1990) later posited that the most influential theories converged in some important ways. Osipow identified the four dominant theories as Holland’s theory of personality and vocational choices (1992, 1997), Krumboltz’s social learning theory (1979); (Mitchell & Krumboltz, 1990), Super’s developmental theory (1990), and Dawis and Lofquist’s on work adjustment theory (1984). Osipow further suggested that these four theories had the same objective: predicting the degree of fit or congruence between the people’s personalities and their occupations.

Brown and Associates (2002, 1996, 1990); and Brown (1986) grouped the theories as either psychologically based, sociologically based, developmental and post modern, career development anchored in learning theory or as trait and factor. More recent theories included those rooted in logical positivism and those rooted in social constructionism. Hackett, Lent and Greenhaus (1991) chose the content and process of decision making as the dimensions on which to categorize career development theories, a tactic also adopted by Minor (1992). “Content refers to the influences on career development, such as interest and values, and process refers to accounts of change over time and decision-making process” p. 4. Historically, career development theory focused on either content
or process. Major theories focusing on the content of career development include
the psychological approaches of trait and factor theory, the work adjustment
person-environment correspondence theory, and the personality-based five-
factor theory (Hackett et al., 1991). Still others added to their classification
groupings content (of career choices), theories that focused on content and
process, person-environment fit theories, and theories that focused on the
process of career development.

Regardless of which classification approach is used, the most recognized
names in the field include: Parsons (1909), whose work was discussed above,
Super (1983,1990), Holland (1992), Dawis and Lofquist (1984), and Krumboltz
(1979). The more recent authors include Collins and Young (1992), and Lent,
Brown and Hackett (1994,1996). The highlights of these theories are presented
next.

**Theories Focusing on Content of Career Choices**

Theories that focus on the content of career choice can be traced to
Parson (noted earlier in this chapter). Theories that may be included in this
grouping include those based on trait-factor and person-environment fit concepts.
“Although Parsons’ three-step schema cannot be called formal theory in the strict
sense, his statement does summarize the first conceptual framework for career
decision making and thus the first guide for career counselors” (Brown, Duane,
& Brooks, 1990, p. 1). Parsons believed that if a person chose a vocation,
rather than merely hunting for a job, the worker’s satisfaction and success would
increase and the employer’s costs and inefficiency would decrease. He
developed techniques to help individuals identify their resources, abilities, and
interest and match these traits to the “conditions of success in different industries
(Parsons, 1909, p.8)” (Brown et al., 1990, p. 2).

“Because the needs of the marketplace were the predominant concern of
the times, the primary emphasis of vocational guidance and education became
the study of occupations, rather than the study of the psychological aspects of
individual preferences, interests, and values. It was believed that occupational
information provided an adequate basis for vocational choice. This occupational
model, representing step 2 of Parsons’ approach to matching individuals and
jobs, dominated the vocational guidance scene until the 1940’s” (Brown et al.,
1990, p. 2). Brown and Brooks added that “from 1930 to 1950, various complex
economic and social factors emerged that shifted the emphasis from step 2
(occupational information) to step 1 (identification of individual traits) of the
Parsonian approach. For example, the Depression produced a need to help
retrain dislocated workers and find new jobs for them. World War II resulted in a
need to select and train persons for the armed forces” (p. 3). Parsons provided
a systematic plan for career guidance that has endured, with some modifications,
to the present time. According to his philosophical orientation to social reform,
there was to be equality and opportunity for all based primarily on people’s
interests and aptitudes and on occupational information (Zunker, 1998).
**Trait-Factor Theories**

From Parson’s work, “trait and factor theories that focused on the content of career choice, such as characteristics of the individual and of the workplace, evolved” (Patton & McMahon, 1999, p. 2). Trait and factor analysis (focused principally on the optimal person-occupation at the time of career choice (Bradley, Brief, & George, 2002) was the primary approach for many years or perhaps as better stated by Osipow (1983) was “the oldest theoretical method to career research …known by a variety of names, most commonly by the name of the trait-factor approach. This system assumes that a straightforward matching of an individual’s ability and interest with the world’s vocational opportunities can be accomplished and once accomplished, solves the problems of vocational choice for that individual. Some of the original trait-factor theorists who influenced thinking about vocational psychology are Parsons (1909), Hull (1928), and Kitson (1925)” (p. 9).

“The trait and factor approach was the first structural theory of occupational choice making to emerge. Others - notably Holland’s model – followed, and all possess some common assumptions. Foremost among these is that each individual possesses certain rather stable psychological traits that are inhibited or develop as a result of person-environment interaction.” (Brown, 1990, p. 345).
Person-environment Fit Theories – Holland and Dawis and Lofquist

Shortly after Super began work on his theory, theories about interplay between personality and work environments (referred to as person-environment fit theories) were being developed. In this category of theories that focus on content of career choices are found the works of Holland as well as the more recent works of Dawis and Lofquist (1984). Holland’s theory of vocational personalities and work environments (1959, 1966, 1973, 1985, 1992, 1997), in its simplest terms suggests that at first people can be characterized in terms of their resemblance to each of six personality types: Realistic, Investigative, Artistic, Social, Enterprising, and Conventional (hence the reference to it as the RIASEC model). The closer the person resembled a type, the more he/she exhibited the traits and behaviors of that type according to Holland. Holland, as noted in Osipow’s summary of the field (Osipow, 1983), indicated that the way in which these orientations influence vocational behavior is that once the types or orientations have been clearly established and if one orientation is dominant over the others, the individual will seek an occupational environment that corresponds to the orientation. Basically Holland’s theory saw people as choosing work that was congruent with their personality types (Brown et al., 1990). Secondly, environments can be characterized as well in terms of their resemblance and support of the types. As Holland goes on to state, “…the pairing of persons and environments leads to outcomes that we can predict and understand from our
knowledge of the personality types and the environmental models” (Holland, 1985, p. 2).

Holland (ibid) provided additional help in predicting how one will find satisfaction or dissatisfaction with a choice. For that, he introduced the principle of congruence, that is, thinking about the agreement between a person’s personality type and the environment; i.e. the more the agreement or congruence, the more the satisfaction the individual will have with the choice.

In 1969, Dawis and Dawis published the first version of work adjustment theory. This theory has always emphasized that work is more than step-by-step task oriented procedures. “Work includes human interaction and sources of satisfaction, dissatisfaction, rewards, stress, and many other psychological variables. The basic assumption is that individuals seek to achieve and maintain a positive relationship with their work environment. According to Dawis and Lofquist, individual bring their requirements to a work environment, and the work environment makes its requirements of individuals. To survive, the individual and the work environment must achieve some degree of congruence (correspondence). To achieve this congruence, or agreement, the individual must successfully meet the job requirements, and the work environment must fulfill the requirements of the individual.” (Zunker, 1998, p. 25) Four key points of Dawis and Lofquist’s theory are that "work personality and work environment should be amenable, individual needs are most important in determining an individual’s fit into the work environment, individual needs and the reinforcer
system that characterizes the work setting are important aspects of stability and tenure, and the job placement is best accomplished through a match of worker traits with the requirements of a work environment” (Zunker, 1998, p. 25)

**Super’s Developmental Theory – Concept Theory**

Super’s (1957) theory was the most comprehensive of those presented to date, and therein lies its strengths and its weaknesses. Super (1990) described his theory as “a segmental theory…a loosely unified set of theories dealing with specific aspects of career development, taken from developmental, differential, social, personality, and phenomenological psychology and held together by self-concept and learning theory” (p. 199). Super made many contributions to the study of vocational behavior including his formation of developmental stages: growth, exploratory, establishment, maintenance and decline; the idea of self-concept and vocational maturity, among others. (Super considered “self-concept as the vital force that establishes a career pattern one will follow throughout life” (Zunker, 1998, p. 68) Super has not only attempted to explain career development but has also, in his recent work on role saliency, taken on the broader challenge of theorizing about life roles (Brown, 1990).

Building upon the work of Buehler (1933) and the Ginzberg group (1951), Super and his associates formulated a theory to “explain the process through which interest, capacities, values and opportunities are compromised…” (1953). Within a structure of stages and periods, Super and his associates specified the kinds of behaviors that contribute to career development. According to Super,
each career stage has broad, distinctive tasks whose implementation depends upon the acquisition of specific skills and attitudes and whose accomplishment is necessary to both succeed in that stage and move on to the next stage. Super coined the term *vocational maturity* to epitomize the changing yardstick of unique career related behaviors that make up career development at different life stages. Vocational maturity is used to denote the degree of development, the place reached on the continuum of vocational development from exploration to decline, Vocational maturity may be thought of as a vocational age, conceptually similar to mental age” (Super, 1955).

Super (1990) hypothesized “that career choice is the implantation of self-concepts. In order to understand this proposition, it is necessary to have a clear definition of self-concepts and career and a clear sense of the theorists view of the process of decision-making. (Brown, 1996, p. 6). Super (1990) stated in one of his propositions that work and life satisfactions are dependent upon the degree to which an “individual finds adequate outlets for abilities, needs, values, interests, personality traits and self-concepts” (p.208). It is impossible to discern which of the constructs involved is theoretically most important when considering sources of life and career satisfaction” (Brown, 1996, p. 6).

Krumboltz’s Social Learning Theory

Krumboltz, Mitchell, and Gelatt’s (1975) theory is an attempt to simplify the process of career selection and is based primarily on life events that are influential in determination career selection. Krumboltz’s learning theory of
career choice and counseling is based on Bandura's social learning theory. Krumboltz adapted and extended Bandura's (1977b) social learning theory into an explanatory system of career decision making. He deviated from Bandura in several regards. He has renamed many of Bandura's constructs; for example, self-observation generalization becomes a general construct related to self-efficacy, interests, and so forth. Because Krumboltz has carefully defined these new labels, he enhanced Bandura's ideas rather than detracting from them. Although he deviated somewhat from Bandura's ideas, he does not appear to assume that certain types of learning are more potent than others. Bandura believed that participants' modeling is a more powerful method of improving self-efficacy than vicarious modeling. Krumboltz had not made this distinction, although it may be implicit in his theory.

"Social learning theory posits two major types of learning experiences that result in individual behavioral and cognitive skills and preferences that allow people to function effectively in the world. The first is instrumental learning experiences, which occur when an individual is positively reinforced or punished for the exercise of some behavior and its associated cognitive skills….The second type of learning experience posited by social learning theory is associated learning experiences, which occur when people associate some previously affectively neutral event or stimulus with an emotionally laden event or stimulus" (Mitchell & Krumboltz, 1990, p. 234). In this theory, the process of career development involves four factors: (1) genetic endowments and special
abilities, (2) environmental conditions and events, (3) learning experiences, and (4) task approach skills. (see Zunker (1998); Mitchell & Krumboltz ((1990)). Genetic endowments are inherited qualities. Environmental conditions and events were factors of influence that were often beyond the individuals environment influences skills development, activities, and career preferences. The third factor, learning experiences, included both instrumental learning experiences and associative learning experiences. Instrumental learning experiences are those the individual learns through reactions to consequences, through direct observable results of actions, and through the reactions of others. The consequences of learning activities and their later influence on career planning and development are primarily determined by the reinforcement or non-reinforcement of the activity, the genetic endowment of the individual, special abilities and skills, and the task itself. The fourth factor, task approach skills, included the set of skills the individual has developed, such as problem-solving skills, work habits, mental sets, emotional responses, and cognitive responses. These sets of developed skills to a large extent determined the outcome of problems and tasks he individual faces. (Zunker, 1998)

Young, Valach and Collin – Action Approach

Collin and Young (1986) also reviewed career theory, concluding, first of all, that there is not even agreement regarding the meaning of the term career. They also enumerated two related criticisms...i.e. that a career theory is concerned primarily with the objective rather than the subjective career, and
“career theories have been conceived within the orthodox philosophy of the social sciences.” (Brown, 1990, p. 339) Collin and Young believe that career theorists have erred by ignoring the subjective experience of the individual, since subjective experience will influence objective experience (that is, one observed by the scientist). Accepting the subjective experience of the actor would result in changes in our definitions of major career change and work adjustment, since the workers’ perceptions and values would be taken into consideration in those definitions. For example, what the observer might classify as a major job change might be perceived as a relatively minor shift by the individual (Brown, 1990).

**Theories Focused on the Process of Career Development**

Other theories that are not necessarily considered major ones (as influential) but that provide some insight into the individual’s choice of a career include the theories of Roe (1956); (1956), Bordin (1943, 1984, 1990) and Ginzberg (1951). The theories of Roe and Bordin stressed intrinsic personality needs as the primary determinants of choice as opposed to those of Holland that focused on observable personality characteristics. They believed that people selected occupations that satisfy important psychological needs (Brown et al., 1990)

In (1951), the multidisciplinary team of Ginzberg, Ginzburg, Axelrad, and Herma set forth a radical new psychologically-based theory of career development that broke with the static trait and factor theory of occupational choice. “They posited occupational choice as a developmental process that
occurs over a number of years, a largely irreversible process characterized by compromise because people must balance interests, aptitudes, and opportunity. In their original formulations, they assumed that occupational choice occurred over a number of years but is completed in early adulthood.” (Brown et al., 1990, p. 3)

**Roe’s Need Theory**

Roe’s (1956, 1984, Roe & Lunnesborg, 1990, 1964) theory of occupational choice assumes a relationship between certain childhood environments, need development, personality, and, ultimately, job choice. Although her early work focused on rather specific groups, such as artists and scientists, her theory now stands as a general theory. It is primarily a psychological theory in that Roe attempts to account for psychological processes that lead to career choice (although the formulations in this volume indicate that she is aware of the need to integrate environmental and socio-demographic factors into her theory).

Roe posits that each of us is born with certain psychological predispositions and a cluster of physiological and physical strengths and weaknesses. These interact with certain environmental conditions, particularly child-rearing practices, and a need hierarchy develops. Each of us seeks to meet those needs in a particular type of work environment. Roe’s (1956) system for classifying occupations stands as a major contribution to occupational psychology. However, her theoretical system is very difficult to research, although a number of attempts have been made.
Bordin’s theory of life development (a psychodynamic one) emphasized careers. He posited that “a relationship between biological needs or drives and family atmosphere, a relationship that results in a certain personality type. These ideas are similar to those of Roe and Holland, although they grow out of a somewhat different psychological set” (Brown, 1990, p. 353). His emphasis was on the development of personality in relation to the role of work and play in an individual’s life. He also linked the development of identity and parental influence and work (Patton & McMahon, 1999).

Five of the theories detailed above can be labeled as primarily psychological in nature. Four of the theories (those of Holland (1959, 1966, 1973, 1985, 1992, 1997; Roe (1956); Bordin (1943, 1984 ,1990) and trait and factor theory) share several ties: (1) the early environment is the major contributing factor to personality development, (2) psychological processes are dominant in the occupational choice – making process, (3) choosing an occupation involves the implication of one’s personality, and (4) development (in the sense that developmental psychologists think of it) is either unimportant or cannot be accounted for by stage theory. Roe and Bordin have focused on the early environment and the identification process and have much more to say about the factors that may be related to personality development than either Holland or the trait and factor theorists, a major weakness in their positions. Because they (particularly Bordin) have focused on the development process, they have more to say about changing personality, as well as programs that can
be utilized by practitioners. This synthesis would also give legitimacy to other
traits (Brown, 1990).

Numerous new theories of career choice and development have emerged
since the 1950s. The theories started with a focus on testing to get an individual
into the proper job. Later theories appeared that focused on the psychological
aspects of career, and along with theories that examined how career fit into the
development of the human. The social learning theories followed as the ideas
about career expanded to include more than ideas about work and how work
impacted on individual's lives. More recent years have seen the emergence of
career choice literature theories addressing careers as a part of a system\(^5\),
examining the psychology of work, considering career development based on
cognitive theory and reliance upon an information-processing model to explain
the processes involved (Peterson, Sampson, and Reardon, (1991)) and the
influence of the environment on the individual and the cultural context in which

\(^5\) According to Patton and McMahon (1999), systems theory is well established in other fields,
such as family therapy, but it is relatively new to career development theory. While its potential
was acknowledged as early as 1983 (Osipow, 1983), and while theorist and researchers have
commented on it applicability at various levels (e.g., Collin, 1985; Krumboltz & Nichols, 1990; ...),
its potential as an overarching framework has not been explored. Systems theory is broadly
based and is able to take into account the diversity and complexity of the influences on career
development and thus of career development itself. Its elements are present in a number of
perspectives being discussed in relation to careers and career development“ (p. 9). Patton and
McMahon added that a key aspect of systems theory is: “an emphasis on wholeness and the
interrelationship of parts within a whole; view of the whole as greater than the sum of its parts; the
inclusion of elements from a variety of fields … and emphasis on mutuality of action and
interaction – that is, the dynamic and recursive impact of the individual and the context on each
other. The emphasis in systems theory is on the recursiveness, or ongoing relationship, between
elements or subsystems of the system and the changes that occur over time as a result of these
continual interactions. The application of systems theory to career development allows the
disparate concepts addressed in the literature to be dawn together in one theoretical framework.
This does not make the existing theories redundant or devalued; rather, each can be viewed in
the context of all available theory” (p. 9)
occupational choices take place. Blustein and Ellis (2000) using the emerging concepts of impact of the environment on human behavior in reference to career development while writing from the point of view of social constructionism have made recommendations for making tests more culturally sensitive (Brown, 2002).

**Psychological, Personality and Human Development Theories as Related to Career Choice**

In addition to the major career theories noted above, other social sciences have theories that may help explain career choices and the factors that influence these choices. Some of these personality, psychological, development and sociological theories are discussed next.

**Human Development**

Another body of literature the researcher reviewed was human development as it relates to career choices, personality, and self-concepts. Specifically the researcher gathered information on what aspects of childhood influence career development. Personality theories have been categorized in many ways. Maddi (1976) grouped them into three broad categories: the conflict model, the fulfillment model, and the consistency model. In the conflict model, it is assumed that the person is continuously and inevitably in the grips of the clash between two great, opposing, unchangeable forces. The fulfillment model assumes only one great life force and it is localized in the person. In this model, life is construed as the progressively greater expression of this force. The force is either a genetic blueprint determining the person’s special capabilities or it
represents ideals of what is fine, excellent, and meaningful in life. The greater force strives toward these ideals of perfection, regardless of whether that entails expressing one’s own genetic capabilities or inferiorities. In the consistency model, there is little emphasis upon great forces. Rather, there is emphasis upon the formative influence of feedback from the external world. If the feedback is consistent with what is expected or what is customary, then there is quiescence. If there is inconsistency between the feedback and the expectation or custom, there is pressure to decrease this uncomfortable state of affairs. Life is understood to be the attempt to maintain consistency.

The conflict model includes the theories of Freud, Murray, Rank, Jung, Erickson, and other psychoanalysts. The fulfillment model includes Rogers, Maslow, Adler, Allport, Fromm, and some existential psychological theories. The consistency model includes cognitive dissonance and consistency models of Kelly, McClelland and Fiske and Maddi (Maddi, 1976). These human development consistency model theories are similar to the theories of cognitive dissonance discussed in the conflict resolution theories in Chapter 4.

Regardless of how one categorizes the theories, a majority of the personality theories suggest that our childhood backgrounds impact on the type of adults we become. Rogers (1972) noted that “all these aspects of the individual – life style, self-concept, and role—constitute his personality, which in turn, is influenced by assorted biological and environmental factors” (p. 47). He went on to indicate that significant environmental influences including the
adolescent’s family, school, peers, and the larger society and the impact of these influences depends somewhat on how a particular individual relates to the institution concerned (Rogers, 1972). Goleman (1994) reminds us in his best selling book, *Emotional Intelligence: Why It Can Matter More Than IQ*, that the emotional abilities that children acquire in later life are built on the shaping of emotional intelligence that occurred in the earliest years of life and continue to be shaped throughout the school years.

Many authors have discussed the various stages of life as if the various stages are discrete and qualitatively different from one another. The critical-period hypothesis, which is an out-growth of stage theory and Freudian concept of sensitive periods, states that particular experiences may have a more profound effect at certain periods, than at others (Rogers, 1972).

**Sociology and Career Choice**

A second set of approaches on how career choices occur might be best represented as a sociological model of career development. Another descriptive name for the position has been the reality theory of vocational choice. This approach has as its central point the notion that societal circumstances beyond the control of the individual contributed significantly to career choices and that the principal task confronting a person is the development of techniques to cope effectively with the environment. Factors influencing level of aspiration assumed importance (see for example, Sewell and Hauser, 1975; Sweet, 1973; Caplow (1954), Hollingshead (1949), and Miller and Form (1951) (Osipow, 1983).
People have social as well as psychological needs. Motivation is extremely important in the choice of work as well as in the day to day work world. Studies have noted that people’s efforts at work and play will be directed toward the satisfaction of all their needs, not just the materials things such as food, clothing, and housing (See for example: Morgan & King (1966); Maslow (1968); (1969).

**Career Choice Decision Making**

Some of the basic building blocks of careers as discussed in Career Decision Making literature included personality traits, vocational interests, skills, and abilities. Next the researcher examined literature on when individuals choose careers, how they make the transitions from school to work, expand their career interests and work skills in early career, shift career paths and readjust to new life demands in mid-career. Also literature will be summarized on the factors that seem to impact on the career choice decisions.

**Career Choices Begin**

Children are often asked “what do you want to be when you grow up?” As the child matures the question becomes more pressing so that by the time one graduates from high school, one is expected to have, at least tentatively, chosen a vocation (Julian, 1973). A review of the literature provided a wide age range (birth up to about 27 years of age) as the time period when decisions are made about careers. A brief summary of some of these theories and the ages at which the authors believe decision about career begin are noted below.
Although, Tyler (1951) studied first-grade children to examine when differences in interests may appear, most literature suggested that adolescence appears to be critical in terms of achieving autonomy, and of establishing self identity which may relate to career choices (Hess, 1972; Rogers, 1972). Erikson (1950, 1963, 1972), in his stages of development theory, listed the adolescence stage (20 and under) as the point at which the individual determines his or her role in life. Erikson noted that as a part of identity formation, the individual tries to make sense of the sameness and continuity of his meaning for self and others. Career represents some promise of a sense of that identity for self and others (See for example (Erikson, 1972); (Morgan & King, 1966). According to Harman and Farmer (1983), although Erikson (1963) attempted to relate his work to the vocational sphere, few vocational researchers attempted to relate Erikson’s work to the field of vocational behavior.

As noted by Harman and Farmer (1983) cognitive developmental theorists such as Piaget (1965) found that cognitive capacity developed through a series of sequential stages and that the higher level cognitive skills could occur before a person had mastered the lower level skills in preceding stages. Certain cognitive skills associated with decision making were found to be age-related by Piaget. For example, the ability to engage in abstract formal thinking is a prerequisite to evaluative skill involved in decision making. There is considerable agreement about the skills involved in decision making. Jepson and Dilley (1974) summarized the various approaches to vocational decision making, indicating
that most included the ability to: focus on the problem/goal; generate a lists of alternatives, seek out and obtain relevant information about alternatives; relate information to goals; evaluate among alternative solutions; select from among alternatives; develop a plan for implementing the alternative, and act to implement the plan.

Harmon and Farmer (1983) in a summary of the issue of early career development, observed that three vocational theorists are recognized as having contributed to the understanding of the childhood determinants of later vocational behavior. The three noted were Super (1957, 1980), Holland (1973) and Roe (1956). Super (1957, 1980) discussed the childhood growth stage (ages 0-14). Super (1975) indicated that this stage is characterized by as an “interaction between the child and the home. Neighborhood, and school environment, resulting in the active development of some abilities, interests and values, and in the neglect and atrophy of other potentials which, given a certain glandular and neural make-up, might have become important” (p. 21) He also noted that “it is these same abilities, interests and values that later influence the person’s choice of a particular vocational field (p. 60) Harmon and Farmer believed that implications from Super's work on the growth stage is suggested the importance of fostering and encouraging the development of a child’s growing interests, values, competencies, and self-concepts through a broad range of experiences, both curricular and extracurricular. Super (1957), also believed that the
individual starts to collect information concerning the preferred occupation between 14 and 18.

Holland (1973) provided some evidence that children were likely to choose career fields similar to those of their parents partly as a result of being exposed to experiences and an environment consistent with that career field and partly as a result of not being exposed to other alternative fields, according to Harmon and Farmer. With regard to childhood determinants of vocational behavior, Harmon and Farmer pointed out that Roe in a study of childhood experiences of some successful adults in scientific and social service fields found that scientists come from families that emphasized working with things and ideas and had parents that were not very warm or people–oriented as contrasted with persons in social service fields who were warm and people-oriented. Although the results of her study have not been duplicated, career counselors are often taught to consider the family history in guiding clients.

Gottfredson (1981) proposed a developmental theory of vocational choice using extant research to support Roe’s model. She traced the development of occupational stereotypes, the sex-role appropriateness of occupations, prestige strivings, and vocational interest from age 3 to adult. Gottfredson placed the development of these dimensions in a time frame suggesting that occupational sex-type develops first between the ages of 6 and 8, prestige strivings develop next between the ages of 9 and 13, and interest in a particular career field develops last after the age of 14. (Harmon & Farmer, 1983)
Schein (1978, 1984, 1990) believed that career exploration begins in earnest around 16 to 25. Levinson (1978, 1996) thought that the individual starts to begin the exploration between 20 and 27. Miller and Form (1951) thought that the person begins to acquire technical and social skills necessary for the job performance between the ages of 16 to 18.

Some of those who have studied career choices also examined personality traits (Roe, noted above was one example). According to Feldman (2002b), personality traits and personal styles are developed early in life and have long-term consequences for how individuals perceive themselves, their environments, and their careers. He noted that careers researchers who take a developmental perspective on the study of careers are similarly interested in how personality traits, personal styles, and personal values come (see for example, Digman, 1990; Hogan, Hogan & Roberts, 1996). Furthermore, these personality traits influence the degree of effort put into, and the degree of success in making, subsequent career moves (see for example: Albert & Luzzo, (1999); Betz & Voyten, (1997); Lent, Brown, & Hackett, (2000)).

**Impact of Gender, Race and Family on Career Choice**

As systems theories of career choice convey, various factors and roles and influence career choices. Some of these include one’s gender, race, socio-economic status and family influences. The studies on these influences were too numerous to summarize in this dissertation but the researcher has listed some of
the factors, influences, roles and/or variables and the areas of research that has been conducted on each.

Many researchers have emphasized the importance of considering the cultural factors. Young, Valach and Collin (1996) in their contextual explanation of career noted the following “Fitzgerald and Betz (1994) argued that gender and cultural factors have been ignored in theories of career development despite their relative importance. They described cultural factors as those “beliefs and attitudes commonly found among group members – often these are socialized by society (i.e., occupational gender stereotypes, internalized homophobia)” (p. 107). . . . Our perspective is that the person interacts with these factors in a dynamic way to construct the self and the potential for action and career. This is not to say that there are not factors that impeded and inhibit possibilities for some. In effect, the primary point of an action explanation is that it accounts for the specific context in which action occurs including cultural and gender issues” (p. 494)

The Study of Career Development for Women

Although the field of vocational psychology itself is over 70 years old, the interest in the effects of gender on career choice and vocational adjustment, in particular interests in women’s career development, is a relatively recent phenomenon (Fitzgerald & Betz, 1983). Only in the last 20 years or so have scholars begun to view women’s career development as an important and in many respects unique area of study. Fitzgerald and Betz believed that the lack
of attention to women’s career development during vocational psychology’s first
50 years probably derived from one or both of two previously accepted
assumptions – 1) the primary role of women was believed to be of those of
housewife and mother and 2)“ that women’s career development is capable of
being described, explained, and predicted using existing theories of career
development, is also untenable” (Fitzgerald & Betz, 1983). “When women did
work outside the home they were observed to occupy primarily low-level, low-
status positions providing little or no opportunity for advancement or societal
recognition. The concept of career applied neither to those women whose
“place” was in the home nor to the women workers who were viewed as working
only until they could afford not to work. As stated by Vetter (1973), women
workers were perceived as “individually” transient and collectively insignificant
due to the type and level of jobs available to them,” (p. 54) as holding jobs rather
than as building a career” (Fitzgerald & Betz, 1983, p. 84).

Fitzgerald and Betz expressed that the “second possible basis for the lack
of attention to women’s career development involved implicit assumptions that
the theories and concepts developed to describe and explain male career
development would generalize to the description and explanation of women’s
career development. The field of psychology as a whole has been characterized
by this assumption (Hyde & Rosenberg, 1980), so it is not surprising to find it
existing among vocational psychologists in particular” (p. 84). With regard to the
second assumption, they expressed the idea that women’s career development
was capable of being described, explained, and predicted using existing theories of career development, was flawed. “The lack of applicability of theories developed on men to women’s vocational behavior has been frequently discussed (Osipow, 1973, 1975a, 1975b) and can probably best be illustrated by discussion of some clearly evident sex differences relevant to vocational choices and patterns” (p. 85).

“One of the major areas of interest of vocational psychologists over the years has been the explanation and prediction of patterns of vocational choice. Because research and theories have focused primarily on male career development, they have until recently neglected to consider the possible differential influence of major explanatory variables on the career of choices of women versus those of men and the unique variables related to and dimensions descriptive of women’s career development” (Fitzgerald & Betz, 1983, p. 88). Some variables that are used to differentially describe women’s career choice behavior (i.e. dependent variables) that been studied included homemaking versus career orientation, variables describing career orientation, and career patterns (a concept developed by Super (1975) as cited by Fitzgerald and Betz (1983)). “The study of women’s career choices has involved the use of variables that attempt to take into account the major difference in the career development of women versus that of men, (i.e. the expectation that women’s lives will usually include, if not revolve around, the roles of homemaking and childrearing). Because the assumption of competing roles was not previously considered
relevant to the study of male career development, research on men could proceed more directly toward examination of the content of career choice. Thus the study of women’s career development is inherently more complex” (Fitzgerald & Betz, 1983, p. 93).

Some independent variables that have been studied with regard to women’s career choices include marital/familiar status, sex-role attitudes and role conflict along with those independent variables emphasized in the study of men (e.g., abilities, interest, socioeconomic and family background factors).

Among the factors influencing women careers choices is culture which includes societal sex-role stereotypes and occupational sex stereotypes (Fitzgerald & Betz, 1983). Sex role stereotyping has been defined as attributing behaviors, abilities, interests, values, and roles to a person or group of person on the basis of their sex (Peterson & Vetter, 1977). Occupational sex stereotypes, which are related to sex-role stereotypes, “are occupational stereotypes or normative views of the appropriateness of various occupations for males and females” (Fitzgerald & Betz, 1983, p. 96).

Our society has traditionally specified different life roles, personality characteristics and acceptable behaviors for males and females (Fitzgerald & Betz, 1983). Norms governing the approved masculine or feminine image are clearly defined and consensually endorsed (Broverman, Vogel, Broverman, Clarkson, & Rosenkrantz 1970; Mischel 1970 Steinman & Fox 1966) and become a powerful force in the socialization of children. Gysbers, et al (2003)
note that acquisition of gender-typed personalities traits, interest, and behaviors start early in life according to Mutlin, 1996 and is reinforced by parents, teachers, peers, the media, and the church, among others.

Occupationally stereotyping has been reported as possibly beginning as early as age three (Gottfredson, 1981). Occupational stereotypes are consistent and durable in adult populations (Albercht, Bahr & Chadwich, 1977; Panek, Rush & Greenwalt, 1977 Shinar, 1975). Gettys and Cain (1981) reported that children as young as two or three identified sex-stereotyped occupations for men and women. Matlin (1996) reported that children between kindergarten and fourth grade become increasingly rigid about which occupations they perceive that men and women can hold. These findings support Gottfredson’s (1981) theory of circumscription and compromise in which she theorized “that children’s perceptions of appropriate occupations become circumscribed into a narrow range of acceptable sex-typed career options. This range is generally set by the time the child is six to eight years of old and is difficult to modify once set” (p. 79).

In addition to the overall culture in the development and experiences of females and males, the subculture in which he/she developed affects career development. Two of the major variables describing that subculture include socioeconomic status and race. (Fitzgerald & Betz, 1983)

“In spite of definitional variation, socioeconomic status (SES) is one of the most consistent predictors of the occupational level achieved by males; higher family SES is related to higher achieved occupational levels
in sons, whereas sons of lower-class backgrounds achieve lower occupational levels (Brown, 1970; Hollingshead, 1949; Sewell Haller & Strauss, 1957). As pointed out by Goodale and Hall (1976), sons are likely to “inherit” their fathers’ occupational levels.

In contrast, data regarding the influence of parental SES on women’s career development yield an inconsistent pattern of results. In some studies, higher SES was related to stronger career orientation and/or innovation in women (Astin, 1968, & Myint, 1971; Burlin, 1976b; Werts, 1965). Several studies have found that women pursuing male dominated professions (e.g., physicians, academics) are significantly more likely than women in general to have fathers who are professionals (Cartwright, 1972; Helson, 1971; Russon & O’Connell, 1980; Standley & Soule, 1974).

Other studies, however have reported negative relationship between career orientation and SES (Del Vento Bielby, 1978; Eyde, 1962; White, 1967), and still others have found no relationships between the two variables (Card, Steel, & Abeles, 1980; Crawford, 1978; Falk & Salter, 1978; Ridgeway 1978). Marini (1978) suggests that although family SES is associated with higher educational aspirations in daughters, the relationship of family SES to girl’s occupational aspirations is far less clear” (Fitzgerald & Betz, 1983, p. 97).
Thus, there is some evidence that women’s career choices are influenced by the occupational level and particularly, the educational level of their fathers. Having a highly educated professional father appears especially facilitative of women’s pursuit of male-dominated professions (Fitzgerald & Betz, 1983). Goodale and Hall’s (1976) suggestion that parental interest and support moderate the relationship of SES to career achievements seem essential to and, as will be discussed in a subsequent section, particularly valid for the understanding of women’s vocational aspirations.

Several aspects of the more immediate environment have been found to influence the career development of women. These include family background characteristics, variables related to marital and familial status as an adult, the availability of role models and supportive figures in the immediate environment, the educational system and counseling services. In summary, the data generally suggest that women’s career development is influenced by variables related to maternal employment and by the educational levels of both parents. In addition to demographic aspects of family background, however, research has consistently suggested the importance of parental encouragement and support in facilitating daughters’ career development. Some research has also been done on the background variable of birth order with varying results. Some studies indicate it is a differentiating factor but others do not (Fitzgerald & Betz, 1983).
The Study of Career Development for Minorities (Racial and Ethnic Groups)

Like the area of women's career development discussed earlier, little research as been conducted on the career development of minorities prior to the 1970s. Researchers simply had not explored issues related to the career behavior of ethnic minorities. Research in this area was largely neglected prior to this time (Smith, 1983). “Since the mid 1970s, a number studies have investigated the career behavior of American minorities. Researchers have examined the career development of black Americans, Asian Americans, Hispanics, and Native Americans (Berry & Lopez, 1977; Osipow, 1973, 1975; Scott & Anadon, 1980; Smith, 1975, 1977; Sue, 1095). Black Americans, however, have been the most researched group” (Smith, 1983, p. 161).

Similarly to how existing theories were applied to women, many have presumed that the theories developed for the majority population (white males) would translate to minorities. Career theories can be grouped into three categories in terms of their relevance to racial and ethnic groups: traditional theories that have tried to incorporate minority issues into their conceptualizations, broader theoretical models that may be applicable across cultures, and recent conceptual proposals that are attempting to incorporate cultural validity through culture specificity.

Smith’s (1983) opinion was that “much has been written about the relevance or irrelevance of theories for American ethnic minorities (Griffith, 1980; June & Pringle, 1977: Osipow 1975, 1976; Smith, 1975; Warnath, 1975). In
general, two positions have appeared most frequently in the career literature: (1) one that has tended to dismiss career theories as irrelevant, or at the very least severely limited in application to racial minorities; and (2) another that has tended to acknowledge the shortcomings of careers for special groups, although still pointing out their overall value for understanding vocational development. The question of just how applicable career theories are for racial minorities is an important one” (p. 185).

“Criticisms of career theories have been several: (1) they were developed from restricted or majority populations: (2) they are based on some faulty assumptions; (3) they are not the most meaningful for minority populations; (4) they tend to ignore the social psychological realities that shape racial minorities’ lives; and (5) they tend to ignore the changing economic and social situation. For example Warnath (1975), Griffith (1980), June and Pringle (1977), and Picou and Campbell (1975) have observed that existing theories of career behavior are based on limited samples of middle class majority male Americans. Generally speaking, the Ginzberg, Ginsberg, Axelrad, & Herma (1951) theory of career development, Super’s (1953) Middletown’s study, Roes’ theory of career choice, and Holland’s (1959) theory of personality and work environments were developed primarily from research on white males. Most theories also tend to stress a career pattern that is continuous, uninterrupted and progressive, wherein both psychological and economic resources are
available to aid the individual’s purposeful career development. Given these set of circumstances there is the likelihood that a high correspondence will exist between a person’s self concept and vocational self-concept. These conditions do not usually reflect the life circumstances of racial minorities, especially black American, Hispanics and Native Americans” (p. 186).

Life-stage development as typically described by career theorists may have limited generalizability to racial minorities. External constraints, limited economic resources, and racial discriminating make the concept of life-stage development for racial minorities more of a dream than a reality for all but the most persistent, the most fortunate, and the group of mixture of individuals perceived as most social desirable within a given racial group.

Another assumption of most career theories is that there exists a free and open labor market (Warnath, 1975) and that people have an array of choices about their careers. For racial and ethnic American minorities, the labor market may not be free or open. Warnath (1975) has challenged the assumption that persons with sufficient motivation, information, and guidance can move though education and the labor force to satisfying jobs.

Likewise, Griffith (1980) has maintained that career theories must attempt to deal with the “issues of attribution of cause. ”That is, researchers must begin to analyze more carefully if the patterns observed in the career behavior of ethnic minorities should be attributed to the minorities themselves or to the effects of a
restricted opportunity structure. According to Griffith (1980), black Americans respond to three levels of the American opportunity structure: the ideal, perceived, and real. The ideal opportunity structure symbolizes the American ideal of equal access to employment opportunity, whereas the perceived opportunity structure “represents what is subjectively seen as the obtainable,” as opposed to ideal choices. “…The perceived opportunity structure is less than the ideal and less than the real [p. 303-304].” The career behavior of many poor ethnic minorities is likely to emphasize the perceived and real opportunity structure” (Smith, 1983, p. 188).

Smith added that “there are other more specific limitations of career theories for ethnic American minorities. Osipow (1975) has pointed out that career theories represent the ideal career development of individuals at the upper level professional and vocational activities, and the occupational environments described by Holland may not be equally available to ethnic minorities because of level bias. For example many poor black and Hispanics males may be channeled into lower-level Realistic and Conventional – type careers. A similar situation exists with Roes and Klos’ (1969) conically shaped occupational classification system. Top-level jobs, where the cone is wide, have highly differentiated psychological environments whose access may be limited to ethnic minorities because of racial discrimination, social and economic factors, and personal skill characteristics (Osipow, 1975)” (p. 188).
Super’s (1953) theory, which viewed career development as mainly a process of implementing one’s self-concept, also has limitations in applications for racial minorities. Ethnic minorities may not be able to implement their self-concept during their career course due to numerous hindrances to locating jobs that would fulfill the self-concept. In fact, the jobs that many minority individuals hold may constitute a direct challenge to their self-concept (Smith, 1983).

Some of the underlying assumptions and theoretical constructs of career theories may have limited relevance to racial minorities, especially those from lower socioeconomic backgrounds. In analyzing the career behavior of ethnic minorities, we need to ask ourselves; “What do we mean by career development?” To what extent can these concepts be applied to various racial groups? What are the significant variables in racial minorities’ career behavior? Although many career theories have mentioned the importance of situational variables on individual’s career development, they have done so in abstract terms and global terms, making it difficult to operationalize or, at the very least, measure the concepts presented.

Gysbers, et. al. (2003) noted that the 21st century represented the creation of an increasing multiracial, multicultural society such that by the turn of the millennium, it was projected that the majority of the population of the United States will be people of color: Asian/Asian American, Afro-American, Hispanic/Latino American, or Native Americans. Therefore there will be a greater need to assist racial and ethnic minorities as they move fully into the schools and
workplaces where they have for so long been discriminated against and marginalized. He added that career counselors’ “knowledge …about the development of racial development is limited at this time. Our research has been overwhelmingly conducted on an exceedingly small portion of the population: White, able-bodied, heterosexual, middle class college students. We know considerably less about the bulk of the U.S. population, most notably racial and ethnic minorities. Research in this area is needed to assist in the development of culturally relevant theories and paradigms to describe the career development of a broad range of populations” (Gysbers et al., 2003, p. 59) Of the literature published about multiethnic groups and their relationship to career development issues, annual review of vocational behavior and career development reflect a significant disparity in quantity and comprehensiveness (Walsch, 1979; Garber & Stover, 1980; Bartol, 1981; Fretz & Leong, 1982). Apparently, there is an inclination and trend whereby only select attention has been given to career development concerns of multicultural groups. Theorizing about career development of racial and ethnic groups is at a particularly early stage of development (Arbona, 1996; Hackett et al., 1991; Smith, 1983).

Banks (1976), Sue (1977), and Harren (1981) have devised meaningful paradigms that explain the progression of human growth in career development. Banks charts the emerging stages of ethnicity in a preliminary typology; Sue’s “Graphics Representation of World Views” examines clients’ locus of control and
responsibility; and Harren’s model reveals what he believes to be the four stages of career decision making.

While there is a similarity between Banks’ typology and other developmental paradigms, his multicultural typology considers the impact of pertinent life experiences upon the social-psychological dynamics that relate to ethnicity. These pertinent life experiences significantly shape the ethnic client’s view of environment, the interpersonal world, and the inner world. Believing this to be the case, Banks implies that facilitators should be aware of the stages of ethnicity in order to insure greater success with multiethnic clients who possess multicultural backgrounds. He has identified five stages of ethnicity: (1) ethnic psychological captivity, (2) ethnic encapsulation, (3) ethnic identity, (4) bi-ethnicity, and (5) multi-ethnicity.

Because much of our understanding of individuals’ career behavior comes from studies that have used various measurement devices that have not typically included members from minority groups nor females, we must be aware of the potential limitations of these instruments in assessing the career behavior of members from these groups. Models such as Banks’ and the one shown below support the importance of researching and developing models and career counseling approaches that include the impact of culture.
Parents, Family and Other Factors that Affect Career Choices

Family encouragement was reported as a major facilitator by high school girls planning careers in science (McLure & Piel, 1978), by female medical students (Cartwright, 1972), and by samples of women pursuing male-dominated occupations (Haber 1980; Standley & Soule, 1974). For example 72% of Standley and Soule’s architects, lawyers, physicians, and psychologists reported being the child of whom their parents had been proudest, and 60% reported being their father’s favorite child. The extent of encouragement from the fathers has been found to differentiate pioneers from traditional in several studies (Astin & Myint, 1971; Katz, 1969; Naely, 1971; Turner & McCaffrey 1974).

Women in nontraditional careers have also reported higher expectations from their parents in terms of educational attainments and occupational
involvement (O'Donnell & Anderson, 1978; Patrick, 1973) whereas women in more traditional careers perceived their parents as less supportive of career pursuits than did pioneers in a field according to the study of Trigg and Perlman (1976).

Roe and Siegelman (1964) produced a widely read article on the early determinants of vocational choice (1957), drawing heavily on Maslow and on general child development theory and then research on the origins of interest. Her theory was to the effect that the psychological climate of the home, as determined by parental coldness and warmth, involvement and detachment, leads to person and non-person orientations in children and that these in turn lead to the choice of different types of occupations. Possibly as important as parental encouragement of daughters' achievements is a concomitant lack of pressure toward the traditional female role. Parents who exert less pressure on their daughters to date, marry, and have children have been found to have more career oriented daughters (Haber 1980; Matthews & Tiedeman 1964), as do parents who place less emphasis on the development of stereotypically feminine qualities (Turner & McCaffrey 1974).

Feldman (2002b) stated that career identity begins to form in early childhood and is strongly influenced by early experiences within the family. He noted that “that from as young as five years of age, children understand such concepts as unemployment and welfare; beginning around age ten, children become knowledgeable about such concepts as pay, working conditions, and
work conflict (Barling, 1990; Pautler & Lewko, 1985; Piotrowski & Stark, 1987). By the time they hit adolescence, many teenagers are role modeling their parents’ level of work involvement and work habits (Brooks, 2001; Shellenbarger, 1998). In addition, parents’ wealth influences how much education students can obtain and their levels of career aspiration (Shea, 2000), and how much time parents spend in career planning with their children influences their levels of career salience and career motivation” (Feldman, 2002b, p. 11).

Erickson discussed the development of the work principle beginning in the Industry vs. Inferiority stage or the fourth stage of his model. He expressed that “in all cultures, at this stage, children receive some systematic instruction, although literate people, with more specialized careers, must prepare the child by teaching him things which first of all make him literate, the widest possible basic education for the greatest possible careers” p. 25. Erickson adds that “the more confusing the specialization becomes, however, the more distinct are the eventual goals of initiative; and the more complicated social reality, the vaguer are the father’s and mother’s role in it” p. 24.

Holland’s six career types included the impact of gender, race and environment on careers. Specifically he indicated that, “each type is the product of a characteristic interaction among a variety of cultural and personal forces including peers, biological heredity, parents, social class, culture, and the physical environment. Out of this experience, a person learns first to prefer some activities as opposed to others. Later, these activities become strong
interests; such interests lead to a special group of competencies. Finally, a person's interests and competencies create a particular personal disposition that leads him or her to think, perceives, and acts in special ways”.

Because different types have different interests, competencies and dispositions, they then surround themselves with special people and materials and to seek out problems that are congruent with their interest, competencies, and outlook on the world. Thus, where people congregate, they create an environment that reflects the types they are, and it becomes possible to assess the environment in the same terms as we assess people individually.

Holland's theory suggested that to some degree, types produce type. Although parental attitudes play a minor and complex role in the development of a child's interests (Roe, 1956; Roe and Siegelman, 1964), the assumption here is that each parental type provides a large cluster of environmental opportunities, as well as some deficits which extend well beyond parental attitudes.

Another family background variable that may impact career choice is birth order. “Numerous researchers have noted the predominance of first-borns (including “only” children) among high achievers (Eysenck & Cookson, 1970; Helmreich, Spence Beane, Lucker, & Matthews, 1980; Sampson 1965; Schacter 1963). Compared to the percentage of first-borns in the general population, first-borns were significantly overrepresented in Astin’s (1969) and Helmreich et al.’s (1980) samples of female Ph.D’s in Standley and Soule’s (1974) sample of female professionals and in Patrick’s (1973) sample of female graduates of
highly competitive colleges. Other studies, however have not found birth order to differentiate pioneers from traditionals (Crawford 1978; Greenfield, Greiner, & Wood, 1980), and the importance of this variable in women's career development is not yet firmly established" (Fitzgerald & Betz, 1994, p. 102).

Lastly, the influence of role models has been discussed in regard to careers. The literature regarding the selection of occupational role models indicated that males almost always reported other males (e.g., fathers, male professors) as their significant models and influences. Females on the other hand, according to Fitzgerald and Bets (1994), were more likely to report both male and female models. The literature suggested the importance of such models, male and female in women's career development. Some studies have suggested that choice of a pioneer occupation is related to having a male model (Weishaar et al., 1981).

**Career Change through the Life Span**

The literature presented several models of the phases of career development. For the past fifty years, almost all models of vocational choice have explicitly posited some typology of developmental stages among adolescents and young adults (Feldman, 2002b). These models suggest that the vocational decision-making process goes through several phrases, beginning with adolescents’ fantasies about work and ending with young adults’ realistic choices of vocations appropriate to their skills and interests. These stage models include the work of Super, 1957 and Ginzberg, Axelrod and Herna (1951) which
suggested that individuals go through three stages. The stages include an exploration period (individuals begin to consider their interests and values and where talents lie), the crystallization period (individuals begin to think more clearly about which career options they can realistically pursue) and the specification period (during which the individuals make concrete decisions about the career they will enter).

Some models, according to Campbell and Heffernan (1983), indicated that four major phases take place during the career development cycle: (1) preparation for an occupation and obtaining a job; (2) demonstration of competence in and adjustment to a new work environment; (3) maintenance and/or advancement of one’s position in an established occupation; and (4) decline in involvement with the work place. These career development stages were named, respectively; (1) preparation; (2) establishment; (3) maintenance; and (4) retirement. This conception is consistent with that presented by Super (1957) and Hall (1978).

The stages are not always linear or age specific. In addition to individuals beginning their careers, many individuals in the preparation stage are negotiating major career changes. For example, self-employed persons may decide to join an organization. Individuals in the preparation stage are negotiating major career changes. Individuals may choose to make a major change in their occupation or to make a change in organizational affiliation. Other individuals may choose to leave the military and to seek civilian employment. In such cases, these
individuals must perform a series of self-assessments, make decisions, and locate new positions (Campbell & Heffernan, 1983).

Whereas individuals in the preparation stage are most likely to be in the 14 to 24 year age range, individuals may also pass through this stage later in life. It may seem that an 18 year old obtaining a first job, a 35 year old reentering a job market, and a 50 year old changing job would perform basically different tasks in obtaining their jobs. However, as Super (1977) noted, many career tasks are similar across the life span (i.e., although the content of the task may vary, the process remains the same) (Campbell & Heffernan, 1983).

According to Campbell, the establishment stage encompasses that period of time and those activities that are relevant to demonstrating one’s ability to function effectively in an occupation. Although most workers in the establishment stage are young, other ages and a variety of work histories may be found among individuals in this stage including the more mature workers including those men and women who have decided to make a midlife career or to come out of retirement and reenter the work force. The change is most likely to entail entry into a new organizational/institutional environment or into an entirely new career field. Such changes are not uncommon (Byrne, 1975; Gottfredson, 1976; Sommers & Eck, 1977).

Individuals in the maintenance stage have prepared for and established themselves in an occupation. These individuals are relatively satisfied with their work and are unlikely to make radical changes unless confronted with a crisis.
Thus during the maintenance stage, individuals shift from a major focus on occupational choice, preparation, and establishment task to adjustment and stabilization tasks. Theorists estimate that persons in the maintenance stage range in age from 35 to 65 years (Miller & Form, 1951; Super, 1957). The maintenance stage is followed by the retirement stage. As with previous stage transition points, it is difficult to specify the exact moment at which individuals enter retirement. This is further complicated by the fact that some people plan for, others postpone consideration of, and still others never reach retirement.

Although retirement has become an accepted custom in the United States over the past 45 years and consequently affects nearly every person’s career development, little attention has been given to those people exiting the labor force compared to the attention given to those entering and progressing through the working years.

**Adult Career Development**

It has been assumed that very little of interest happened after an adolescent selected and initially entered and occupation. However, the belief that a static occupational existence occurs beyond age 25 is rapidly changing. There are many key transitions and corresponding critical decisions throughout the adult life cycle. It has been noted that adults just do not stay “put” as in the past. People are discovering that there is life after 40, even after 70. Many are having at least two careers, if not three or more. Approximately one-third of them
are seeking career changes. Conceptualizations of work at midlife continue to evolve.

According to Feldman (2002b) “careers need to be examined as they unfold over time. Most researchers agree that career dynamics can be understood only by examining individuals’ experiences over time. Individuals’ decisions about their career moves are not solely determined by current skills and interests. Instead, career plans are shaped by previous work histories and long-term plans for the future as well. Careers, then, are neither static nor self-encapsulating in nature. Rather, they evolve over time and are influenced by both past events and future aspirations.

In addition, the evolution of careers over time needs to be considered in terms of both career stages and life stages. Whether researchers agree on the existence of separate and distinct stages of careers, most researchers agreed that organizations’ work demands on individuals change over time. (Dalton, Thompson, & Price, 1977), particularly as employees gain more years of experience or advance higher in the organization. Furthermore, what individuals find fulfilling changes dramatically over the forty or more years they work (Gould, 1978; Valliant, 1977). Where twenty-five year olds may be excited by being connected to work “24/7”, sixty-five year olds may prefer having to work only twenty-four hours per week, seven months a year. Consequently, important career decisions have to be understood in the context of changes in both career stages and life stages” (p. 7).
In addition to changing views about work and the stages of work, other factors such as personality are influencing how people perceive work. Feldman (2002b) proposed that personality influenced how individuals perceive their careers and their environments over time. For example, the work of Staw and Barsade (1993) suggested that individuals enduring predispositions to be basically happy or unhappy with their lives are stronger predictors of reactions to work situations than the specific working conditions themselves. Similarly, Holland's research (1985) suggested that individuals’ preferences for different kinds of work environment form relatively early in life and remain fairly stable across subsequent career stages. Thus, personality traits formed early in life cast a long shadow over the course of individuals' careers across time (Tett, Jackson, & Rothstein, 1991).

Feldman also observed that in addition to changing organizational contexts (such as downsizing), increased technology and globalization have altered the way people think about themselves, their careers and their definitions of career success plus the aging process itself creates incentives for individuals to modify their career interests, values and skills across life span. He proposed that "the process of aging itself creates conditions that energize individuals to reconsider and modify their career paths across the course of their lives. Aging changes physical and physiological reactions to work tasks and job environments" (p. 14). Aging may affect individuals' career interests and career values.
Feldman (2002b) pointed out with regard to the models of person-environmental fit, “to the extent that there is an asymmetry of influence, it appeared that congruence of skills may be more powerful than congruence of interests in driving careers decisions. For example, when individuals have career aspirations that are inconsistent with their work skills, they are more likely to change their aspirations than their occupations (Gottfredson & Becker, 1981). That is, once skill acquisition and the achievement of skill congruence have taken place, it is easier to change career goals and interests than it is to acquire a whole new set of skills (Wilk et al., 1995)” (p. 16).

Aslanian and Bricell (1980) completed a national study of the reasons adults pursue education. They found that approximately 50% of the American adult population age 25 and older participated in at least one educational course during the year as a result of some transitions and/or triggering event in their life, such as divorce, loss of business, or change of life-style. These transition events were classified into seven categories representing major life area: changes in careers, family life, leisure, artistic life, personal health, religious life, and citizenship. Chronological age is no longer the sole indicator of career stage due to increasing individual differences in career changes, work patterns and decisions to leave or reenter the workforce (Schaie, 1990).

**Impact of Conflict on Career Choice**

The current century has witnessed the steady growth in the number of publications concerning the mental health impact of traumatic events (Freedy &
Donkervoet, 1995). Norris and Thompson (1995) indicated that recent evidence shows that most people will experience a traumatic event at some point during their lives, often while they are still quite young (see for example, Breslau, Davis, Andreski, & Peterson, (1991), Kilpatrick & Resnick, (1993). “In one community sample of 1,000 adults, 21% had experienced a potentially traumatic event, such as assault or injury producing accident, in the past year alone, and 69% had experienced a traumatic event at some point during their lives (Norris, 1992)” (Norris & Thompson, 1995, p. 50). Breslau, Davis, Andreski and Peterson (1991) interviewed a random sample of 1,007 adults belonging to a health maintenance organization in Detroit, Michigan. It was discovered that more than one-third of those interviewed had experienced at least one traumatic event during their life span. According to Freedy and Donkervoet (1995) the types of events that were reported in the Breslau, Davis, Andreski and Peterson (1991) study included “sudden injury/serious accidents, physical assault, observing the death or serious injury of another person, news of sudden death or serious injury to a relative or friend, rape, natural disasters, and several other traumatic events” (p. 5). Resnick, Kilpatrick, Dansky, Saunders, and Best (1993) conducted a study of the prevalence of traumatic events from a national probability sample of 4009 American Adult (age 18 or older women). “The respondents were specifically questioned regarding exposure to the following events: rape, molestations or attempted sexual assaults, physical assault, homicide of a close friend or relative, and noncrime traumatic events (including natural disasters,
serious accidents, serious injuries, life-threatening situations, events involving perceived life threat or threat of serious injury, and any other ‘extraordinarily stressful’ event). Of this sample (68.9%) had experienced one or more of the events during their lifetime; moreover a substantial number (35.6%) reported experiencing at least one of the four traumatic “criminal” events during their lifetime" (p. 6).

According to van der Kolk, McFarlane and Weisaeth, (1996) “trauma in childhood can disrupt normal developmental processes. Because of their dependence on their caregivers, their incomplete biological development, and their immature concepts of themselves and their surroundings, children have unique patterns of reaction and needs for intervention” (p. xiv).

Overstreet and Braun (2000) examined exposure to community violence and post-traumatic stress symptoms based on data collected from seventy 10-15 yr-olds living in and around an inner-city public housing development. They explained that “exposure to an extremely traumatic event involving ‘actual or threatened death or serious injury, or a threat to the physical integrity of self or others…’ (American Psychiatric Association [APA], 1994, p. 427) may be followed by post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD)” (p. 2). Results from this small sample size study suggested that exposure to the violence in the community decreased the children’s perceptions of safety, resulted in greater family conflict and may have shaped the children’s general views of the world.
Brothers (2008) noted that research shows that “most people are exposed to at least one situation they experience as traumatic before they die (Ozer, Best, Weiss, & Lipsey, (2003)). Claiming that ours is a ‘trauma-organized society,’… Bloom (1997) provides long lists of sobering statistics on the prevalence of violence to children, violence to women, violence to men, violence at school, violence at work, as well as violence related to gun ownership, substance abuse, and pornography. Amid such rampant ferocity, those who escape being directly traumatized must count themselves among the fortunate few. Moreover, as I suggested … to the extent that we all connected in a network of systems, these violent traumas affect us all” (p. 62).

Brothers (2008) proposed that experiences of uncertainty are continually transformed by means of our expectancies (regulatory processes and the relatively stable patterns of relating they produce) resulting in expectations regarding the orderliness of the relational exchange. Trauma often involves the experience of a terrifying loss or disruption of such orderliness – the experience of meaningless chaos. Ulman and Brothers (1988) theorized that “trauma does not reside in a specific event such as a natural catastrophe or a malevolent act by a human, but rather in the meanings of that event for a given individual” (Brothers, 2008, p. 49). Brothers later refined the theory and proposed that “the meanings that are often traumatizing are those involving betrayal of trust in oneself, and /or to in others, to provide the self-object experiences on which selfhood depends” (Brothers, 2008, p. 49). She added that “it is not self-object
experience per se that we cannot do without, but the confident expectation of engaging with others in relationships in which self-object experiences can be shared" (Brothers, 2008, p. 49). Ulman and Brothers (1988) explained that “another way of understanding trauma, is that the meaning of an occurrence changes one’s experience of oneself in relation to self-objects in ways that are intolerable. In other words, meaning of an occurrence changes a person’s experience of self” (p. 3). Brothers (2008) used the term “self-trust to designate the complex ways in which trust in self and others organizes self experience. By postulating that it is the betrayal of self-trust that constitutes the traumatizing meaning of some event, she placed even greater weight on the relational experience of trauma. She understood that it was the profound disruption of one’s trusting relationships with others, not merely one’s fantasies about oneself and others, that shattered the organization of one’s self-experience” (p. 49).

Although the researcher did not find any literature that spoke of the link between exposure to conflict and career choice⁶, using Brothers ideas about the traumatizing meaning of some events along with the more recent theories that see career development as a system with inputs from many factors in the environment, leads to the thought that “trauma” which may include exposure to events (that may be violent or of a conflict nature) would impact on the career

---

⁶ A review of the literature produced numerous studies that have examined the impact of exposure to trauma and the impact on the ability to function afterwards. These studies have primarily surrounded the veterans and post traumatic stress disorders or survivors of industrial accidents. (See for example Foy, et. al; Breslau & Davis, 1987; Gallers et. al, 1988; Green & Berlin, 1987, McFall, 1991; Sutker et. al, 1990. Studies around firefighters include McFarlane, 1988 & 1989).
choice. In fact there are a number of psychologists who are applying nonlinear
dynamic systems theory, chaos theory, and complexity theory to human
psychology including the study of human development (Brothers, 2008). Ulman
and Brothers (1988), noted that Greenacre (1949, 1950, 1967) advanced the
view that trauma is primarily a phenomenon of development. She “argued that
trauma is an inevitable part of all psychological development, encompassing
expectable as well as extraordinary occurrences. Greenacre implied that the
crucial question for psychoanalysis was not whether trauma occurs, but its
timing, type, and intensity. She contended that the earlier, more profound, and
more intense the trauma, the more severe and lasting will be its damaging
psychological effects” (p. 50). Brothers, in her discussions of the impact of
trauma, cited Thelen and Smith (2000), as two psychologists who have applied
the principles of nonlinear dynamic systems to early human development.
Thelen and Smith (2000) believed that unpredictability and disorder are inevitable
aspects of evolving dynamic systems e.g., that uncertainty is implicit. Fletcher
(1988) in a study of veterans of the Vietnam War, confirmed prior research
findings that traumatic experiences were associated with negative changes in all
basic beliefs, but some beliefs changed more than others, depending on the
nature of the trauma.

The psychoanalysts noted above suggested that all individuals have
experienced stressful and/or traumatic events by adulthood. Some conflict
interveners intervene in stressful and/or traumatic events. Lederach, Neufeldt,
and Culbertson (2007) described a model for peacebuilding practitioners of practice, system for reflection and learning into one cycle. This model placed peacebuilding activities and actions at the center, akin to the eye of a storm. They stated that “the eye does not stay in one place but moves over time as the pressures, within and outside shift. Conflict environments are notoriously dynamic, affecting our actions, what is possible and what is needed” (p. 7.)

Lederach et. al. (2007) stated that in a variety of studies, many authors suggest that social conflict causes changes in four dimensions: the personal, the relational, the structural and the cultural. In the personal dimension conflict changes individuals personally, emotionally and spiritually. The relational dimension of conflict referred to people who have direct, face to face contact. In this dimension when conflict escalates, communication patterns change, stereotypes are created, polarization increases, and trust decreases. The structural dimension is where conflict impacts systems and structures – how relationships are organized, and who has access to power—from family and organizations to communities and whole societies. Within the cultural dimension – violent conflict causes deep-seated cultural changes, for example, the norms that guide patterns of behavior between elders and youth, or women and men. It would seem logical, although untested, to expect that changes in the four dimensions (especially the personal one) would impact on the decisions about career choice.
Purpose of This Research

As the summary of literature above indicates, career choice theories have discussed factors that impact career decision making and the stages of such decision making. Psychological, personality and human development theories while addressing the stages of development that humans undergo, have addresses when decision about careers are made and the factors that may influence career decision making.

Career choice researchers have examined many professions or occupations to determine if the theories apply. Perhaps because mediation is a relatively new profession, it has not been examined. Other than the one dissertation in the field of conflict resolution noted (Birkhoff, 2000), the researcher did not locate studies that examined what background factors influenced the mediator’s decision to become a mediator. Psychological, personality and human development theories have addressed the stages of development that humans undergo when decisions about career are made, and the factors that may influence career decisions making.

The changes in the theories of career development over time, from a testing focus to place people in a job to the more recent ones that present career choice and development as being impacted by the factors in the individual’s environment including events and experiences (i.e. as perhaps a system with changing inputs or varying levels of significance), seem to provide a platform for the model presented in Chapter 1 for factors that impact the individual’s decision
to become a mediator. These theories on how career choices are made will be useful in examining the information from the survey on what life circumstances or events the mediators identify as being influential in the choice to become a mediator.
3. Mediator’s Characteristics

Introduction

In the preceding chapter, the body of literature on how and when individuals select careers was reviewed along with theories that examined variables that impact career decision making. In view of the theories surrounding career decision making, as the researcher began to explore the questions of this particular research and the related hypotheses (See Chapter 4), a review of the literature on careers in conflict intervention with a specific focus on the mediator seemed to be the next step. A literature review was conducted to discover what had been written with regard to the life circumstances and life events instrumental in the decision to become a mediator, the types of cases the mediator prefers to mediate, and the style of mediation practiced. In this Chapter, the researcher explores when conflict resolution began to be perceived as a possible occupation, the demographics and characteristics of mediators, what training they received, and why people selected mediation or conflict intervention as a career.

Intervening in Conflict as a Career

As noted in Chapter 1, as long as there has been conflict, there have been individuals who help others handle or address conflict. These conflict interveners
or third parties have operated in a variety of ways and under many labels or titles including that of mediator. Although mediation as a career is not discussed in the career choice literature, mediation is not a field of study that has been ignored by the research community. Social scientists from an assortment of disciplines have surveyed, interviewed, and observed mediators. Much of the literature has focused on the diversity of possible third-party roles in conflict resolution. Mediator behavior has been the subject of theory, models, and laboratory simulations (Kolb, 1983).

One body of literature that provided information on conflict interveners and mediators is the field of conflict resolution. Professionals in the field of conflict resolution conduct analysis of inter- and intra-group dynamics as well as of the process and outcome of negotiating different values and incompatible interests to try to help parties find solutions to conflicts (Jeong, 1999). Mediation as an occupation was first noticeably addressed in the literature with regard to its role in labor relations. "In the early years of American history, religious leaders helped resolve disputes between workers and employers, settlers and governors. When, during the later part of the nineteenth century, industrial disputes increased in frequency and intensity, a few states authorized public agencies to appoint ad hoc tribunals, or arbitration boards, to assist in settling industrial conflicts" (Necheles-Jansyn, 1990, p. 9). Maryland was the first state to act; in 1879, a year after a violent railroad strike, to form an office of state mediators. New Jersey, Pennsylvania, New York and Massachusetts, Ohio and Illinois soon
followed with the creation of state mediators. Necheles-Jansyn (1990) noted that by the late 1950s, the practice of labor mediation had matured and the use of agency staff to assist in the resolution of industrial disputes had become so widespread that many felt that studies of the profession were necessary.

One of the first studies of labor mediators was conducted by Douglas in 1962. Her study published as *Industrial Peacemaking (1962)*, consisted of observing and analyzing data from live labor mediations. Landsberger was also studying mediators in the late 1950s and early 1960s (Landsberger, 1955a, 1955b, 1956, 1960). His studies were focused on developing psychological tests capable of screening potential mediators (Landsberger, 1960). Both Douglas and Landsberger’s explorations only covered a limited number of mediators. In the 1960s, when the Rutgers Institute of Management and Labor Relations conducted a survey of the American and Canadian state, provincial and federal mediators, the size of the study permitted a broader look at the profession of labor mediators (Necheles-Jansyn, 1990). During the 1970s and the 1980s, mediation moved from predominantly labor relations to local community level programs (Merry & Milner, 1996). According to Menkel-Meadow (2003), mediation, in a relatively brief span of time, had evolved from a bold, innovative challenge to conventional methods of decision making and dispute resolution to a more professionalized and institutionalized practice, one that was the subject of an ever-increasing number of scholarly books and articles.
In the late 1960s and throughout the 1970s, conflict resolution, according to Avruch (1998), was seen as a great hope, such that some even saw it as part of a new social movement. Avruch went on to note that by the 1980s the movement was judged a success by many and the field was being taught in degree granting programs at the post-graduate level. Alternative dispute resolution (ADR) programs based on conflict resolution principles were instituted in courts, corporations, and local, state and federal governments. Trainers and community mediation programs were also running courses and workshops to train individuals on how to become mediators, facilitators and consultants with reference to conflict resolution. Professional societies were established and soon people began to talk about credentials and licensing (Avruch, 1998).

Avruch further noted that other researchers were stating that conflict resolution was increasingly becoming seen as a profession. Many articles were written on the mediators and third party conflict interveners as the field evolved, but as this present research began, limited research had been conducted on why people become mediators or conflict interveners.

Research Literature Related to Mediators

A review of the literature on mediators produced numerous articles based on observations of mediators/conflict interveners and their approaches as they intervene in a variety of cases and settings. The literature revealed information on what competencies, knowledge, skills and abilities mediators possessed and/or were perceived as needing. There was also discussion of mediator
characteristics, mediator traits and mediator styles. The literature on these mediators’ competencies, knowledge, skills and abilities as well as the literature on mediator characteristics, mediator traits and mediator styles will be summarized in the upcoming sections of this chapter. In addition, studies have been conducted on the demographics of the people who are mediators (See for example: Birkhoff (2000); Goettler, Herrman and Gale (1999)) and on the types of cases that mediators address (Folger, Poole, & Stutman, 1993; Laue & Cormick, 1978; Moore, 1986).

Some of the literature focused on assessment of mediators. The majority of the literature regarding the assessment of mediators presented the elements of what makes a good mediator, how to select and train a mediator, and the importance of evaluating a mediator’s performance. A number of studies focused on how mediators are assessed in a specific setting usually as a part of an assessment of an entire program (See for example: Brett, Barsness & Goldberg (1996); Briggs & Koys (1990); Carnevale, Putnam, Conlon & O'Connor (1991); Jones & Bodtker (1998); Kelly & Gigy (1998); McGillicuddy, Pruitt, Welton, Zubek & Pierce (1991); Shapiro & Brett (1985)). The research on mediators that focused on demographics, characteristics, skills, qualities, and incentives for becoming mediators seemed most relevant to the proposed research and is discussed next.
Mediators’ Demographic Characteristics

When the characteristics of the mediators have been discussed in the literature, the demographics of the mediator are often a part of the discussion. Birkhoff (2000) provided a summary of some of the studies that have collected demographic information on mediators. These studies have examined many background factors such as age, race, gender, types of cases mediated, and amount of experience, training, and education. Birkhoff collected similar demographic information on the 245 respondents to her survey on mediators’ perspectives on power.

In this summary, Birkhoff’s “average” mediator was a middle-aged, white man who trained and began mediating in 1985. He mediated thirty-four hours a month. He holds a J. D. and believes that his legal skills help him more than any other professional skills when he mediates. Ninety percent of Birkhoff’s survey respondents were white, not of Hispanic origin. Her respondents were similar in demographics to the ones in the other studies she reviewed. With regard to the amount of mediator training and experience, studies have revealed that the bulk of mediators were trained between 1980 and 2000 and have between thirteen to seventeen years of mediation experience (Birkhoff, 2000).

Although Birkhoff’s average mediator cited legal skills as most helpful in mediating, she found that mediators identified a variety of skills and experiences that assisted them when they mediated. The skills or experiences that were mentioned by the respondents as helping them when they mediated were: legal
skills (43%), personal relationship skills (28%), negotiation skills (22%), teaching or educational skills (17%), arbitration skills (11%), organizational developing skills, community organizing skills, social work skills, planning skills, and skills from religion or parenting.

Goettler, Herrman and Gale (1999) examined the background characteristics and incentives of mediators who practiced in public, private and government agency settings in Georgia. Similar to Birkhoff’s average mediator, the 339 mediators in the Georgia survey “primarily represented a white, middle-class to upper-class sample of professionals in their forties” (p. 223). There were an almost equal number of men and women participating in the survey compared with Birkhoff’s group, which had more men. Ninety-one percent of the mediators in the survey were European American (white, not of Hispanic origin) and six percent were African American. The age of most mediators was between forty-one to sixty years of age. The educational level of this group was fairly high, as was Birkhoff’s with 50% having a law degree, 27% having a graduate degree other than a law degree, and seven percent holding a combination of advanced degrees (such as law degree and a Master’s degree or a law degree and a Ph.D., M.D., or Ed.D.).

When asked to identify what they regarded as their primary occupation, 43% of the respondents in the Georgia study indicated a category of legal judicial work that included attorneys, judges and court administrators. Others indicated categories of business-related occupations, finance or sales and education. Only
six percent self identified as primarily mediators. With regard to belief systems (religious and political beliefs), 54% of the participants indicated that religion or a spiritual component in life was very important, 31% said fairly important and 15% indicated it was of little or no importance. The study of Georgia mediators also asked the mediators to rank factors of what sustained their continuation as mediators. “The top reasons for continuing as mediators seem somewhat altruistic and reflective of a commitment to the field. For example, ‘Helping people solve their problems in a cooperative way’ was identified as the most highly sustaining interest …” (Goettler et al., 1999, p. 228). Additionally, mediators in the study identified serving one’s community, the opportunity to learn mediation skills and experience personal growth as high factors for continuing as mediators.

Demographic information has been collected and reported for two other large groups of mediators. These studies were of 464 mediators practicing in Nebraska and 4,206 practicing in Florida (Goettler et al., 1999). Information from those two reports show similar demographic characteristics with regard to the level of education, racial compositions, and occupational similarities as noted in the studies above.

Necheles-Jansyn (1990) also examined the demographics of the mediators in a study in which she contrasted the characteristics of the mediator in 1980s with those of the 1960’s mediator. Based on responses of 250 mediators who worked for the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service
(FMCS) and state mediators who worked for state/provincial agencies that belonged to Association of Labor Relations Agencies (ALRA), her statistically “average” mediator of the 1980s was a middle-aged (45-54 year old) married male who had earned a baccalaureate and had taken some graduate courses. The most commonly reported work experiences were that of either a labor paid employee or labor relation position in industry. Racial backgrounds were not examined although gender was noted (20% of the respondents were female).

According to Necheles-Jansyn (1990), from the 1960s to the 1980s, mediation had become less of an exclusively masculine occupation. In addition, the average age of the mediator in the survey had increased and fewer reported having come to mediation from backgrounds in industrial or union labor relations. Looking at the noted studies of mediators from the 1950s to the ones conducted in 2000, Necheles-Jansyn’s conclusions that the profession has progressed from a male dominated one filled with those who came out of union backgrounds to a profession with more advanced degrees as well as more females members is supported.

**Mediators’ Competencies (Knowledge, Skills and Abilities)**

Beyond the personal demographics of the mediator, mediator competencies have been explored in the literature. Competencies are groups of knowledge, skills, and abilities that are identified as performance standards for a particular job. Many articles have been written on the skills that good mediators should or must possess. Some of the competencies (knowledge, skills and
abilities or KSAs) discussed have included types of knowledge, various technical skills, and interpersonal skills needed to work as an intervener. (Cohen, 1996);(Bercovitch & Lamare, 1993); (Feer, 1992)

When examining what competencies are demonstrated by mediators, one must first identify among the varied group of interveners, who utilizes the title of intervener and more narrowly, who is a mediator? Rouhana (1995) noted that “unofficial third-party intervention in international disputes is a concept that means different things to different people under different circumstances. As Burton (1987) observed, the ‘definitions of conflict resolution range from deterrent strategies to power bargaining techniques, to normative or legal approaches, to interactive management and collaborative problem solving, to negotiations, and to psychological attempts to change the attitudes of opposing groups’. For others (see for example, Deutsch, 1973), the terms means the development of theory; experiment work, and findings on interpersonal, intergroup, and international conflict; it also may signify the analysis of types of interdependence, the effects of competition and cooperation, constructive and destructive processes, and the effects of threat on social relationships” (p. 296). As each author discusses the KSAs of mediators, the reader should keep in mind that there does not appear to be uniformity in the definition of a mediator and therefore not in the perception of mediation competencies.

With regard to the qualifications of individuals who intervene in conflicts, Rouhana (1995) believed that “conflict resolution in the form of unofficial
intervention is a profession that as of now is best characterized as a free-for-all. Practitioners come from all kinds of disciplinary backgrounds and are often drawn by sympathy to one side or the other in the conflict. Former diplomats, academics, psychologists, psychiatrists, and many others practice conflict resolution. Often, it is not their qualifications or training but their good will that motivates and sustains their efforts. In many cases, practitioners do not have formal training in conflict dynamics. Nor do they always have area expertise that would enable them to interpret the subtext of participants’ statements accurately” (p. 261).

Herrman (2006), with over thirty years of experience as a mediator, facilitator and trainer of hundreds of mediators, believes that effective third parties must exhibit malleability that sensitively adjusts to the needs of clients and self. She added that a variety of skills produce positive outcomes and no single skill set or style of intervention helps everyone. Based on her experience, she noted that trainers, as well as mediation clients, have seen a continuum of skills anchored by good and bad practices.

Honeyman (1990) argued that a mediator’s basic talents can be usefully distinguished as five different types of skills: investigation, empathy, invention, persuasion and distraction. He also argued that these five skills along with two types of experience (managing the interaction and substantive knowledge) can be used to conduct an evaluation of the mediator. Honoroff, Matz, and O’Connor (1990), who believed that when selecting mediators, program administrators
often simply rely on some combination of reputation and eagerness, used Honeyman’s five skills to develop an evaluation process for selecting and training mediators in Massachusetts. They found the mediators could be grouped utilizing Honeyman’s five skills. Honeyman (1993) detailed the tasks and skills and the underlying knowledge, skills and abilities to be able to perform those tasks and skills. The tasks included reasoning, analyzing, problem solving, reading comprehension, writing, oral communication, nonverbal communication, interviewing, emotional stability/maturity, sensitivity, integrity, recognizing values, impartiality, organizing, following procedure and commitment. From the laundry list of functions, Honeyman saw the mediator style as a conscious and unconscious understanding of which skills were available to him/her and which one should be emphasized in a particular conflict.

Dingwall (1993) noted that mediators need to have a specific knowledge of the areas in which they intervene. “For example a family mediator needs to know a certain amount of family law; a small claims mediator needs to know something about contracts and warranties; a housing mediator needs to know about the law of landlord and tenant” (p. 332). He also commented on the need to be able to assess the level of knowledge. When alternative dispute resolution spread beyond its initial well-established niches into highly specialized areas of disputes (e.g. construction contracts or shipping disputes), Dingwall noted that it would have been helpful to have had a formal method of signaling quality to potential customers. He pointed out that one classic response to addressing
problems as a means of maintaining quality and competence is certification and the development of standards.

Standards have been developed for mediators. The *Model Standards of Conduct for Mediators* (*Model Standards of Conduct for Mediators, 2005*) was prepared in 1994 by the American Arbitration Association, the American Bar Association’s Section of Dispute Resolution, and the Association for Conflict Resolution and a joint committee consisting of representatives from the same successor organizations revised the Model Standards in 2005.

These standards were designed to serve as fundamental ethical guidelines for persons mediating in all practice contexts. The standards indicated that mediators should practice mediation based on the principle of party self determination; conduct a mediation in an impartial manner and avoid conduct that gives the appearance of partiality; avoid a conflict of interest or the appearance of a conflict of interest during and after a mediation; maintain the confidentiality of all information obtained by the mediator in mediation, unless otherwise agreed to by the parties or required by applicable law; and shall

---

7 The Association for Conflict Resolution is a merged organization of the Academy of Family Mediators, the Conflict Resolution Education Network and the Society of Professionals in Dispute Resolution (SPIDR). SPIDR was the third participating organization in the development of the 1994 Standards. ACR, according to its website, is the largest professional organization dedicated to advancing the practice, research, public understanding and teaching of conflict prevention and resolution. The organization is made up of mediators, arbitrators, educators and other conflict resolution practitioners.

8 The 2005 revisions to the Model Standards were approved by the American Bar Association’s House of Delegates on August 9, 2005, the Board of the Association for Conflict Resolution on August 22, 2005 and the Executive Committee of the American Arbitration Association on September 8, 2005.
mediate only when the mediator has the necessary competence to satisfy the reasonable expectations of the parties. The standards added that “training, experience in mediation, skills, cultural understandings and other qualities are often necessary for mediator competence” (*Model Standards of Conduct for Mediators*, 2005). It is stated in the standards that mediators should attend educational programs and related activities to maintain and enhance knowledge and skills related to mediation. With regard to what knowledge the mediator must possess, the American Arbitration Association believes that it is helpful if a mediator has a working knowledge of the substantive issues involved in the underlying dispute (Friedman & Silberman, 1993).

Typically when discussions of standards for mediators arise, the concept of measuring the effectiveness of the mediation and the impact of mediators’ KSAs on the mediation process and outcome follows. Linked to the discussion of standards and the impact of mediator KSAs is the question of how one screens for these competencies. It is highly unlikely that the assessment of mediators can be reduced to simple, cheap paper-and-pencil tests, except in areas of special knowledge (Dingwall, 1993), however, many articles have discussed the prerequisites that should be used in the selection of mediators. Carpenter and Kennedy (1988) were among those authors who argued in favor of the prerequisites that should be used in the selection of mediators. They believed that impartiality, process skills, and ability to handle sensitive information should be the prerequisites. Susskind and Cruikshank (1987) said that background,
affiliation, record, and reputation are equally useful in assessing a potential intermediary’s competence. Bush and Folger (1994) pointed out that most evaluative studies (internal program evaluations and academic studies) concentrated on three measures of performance: rate of settlement, levels of party satisfaction, and quality of substantive outcome.

Kimsey, Fuller, Bell and McKinney (1994) noted several studies that show the impact of selected mediator variables on the mediation process, on mediation outcome, and on disputants’ perceptions. For example, Rogers and Salem (1987) and Kimsey, Fuller, and McKinney (1993) found that mediator listening behavior is a significant variable. Karim and Pegnetter (1983) and Briggs and Koys (1990) found that mediator tenacity and mediator experience were potentially important variables. Karim and Dilts (1990) and Fuller, Kimsey and McKinney (1992) found that mediator trust and mediator neutrality impacted mediation outcomes.

It is important for several reasons to be able to answer questions about the effectiveness of the mediator as well as the effectiveness of mediation. Knowing what produces an effective mediator will assist individuals as they decide to enter the profession. Information about mediator backgrounds and competencies may also assist those who select individuals to be trained as mediators and those who train mediators. Research on the backgrounds of mediators may provide those who assign mediators to cases with some criteria to assist in better matching mediators to disputants to maximize the potential for a
successful outcome. Such research may also provide information that will assist mediator mentors and other coaches of mediators in providing feedback to junior mediators. And lastly, the information may assist mediators who practice “reflection” in their profession, as espoused by Schön (1987, 1983) and Birkhoff and Warfield (1996), to continue to improve their skills and become more aware of biases, traits, and characteristics that could impact the mediation.

**Gender Differences in Conflict Intervention**

With regard to the KSAs of interveners, there has been some discussion of the different styles used by males versus females when intervening in conflict. d'Estrée and Babbitt (1998) conducted a review of women in peacemaking. They noted that Keashly (1994) and Ruble and Schneer (1975), among others, had found that despite the widespread perception that differences exist, empirical evidence for gender differences in conflict resolution strategies and orientations is mixed and contradictory. However, specific skills necessary for peacemaking and unofficial diplomacy may indeed show gender differences. Such skill differences, coupled with structural constraints such as status, power, and political access, may manifest themselves in alternative political influence strategies (d'Estrée & Babbitt, 1998).

d'Estrée and Babbitt (1998) observed that early work on gender differences in bargaining and negotiation focused on cooperative and competitive behavior in laboratory experiments. Those early studies were mixed on the question of gender differences, but “Rubin and Brown (1975) clarified the
complex pattern by suggesting that, although men and women did not differ on skills, they differed in their perception of situational cues. Women focused more on relationship cues, whereas men focused more on task cues. Whether people competed or cooperated depended on what their important cues (relational or task) dictated. Others (Keashly, 1994; Renwick, 1977) have since argued that because of the ambiguous or sparse nature of such experimental contexts people are more likely to rely on sex-role behavioral expectations” (p. 191).

**Competencies - Personal Qualities or Characteristics of Mediators**

Although the training and development of mediators have focused primarily on enhancing mediators’ technical skills and ensuring that they possess knowledge of the areas in which they mediate and following the professional standards, some researchers have either added discussion about the importance of also focusing on the personal qualities of the mediators or the importance of looking primarily at the personal qualities of mediators as they impact on the mediation process and outcomes. According to Cohen (1996), mediator characteristics include features of personality, degree of impartiality, and choice of directive or nondirective approaches. Touval (1982) also described the qualities of the mediator. He felt that the mediator must have two kinds of skills. One was expertise about the conflict, the context within which it was waged, and the parties involved. The other necessary expertise was experience in conflict resolution in general. He went on to list the personal qualities the mediator
should possess. Useful personal qualities cited include tact, intelligence, persuasiveness, humility, and patience.

Du Toit (1990), in studying mediators in South Africa, found eight characteristics she perceived as important in a mediator: impartiality, the ability to understand the context in which the parties operate credibility, communication skills, the ability to identify underlying problems, creative and logical thinking, perseverance and knowledge of the mediation process. Miall (1992) noted that the hallmarks of diplomatic mediation are long and patient positional bargaining, combined with a quest for package deals and a willingness to use leverage. With regard to the techniques deployed by mediators as well as conciliators, Miall said they must be non-judgmental and pragmatic, skillful listeners, and confident, honest speakers, and capable of engaging the trust of both sides. They need a sense of timing and a sense of humor. Stein (1985) said the mediator must be skilled and prepared to commit extraordinary energy, effort, time, and resources to produce a series of transitional arrangements that may permit preferences to evolve over time.

Some authors indicated that there was an aspect of the mediator’s efforts that was not just skill based. Historically those people, who have argued that mediators are “born” rather than “made,” point to the interpersonal aspects of the work (mediation) as its key elements (Dingwall, 1993). While acknowledging that the training and development of mediators have focused primarily on enhancing mediators' technical skills and increasing their understanding of the theory
behind the practice of mediation, Bowling and Hoffman (2003), indicated that the personal qualities of the mediator have an impact on the outcome of mediation. They stated that “there is a dimension to the practice of mediation that has received insufficient attention: the combination of psychological, intellectual, spiritual qualities that make a person who he or she is” (p. 14). They contended that “a mediator’s “presence” is more a function of who the mediator is than what he or she does; it has a profound impact on the mediation process” (p. 6). Bowling and Hoffman further elaborated that “drawing on analogies from the social and psychological sciences, we suggest that the most subtle influences of the mediator’s affect and manner may in fact be powerful influences in helping the mediator bring peace into the room. If this is true, then the development of our personal qualities becomes quite important. We suggest that “integration” – a quality of being in which the individual feels fully in touch with, and able to marshal, his or her mental, spiritual, and physical resources – is the one way to describe what underlies presence” (p. 6).

**Mediators’ Styles, Strategies, Tactics, and Roles**

Various terms are used to describe how mediators “get something done” or behave when intervening in a conflict. Some of the terms associated with the mediator’s actions include style, strategy, tactic, role, techniques, and even function. Conflict styles are “patterned responses or clusters of behavior that people use in conflict. Tactics are individual moves people make to carry out their general approaches. Style describes the big picture, while tactics describe
the pieces of the interactive puzzle that make up the big picture” (Hocker & Wilmot, 1995, p. 96). In a review of the conflict styles, Folger, Poole and Stutman (1993) identified several perspectives on conflict styles. Styles can be seen as a property of the person, types of conflict behavior or categories of behavior or a communicative orientation people take toward conflict (Hocker & Wilmot, 1995). The literature on mediators’ styles, strategies, tactics and roles is extensive (See Johnston and LeBaron (2007) for discussion of conflict styles and tactics used in a mediation setting). Some researchers attempted to understand mediation by the kinds of strategies and tactics used. Burton and Dukes (1990) commented on the exhaustive survey of various mediator strategies, techniques and functions that Wall (1981) provided.

**Styles/Strategies**

Recent research has shown that the most effective mediators are highly flexible, using different strategies at different times or in different situations (see for example: Carnevale, Lim & McLaughlin (1989); Donohue (1989); Carnevale et al (1991). Fisher and Keashly (1990), as noted by Pruitt and Olczak (1995) have presented a contingency model that prescribed different forms of third-party intervention for different levels of conflict escalation. Bolduc (1989) suggests four mediator styles: “fair treatment”, “mutual self-interest”, “just-outcome”, and “just relationship” (Burton & Dukes, 1990).

Riskin’s (1994) theory of mediation style discussed how mediators differ with respect to their beliefs about the nature and scope of mediation and their
assumptions about the parties’ expectations. Specifically, Riskin focused on how mediators define their roles along the evaluative-facilitative continuum and how mediators define the problem presented by the participants along the broad-narrow continuum. Mediators who have a facilitative style assume that participating parties are capable and motivated to resolve the dispute themselves, that they have their own internal resources and ideas, and that the mediator role is to simply direct the consensus building process. In contrast to the mediator with a facilitative style, the evaluative mediator will review relevant legal documents, assess the law and facts in the dispute and make evaluations for particular outcomes. Mediators with a narrow orientation tend to encourage parties to focus on resolving the technical issues in dispute whereas mediators with a broad orientation help parties understand and fulfill their interests as well as resolve the technical or legal points of dispute. Riskin’s Mediator Techniques Grid (1994) places a mediator’s style in one of four quadrants of a grid keyed by the evaluative/facilitative continuum and the broad/narrow continuum. The mediator style index (MCI), (Krivis & McAdoo, 1997) has been developed to assess mediator style. The MCI has been proven to be structurally sound; preliminary validation has been established with factor analysis and expert opinion, however, it is still a work in progress and research has yet to empirically establish its reliability and validity (Smith, 2007).

A mediator’s style is thought to be determined by a number of factors, according to Riskin (1996) who theorized that “mediators usually have a
predominant orientation, whether they know it or not, that is based on a combination of their personalities, experiences, education, and training” (p. 116). Riskin produced a number of publications (See for example, Riskin, (1994, 1996) that discussed the concept and applications of mediation style until he later suggested that the concept be revised because it had a static quality that ignores the dynamic, and interactive nature of mediation (Riskin, 2005). A mediator is expected to be able to respond to the dynamic nature of the mediation process and move from style to style as situation permits. Despite this, Kressel (2000) observed that a mediator’s approach is consistent from case to case. Considering the need for the mediator to display many styles and the tendency for the mediator to exhibit a rather constant style, there is a need to understand the predictors of mediator style in order to facilitate the training and development of mediators (Krivis & McAdoo, 1997).

d’Estrée and Babbitt (1998) explained that “by far the most research on conflict-handling styles and orientations has been done within an organizational context. Studies typically use one or more of several standard instruments for measuring conflict-handling styles, such as the Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Mode Instrument ((Thomas & Kilmann, 1977); 1986), the Rahim Organizational Conflict Inventory (Rahim (1983), or Hall’s Conflict Management Survey. These instruments operationalize Blake and Mouton’s (1964) hypothesized five styles of handling conflict: avoiding (unassertive and uncooperative), competing (assertive but uncooperative), accommodating (cooperative but unassertive), compromising
(somewhat assertive and cooperative), and collaborating (fully assertive and cooperative). Work in this tradition assumes that although most people use all styles, people develop preferences for certain styles and these preferences can be measured as stable dispositions” (p. 191).

Conflict Intervention Roles

Laue (1990) said there are a number of ways to analyze intervention roles. “One may view roles in terms of the system levels of disputes. For instance, different roles may be required for family disputes, group disputes, community disputes, neighbourhood disputes, intranational disputes or international disputes. Another approach would be to categorize intervention roles in light of the issue of the dispute, whether environmental, welfare, school segregation, racial, community or international. Another framework could begin with the skills of the intervener. Still another would first analyze the nature and relative power of the parties. Interveners’ roles vary depending on who the parties are, what kind of power they have to affect one another and, indeed, whether parties allow an intervener into a situation at all. Other approaches could include examining the base of the intervener (the organizational affiliation, the source of salary, etc.) or the intervener’s personality attributes.

All these approaches reflect variables that one may take into account in considering different types of intervention roles. My major point is that there are definable, analytically distinct intervention roles that cut across all the other variables of personality, skills, type of issue, system level of the dispute, etc.
These roles are based, in my view, predominantly on an intervener’s base and credibility - for whom does the intervener work, who pays the intervener to be there, and consequently what are the structured expectations for behavior of the intervener in that role? What are the organizational sanctions to which the intervener may be vulnerable? What kind of peer pressure exists?” (Laue, 1990, p. 25).

Laue and Cormick (1978) and Laue (1990) explained that in a basic two-party dispute, there are five derivable roles including the role of activist (in which one who is in, and almost of, one of the parties and who works extremely closely with the parties); the role of advocate (an out-party is a community organizer, or a tenant advocate or legal advocate); the third type of role is the mediator (who is concerned with the parties, with other interveners and with the interaction between them while advocating for the process); the next role is called the researcher (examples include a journalist, a social science researcher or a crisis observation team whose role is to record objectively the interaction) and the final role is the enforcer (arbitrators, judges and police are examples of such individual who has formal power to sanction either or all of the parties).

Zartman and Touval (1985) suggested that mediators take one of three roles: communicator, formulator or manipulator. Pruitt (1981) distinguished between mediators who emphasize the importance of the process and those who focus on content (Burton & Dukes, 1990).
Training of Mediators

A traditional view held of mediation when it began in the labor arena was that it was an art with as many theories, philosophies, and approaches as there were mediators (Kolb, 1983). This “view of the mediator-cum–artist implies that mediation skills cannot easily be acquired through training; mediators are born, not made, according to this viewpoint” (Brett, Drieghe, & Shapiro, 1986) p. 278. Brett, Drieghe and Shapiro concluded that mediation, at least in the context of labor grievances is not an art and that the mediator may vary his/her style or strategy from case to case which implies that it is a learned behavior. If mediators choose the strategy case by case, then the training of mediators is critical. A number of studies have reported the impact of mediator variables on the mediator process, outcome and disputants’ perceptions of the process. One of these variables is the experience of the mediator (Briggs & Koys, 1990; Karim & Pegnetter, 1983; Kimsey et al., 1994).

Babbitt (1997) pointed out that conflict resolution training programs are based on several key assumptions. Although she was speaking about training for parties participating in conflict resolution training as members of a community, the concepts also seemed to apply to mediators. These assumptions included that there are skills that make one better able to handle conflict constructively; that such skills (behavioral constructs that effective negotiators and problems solvers typically use), while seemingly natural only in particular individuals, can be actually taught and learned; and that training seeks to enhance the capacity to
engage in constructive approaches. Fisher (1997) noted that since the 1970s, the field of conflict resolution has seen the development of training programs designed to help individuals and groups manage differences more effectively. He indicated that the outcome of these developments was an incredible range of training experiences in negotiation and mediation, the history, rationale and quality of which is not generally well documented.

Rouhana (1995) believed that in many cases, practitioners did not have formal training in conflict dynamics nor do they always have area expertise that would enable them to interpret the subtext of participants’ statements accurately. He added that even if practitioners want to be trained in conflict resolution, it is unclear what that would entail. Curle (1990) discussed some traits that mediators needed to become aware of and develop. He referenced the importance of acceptance, listening, trustworthiness, impartiality, being well-informed and judicious and being non-judgmental. Specifically he stated that: “mediators need the same psychological equipment of impartial good will, perseverance, imperturbability and objectivity; the same flexibility and preferably the same sense of humour whether they are dealing with a crisis in their home, or neighborhood, or place of work, or are called in because someone’s marriage is on the rocks, or because of an industrial dispute or an international war” (p. 97).
Mediation as a Career

As the theories in the literature review in the prior chapter noted, there are a number of psychological, developmental, sociological, and educational factors that combine to shape the career of any individual. The interests of the individual as well as the environment in which they are raised along with their gender and culture impact career choice. More recent research also suggested that exposure to trauma may impact the perceptions of self which in turn impacts career decisions.

Two studies examined the incentives of mediators or why they became mediators. Goettler, Herrman, and Gale (1999) conducted a comparison of mediators’ backgrounds and incentives to help clarify how much consideration should be given to different practice settings in mediation research studies. Differences were found among mediators across the three different settings on the following variables: sex, age, family income, education, occupation, and career-income-related incentives.

Birkhoff (2000), as a part of her study on mediators prospective on power, asked her respondents why they became mediators. The results showed that: “20% of the respondents answered that they became mediators because they were dissatisfied with the law, didn’t like litigation or litigating, or thought there had to be a better way to resolve disputes than the adversarial process. 19% of the respondents became mediators because mediation was a logical extension of their current practice of work… 17% of the respondents answered that
mediation was a peaceful, humane way to solve problems or that it corresponded with their values. 16% noted that they had begun mediating as a part of something else and enjoyed it, so they looked for ways to mediate more often. They explained that it was challenging and fun. The rest of the respondents became mediators because it was required for their job (8%), because it was a personal skill, they were good at it, or it came naturally (7%), or because they were recruited or someone suggested they would be good at it (5%”) (p. 241).

**Review of Backgrounds of “High Profile” Mediators**

The literature review was conducted to obtain information on the “High Profile” mediators who had participated in some better known mediations or interventions. This researcher found, as have others, that “the literature on personality traits of effective negotiator and mediators is scanty, largely noncumulative, and mainly derived from the organizational, rather than international or intergroup context” (Lieberfeld, 2003, p. 232). There is also little information available on how (decision making process) “high profile” mediators became conflict interveners or mediators. Material was found on mediators who were involved in the well known international conflicts such as the Arab-Israeli conflicts or the efforts to end apartheid in South Africa. From those conflicts, the “high-profile” mediators to be discussed in this section include: Nelson Mandela, Dr. Ralph Bunche, Henry Kissinger, and President Jimmie Carter.

Mandela was the oldest of four children and he was groomed for the role of advisor to the Thembu king, as his father had been. He was treated as a son
of the royal family although not in the line of succession. He was raised to be
both highly task-oriented and also solicitous of others feelings. “Confident in his
skills in persuasion and the efficacy of rational argument, Mandela, an
experienced trial lawyer, sought to engage adversaries in dialogue and lead them
into cooperative relations” (Lieberfeld, 2003, p. 235). In the role of mediator in
the Burundian civil war, he was criticized for being a “one man show” and
keeping the process “extremely personalized”.

Lieberfeld (2003) analyzed Nelson Mandela’s personal attributes relevant
to peacemaking and negotiations. It was noted that Mandela utilized negotiation
along with his charismatic qualities that include his physical presence, sense of
humanity, interpersonal skills, and ease in public role. Mandela’s international
renewed, authoritative bearing and penchant for outspokenness on politically
sensitive issues positioned him to formulate hard truths necessary for
compromise during the transition to democracy and to lead reconciliation efforts”

According to Lieberfeld, “Mandela’s self-identity, in sum, is characterized
by a high degree of self confidence, optimistic self-beliefs, and feelings of self-
efficacy. He believes in his ability to control events but also tolerates lack of
control. He is adept at pressing feelings of fear and doubt. His belief in his own
powers of persuasion motivated him to engage adversaries in dialogue.
Together with his sense of destiny for political leadership, these qualities
sustained his pre-negotiation initiatives with South African governmental officials.
His deliberate mastery of his emotions and impulsivity and cultivation of patience and control gave Mandela a competitive edge over his adversaries and enabled him to control others perceptions of him” (p. 237).

Stein (1985) in examining the work of Henry Kissinger and Jimmy Carter in the Middle East, contended that they shared similar approaches and characteristics. She stated that both were exceptionally skilled, motivated, persistent, wealthy and powerful. Each “drew on the special resources that only the highest level American leadership could command. Even when structures were favorable and strategies were limited, only a special kind of mediator, with unique resources as well as special skills could have succeeded” (p. 344). Kissinger, according to Stein (1983), disposed of resources as Secretary of State that were not available to other mediators. Likewise Carter as President of the United States could reward moderation, insure against cheating while reducing risks. In additional she concluded that each were good negotiators that committed extraordinary energy, effort, time and resources to produce a series of transitional arrangements that permitted preferences to evolve over time.

Touval (1982), in his book, The Peace Brokers: Mediator in the Arab-Israeli Conflict, 1948 -1979, examined the numerous mediators who have been involved in the conflict and some of the traits, skills and other factors that led to their success or failure. Touval saw Dr. Ralph Bunche as standing out among the intermediaries. He was credited with the conclusion of the armistice agreements between Israel and its four neighbors in 1949. In recognition of his
work, he was awarded the Nobel Peace Price in 1950. Bunche received much praise as a skillful chairman. According to Touval, Bunche could influence the agenda and the atmosphere of the meetings but Bunche’s most important substantive contribution was in formulating compromise solutions to issues (concerning principles, territorial delimitations, and demilitarization arrangements) on which the parties disagreed. Bunche was highly knowledgeable about the problem in all its many details, and became familiar with all the ideas and proposals to solve it. “Bunche’s personal attributes greatly facilitated his work. He was creative, articulate, and possessed remarkable drafting skill. He is said to have had charm and a sense of humor. His intelligence, his ability to circumvent difficult issues by vague formulations, and his personal charm combined to make him a gifted salesman of ideas and compromise formulae. In contrast to Bernadotte, [another mediator in the conflict], he was a realist. He was usually able to gauge the limits of his influence and avoid confrontations he could not win….One important function in which he apparently excelled was the devising of compromises. In this task he drew on his intellectual abilities, as well as his political talents” (p. 70). Touval concluded that “Bunche’s qualifications and his bargaining power help to explain his successes, but they cannot explain them entirely. We must also take into consideration his specific goals and the circumstances under which he worked to accomplish them” (p. 73). He added in summary, “Bunche’s successes can be explained by the fortuitous coincidence of circumstances, his own astute political judgment and flexibility, and bargaining
power. The absence of any of these ingredients would have spelled failure” (p. 73).

Touval (1982) also discussed Henry Kissinger, who intervened in the conflict from 1973-1975. Touval noted that “the record of Kissinger’s mediation after the 1973 Yom Kippur war was indeed impressive. Within twenty-three months, his mediation led to the conclusion of five agreements: the cease-fire between Egypt and Israel, the agreement to convene the Geneva conference, the disengagement agreements between Egypt and Israel and Syria and Israel in 1974, and after an initial dramatic failure to do so, he brought off a second agreement between Egypt and Israel in 1975. He was admired because he succeeded where others failed: in negotiating agreements that led to a significant abatement of the Arab-Israeli conflict. His achievement has been attributed largely to his skillful diplomacy and more specifically, to his consummate practice of the art of mediation. In the words of a scholarly treatise, ‘his tactical skills as a negotiator and mediator were unsurpassed. Here his originality, his sense of timing, his intelligence, and even his personality served his especially well.’ Of course he also drew much criticism, but those who criticize him do not dispute his skill” (p. 225).

A question that has been raised with regard to Kissinger’s negotiations in this conflict is: Was he a mediator? Some have puzzled whether the nature of the American involvement such that some other term should be used to describe it? Touval believed “although some American actions went beyond the bounds
of normal mediation, the American role can still best be described by that term. First, the professed purpose of the American intervention was to help the parties conclude agreements. Secondly, the U.S. (and Kissinger) performed the normal functions of mediators. Kissinger helped the parties to communicate, interpreted for each his adversary’s position, sought to persuade them by way of reasoning to change their positions, formulated compromise proposals and presented them to the parties, helped the parties to save face when making concessions, and provided guarantees that facilitated the conclusion of agreements. Thirdly, Kissinger was a mediator because both parties welcomed his intervention and cooperated with it” (Touval, 1982, p. 279).

“Much of what has been said in Kissinger’s praise pertains to his intellectual qualities and skills—his vast knowledge, ability to generate new ideas and formulate compromises, capacity for logical reasoning, and tactical skills. One of his intellectual contributions, the step-by-step approach, has already been discussed” (Touval, 1982, p. 279). “Kissinger’s tactical skills have also attracted much attention. He usually displayed a fine sense of timing, which enabled him to apply pressures and to present compromise proposals at the most propitious moment…. “Some of Kissinger’s personality traits, as distinct from his intellectual talents, need to be mentioned as assets. One is his personal charm, which has gained wide recognition. This quality helped him to establish a quick and easy rapport with his interlocutors, and thus facilitated the negotiations. But it is unlikely that it was important in inducing the parties to change their policies and
make concessions. Personal qualities that seem to have made much difference were Kissinger’s strong will, personal ambition, and aversion to failure. These encouraged him to try, and to persevere, and thus to overcome difficult moments when many another mediator would have given up in despair. However impressive Kissinger’s tactical skills, persuasive powers, and intellectual prowess, their impact upon the parties’ positions should not be overemphasized. Much more important for bringing about concessions were the resources that Kissinger was able to wield” (Touval, 1982, p. 281).

Finally, Touval believed that “least as important as Kissinger’s inventiveness and persuasive skills and nearly as important as America’s resources were his analytical talents, his leadership, and his managerial ability” (p. 282). “His talents enabled him to discern what was possible, to define the goals, to devise the tactics for pursuing them, and to direct and manage the versatile diplomacy required to attain them. Kissinger was a successful mediator not only because he brought about the conclusion of five agreements, but also because his mediation produced some of the political consequences at which his efforts were ultimately aimed” (p. 283).

Another mediator that has been discussed extensively in the literature was President Jimmie Carter. Touval (1982) discussed his role in the Arab-Israeli Conflict from 1977 to 1979 which included his work on The Camp David Accords and the Egyptian-Israeli Peace Treaty. President Carter helped to conclude three major agreements between Egypt and Israel: in September 1978, at Camp
David, they worked out “The Framework of Peace in the Middle East” and “The Egypt and Israel,” and in March 1979, in Washington, Prime Minister Begin and President Sadat signed a peace treaty between their two states.

Assuming that Carter’s strong motivation to resolve the Arab-Israeli conflict and his unflinching personal commitment stemmed to a large extent from his personality, it would seem that the personality of the American President and the diplomatic style to which it gave rise had a significant effect on the outcome. Also contributing to the successful outcome were some qualities already encountered in previous mediation efforts—effective staff work and tactical skill” (Touval, 1982, p. 319).

Touval believed two sources of the mediators’ influence: the triangular structure created when a mediator intervenes in a conflict, and the mediator’s resources both assist mediators in the successful performance of their tasks. He noted that Carter’s ability to “induce the parties to make concessions and accept compromise proposals did not derive from his impartiality, but from the material resources at his disposal. These enabled the mediator to exert pressure on the parties” (p. 327).

Touval concluded after reviewing the various mediators in the Arab-Israeli Conflict that in the mediation attempts discussed in his book, “the personality traits and skills of the individuals involved were highly important and seem to have made some difference for the outcome. Not much can be said about the specific qualities that have been suggested by the literature, except that one
personal quality that was important in these mediation attempts received inadequate attention. The strong motivation and persistence of the principal mediator seems to have contributed to the success of both Kissinger and Carter. On the other hand, the lack of persistence on the part of the American representatives on the UN Conciliation Commission and of Jarring may have contributed to their failures” (p. 329).

In *When Talk Works: Profiles of Mediators*, Babbitt (1994) interviewed President Carter with regard to his work in international dispute resolution. She noted that he is willing to take risks to get the parties to the table including the use of his reputation to bring the media to mobilize national and international public opinion as he acts “as a voice of morality”. His words carry weight because he is known as a person of high personal integrity and spiritual belief. During mediations he used the force of his personality and intellect “as he immerses himself in the substance of the negotiations and strongly advocates for particular outcomes” (p. 389).

Jacobsen (2003) evaluated the role played by five individual mediators in peace negotiations to determine which factors needed to be present for success. She concluded that the mediator will be successful in reaching agreements for complex international conflicts if he or she: (1) has the personality, force of character, skills and accomplishments that are respected by both sides; (2) is viewed by the parties to the conflict as being procedurally unbiased and having integrity (principle) so that both sides feel the process will be fair; (3) has
sufficient management and leadership skills and an understanding of group
dynamics; (4) brings with him or acquires sufficient and significant political
resources that can be brought to bear on the problem; and (5) intervenes at the
“ripe moment”. Based on descriptions of their interventions, the four high profile
mediators seem to share these five conditions. This snapshot of high-profile
mediators also revealed that many demonstrated similar styles and roles in the
conflicts in which they intervened.

Summary

The literature has noted the demographics of the mediator, their
competencies (knowledge, skills and abilities - KSAs), styles, roles, types of
training received, and the impact that their personal characteristics may have on
their interaction with the parties and the outcome of the conflict. The literature
provided “stories” of the “high-profile” mediators’ interventions and some
information about their competencies and personal characteristics. Information
on why interveners became involved in trying to resolve conflict had not yet been
studied to any extent. The researcher in this exploratory study hopes to obtain
some insight into the stories of practicing mediators as to why they made the
choice to become conflict interveners.
4. Conflict Resolution Theories
Related to Choosing to Become a Conflict Intervener

Introduction
This chapter discusses conflict resolution theories that apply to the individual along with theories from other social science disciplines which may provide some insight into why an individual decides to intervene in the world of conflict, e.g. become a mediator.

Why People Become Mediators: General and Conflict Resolution Theories that Apply to the Individual

After reviewing the literature on the demographics of mediators and some competencies demonstrated by individuals (including "high profile" mediators), the researcher in this chapter reviews conflict resolution theories that apply to the individual along with other social sciences theories which may provide some insight into why an individual decides to intervene in the world of conflict, e.g. become a mediator. Conflict resolution theories address how conflict impacts the individual as well as the group. Conflict resolution theories according to Sandole’s (1993) review of the theories in the field can be categorized into four dimensions: the individual level, the societal/national level, the trans-societal/international level, and the global level based on the primary unit of
analysis and the scale of the conflicts or disputes. Sandole’s placement of theories into four categories suggested that individuals who are involved in conflicts, whether alone or in the aggregate, would experience conflict at the same four levels. Mitchell (1981) also discussed conflict occurring at various levels. He noted that research in other fields, specifically cybernetics and communication, have revealed that “all organised entities communicate with one another by some means, so that one way to an understanding of behaviour of individuals, groups, organizations, and nation-states is to study the communication pattern within and between them” (p. 5). Mitchell further noted that conflict research rests on analogue analysis by making comparisons between conflicts at different social levels, involving different types of participating parties, operating in different circumstances. The various levels he mentioned are inter-personal, inter-group, intra-organization, inter-organization, industrial (union/management), inter-communal, and inter-state (Mitchell, 1981). He visualized these levels as a “ladder, with the transfer of insights or theories as a process of climbing up (or down) the ladder bearing different ideas, concepts and findings that might be useful at the other levels in understanding conflict structures and processes to be found there…” (p. 6).

Perhaps because it is a relatively new profession, there seems to be no conflict resolution theories to date that directly explain why individuals chose to become mediators or third party interveners. However, models like Sandole’s and Mitchell’s (that present insight regarding conflict coming from various levels),
along side the career model presented in Figure 4 (that shows the individual being shaped by input from many levels and systems), may provide some insight into why individuals make this choice. This researcher conjectures that if one considers conflict resolution theories that examine the individual as the unit of analysis in studying conflicts along with those that proposed drives, needs, and forces that cause individuals to strive to enter into and exit conflicts, some insight may be discovered as to why individuals chose to become mediators. Basic human needs theory (Burton, 1990), world-view theory (Nudler, 1993 and Docherty, 2001), and nested conflict (Dugan, 1996) are some such conflict resolution theories. The impact of culture is also another lens to explore why individuals become mediators.

**Basic Human Needs**

Basic human needs theory proposed that there are a number of basic universal human needs. These needs were unalterable and nonnegotiable. Their satisfaction was imperative. “Human needs can be divided into a set of physical or material needs and a set of psychological or psychic needs. The set of physical needs includes, among others, food, water, shelter, sex, and medical care for our bodies. In the set of psychological needs we might list, among others love, respect, trust, appreciation, friendship, and a sense of belonging opposed to hatred, disrespect, alienation, fear, threat, repression and isolation” (Ronen, 1999, p. 263).
If Burton (1990) was correct in that all humans strive to satisfy these needs, mediators would also strive to satisfy these needs. The striving to fulfill these needs could potentially be occurring in the decision to become a mediator. The proposed explorative research may reveal whether basic human needs are impacting the choice to become a mediator. It also may be discovered that some mediators are people who want to satisfy others’ needs for some reason.

**World-View Theories**

World-view (Docherty, 2001; Nudler, 1993) captured the interaction between the individual and the social phenomena or event. World-view can be defined by the following inter-related elements: ontology (a theory about the nature of what exists in the universe); logic (a theory about world order which identifies the relationship between elements in the universe); axiology (a theory about the parts of the universe which we may find more or less important); epistemology (the extent to which people are capable of learning about what exists); and morals and values (a theory that tells us what we ought to do). Worlds are unique and based on uncritical acceptance of the basic assumptions on which they lie.

World-view also referenced one’s placement in the world as it relates to one’s sense of reality. It explained that people have a need to make sense of who they are and how they relate to others and that we use metaphors (stories and myths) to order our world. Metaphors help us describe our most important understandings of the world. They allow us to name our perspectives and
thereby understand them as different views of the same reality. According to Dougherty (2001), “metaphors help make sense of the new and unfamiliar by extending knowledge of the familiar. Because our actions are dependent on the way we name the world, metaphors function as a form of action model as well as shorthand descriptors of ontological and logical beliefs” (p. 74).

Eliade (1959, 1965, 1978) also discussed world-view. He believed that one’s placement in the world relates to one’s sense of reality. He thought that people have a need to make sense of who they are and how they relate to others. He thought we used metaphors (stories and myths) to order our world. Metaphors help us to describe our most important understandings of the world. They allow us to name our perspectives and thereby understand them as different views of the same reality. If, according to world-view, mediators need to make sense of who they are and how they relate to others, the theory may provide insight into why individuals chose to become mediators.

**Nested Conflict Theory**

Dugan’s (1996) “nested paradigm” is a mechanism for considering both the narrower issues and the broader system aspects of conflict resolution and peacebuilding. She subscribed to the approach that an issue that is being presented should not be seen just as particular issues to be resolved but also a relationship problem that needs to be addressed. Sometimes the issue may be symptomatic of a subsystem or an even broader societal structure and systems. The theory may have relevance to the current research in that, since we are
addressing conflict, the relationship between the individual, their relationships, and the various systems (micro and macro) they interacted with in the past, as well as are currently interacting with, are most likely to have an impact on their views about conflict and possibly on the decision to become a mediator/conflict intervener. Lederach (1997) addressed systems and subsystems and their impact. Lederach suggested that it may be that the intervener’s role as “middle-range actor” in conflicts and subsystem and relationship foci has the greatest potential to serve as sources of practical, immediate action as well as to sustain long-term transformation. If the desire to have such an impact is a factor in the decision to become a mediator/intervener, then the nested paradigm theory could shed some insight on why it is occurring.

**Theories from Allied Disciplines**

The conflict resolution theories discussed above may be useful in providing insight into why individuals became mediators. The conflict resolution field alone may not explain the results of this explorative study. Since the field of conflict resolution has drawn from many other disciplines (that have been around longer) for its principles, insights, and even scholars, it seemed logical to the researcher to utilize the literature of these other disciplines in order to explore whether the processes used by practitioners in those allied disciplines can provide insight for exploring mediators’ backgrounds, career choices, styles, and effectiveness. The other disciplines that could offer insight into this topic are sociology, social psychology, clinical psychology, psychiatry, labor-management
especially as it relates to grievances, and alternative dispute resolution programs in the workplace), law, psychology, and education (as it relates to career counseling). Individuals in some of these disciplines need some of the same interpersonal skills possessed by mediators, and in some cases, practice in the same arenas of conflict (the individual level, the societal/national level, the trans-societal/international level, and the global level).

Some of the theories in allied social sciences may also be helpful in explaining why people choose to become mediators. Some of these theories are cognitive dissonance or consistency theory (Mitchell, 1981), and social impact theory (Hogg & Abrams, 1988). The research on the role of culture in conflicts and conflict resolution may also be applicable to the mediator.

**Social Impact Theory**

The theory of social impact was designed to explain obedience and rebellion in societies. It has been used to explain how different events have differing impacts on the individual (Brown, 1986). The theory of social impact, as noted in Hogg and Abrams (1988) in their summary of the theory of social impact addressed changes in physiological states and subjective feelings, motives and emotions, cognitions and beliefs, values and behavior that occur in an individual human or animal as a result of the real, implied, or imagined presence or actions of other individuals. The social impact theory may be useful in the proposed research in offering some explanation as to why certain circumstances or events had more impact than others on the decision to become a mediator.
Cognitive Dissonance Theory and Consistency Theory

Cognitive consistency theory discussed the need to have one's world make sense. Mitchell in his book, *The Structure of International Conflict*, (1981) discussed the importance of cognitive consistency with regard to conflict intervention. Mitchell said that “an inter-related cluster of emotions, attitudes, prejudices and perceptual distortions accompany most forms of conflict...” (p. 72). Individuals involved in or observing conflict situations are affected by them. Mitchell stated these types of situations produce stress or psychological discomfort in individuals on either the conscious or unconscious level. Mitchell pointed out that some research indicated that most individuals try to minimize psychological discomfort. He stated that a general human tendency is to reduce psychological strain as far as possible (both consciously and unconsciously), coping with one's environment by avoiding tension, anxiety, reducing levels of uncertainty and ambiguity, lessening any sense of insecurity, and avoiding, as far as possible, irreconcilable pieces of information and uncomfortable complexities.

Mitchell added that it is obvious that the process of avoiding stress and psychological discomfort is not the only method individuals use to cope with their environment. On some occasions, some individuals seek out difficulties, place themselves in situations of uncertainty, and receive stimulation from mild amounts of stress and strain in their environment. Mitchell said that these individuals are employing stress-optimizing. Avoiding difficulties to reduce stress

---

9 Cognitive Dissonance was previously discussed in Chapter 2 as it related to personality development.
or placing oneself in situations to induce stress are processes used to reach a state Mitchell refers to as cognitive consistency. The striving for cognitive consistency may explain the choice to become a mediator. It may also explain why some individuals with similar backgrounds may avoid occupations involving conflict whereas others may wish to be involved in resolving conflicts.

Cognitive consistency theories would seem to support that there is an inter-play between systems and individuals as it relates to conflict. Cognitive consistency theories may also help to explain any patterns between the environmental system levels at which significant circumstances or events occurred: individual, microsystem, mesosystem, exosystem or macrosystem – (See Figure 4) and the conflict dimension or arena in which the mediator practices. That is, does the mediator practice in one of these environmental system levels articulated by Sandole (1993) (the levels are interpersonal (individuals), microsystem (families, communities, workplaces), or macrosystem (societal, national or international) because of the life circumstances or events which occurred at a corresponding environmental system level?

Cognitive consistency, cognitive dissonance, social impact theory, basic human needs, influence theory, nested conflict theory, world-view theory and theories about culture may all help the researcher examine what factors inspired, shaped or “drove” a person to make the decision to become a mediator. There is a possibility that some mediators may have chosen to be in a “helping profession” and that mediation may simply have been the profession selected or
that they just happened to obtain a job that required them to mediate. It is hoped that the research may be able to determine if this is the case.

**The Role of Culture**

An enormous body of literature on the nature of culture has been accumulated over the years. Lederach, Neufeldt, and Culbertson (2007) said that “culture is fundamentally about how people make sense of things, in other words, culture is the process of how meaning is constructed and shared” (p. 23). The role of culture in conflict intervention or mediation cannot be ignored. Culture with regard to conflict intervention is frequently discussed in regard to the parties but is also a factor with the mediator’s role. The culture of the mediator as well as the culture of the parties influences the process and often the outcome (See for example: Cohen (1996); Herrman (2006)).

Avruch and Black perceived the role of culture in conflict as arising from a conception of social life in which culture is seen to be a fundamental feature of human consciousness (Black & Avruch, 1989). They added that “metaphorically speaking, culture is a perception-shaping lens or (still metaphorically) a grammar for the production and structuring of meaningful action. Therefore, an understanding of the behavior of parties to a conflict depends upon understanding the “grammar” they are using to render that behavior meaningful” (p. 132).

Avruch and Black (1993) noted that “when the parties to a conflict come from different cultures then the conflict is “intercultural” – one cannot presume
that all crucial understandings are shared among them. Their respective
ethnotheories, the notions of the root causes of conflict, and ethnopraxes, the
local acceptable techniques for resolving conflicts, may differ one from another in
significant ways. The first task of a third-party intervener in intercultural conflict
situations, is to pay serious analytical attention to these cultural dimensions. The
third party must assay a cultural analysis of the situation” (p. 132).

Avruch and Black (1993) further noted that where all the parties and the
third party come from different cultures, the “inter” – cultural dimensions are
maximized. In this type of situation, the third party must function as an
interpreter in the fullest sense of the term – translating first to his or her culture,
then to the relevant party’s, then back again. Avruch and Black argued that
“intercultural conflict resolution requires, on the part of the parties to the conflict
and especially the third-party intervener, an analysis of the dispute that is
essentially a cultural analysis “ (p. 132).

Cohen (1996) agrees with Avruch and Black as to when culture is a factor.
He stated that “as long as conflict and its resolution remain governed by
common knowledge – assumptions and meanings shared by both participants
and observers – culture can be largely ignored as a pertinent factor. This is not
because culture is absent but because it is understood. Rules of the game
construct the game, but players and commentators rarely refer to those rules in
order to explain outcomes. If actors are all playing by the same rules, then it is
clearly not the rules that account for variance in performance. It is a very
different matter, however, if contestants play by different rules; that is, operate on the basis of dissonant assumptions or systematically violate the rules as the other side understands them” (p. 108).

Thompson, Ellis and Wildavsky (1990) noted that “the basic assumption of cultural theory is, as the saying goes, that life is with people: What matters most to people is how they would like to relate to other people and how they would like others to relate to them. Whereas most theories in the social sciences tell us how individuals or groups go about getting what they want from government or markets, cultural theory seeks to explain why they want what they want as well as how they go about getting it” (p. 97).

The Nature of Culture

According to Cohen (1996) “culture consists in patterned ways of thinking, feeling and reaction, acquired and transmitted mainly by symbols, constituting the distinctive achievements of human groups, including their embodiment in artifacts; the essential core of culture consists of traditional (i.e. historically derived and selected) ideas and especially their attached values” (p. 108). He added that from characterizing culture as a shared body of meaning, it is but a short step to realizing that a boundary that restricts may also be a barrier that excludes. “Simply put culture constructs reality; different cultures construct reality differently; communication across cultures pits different constructions of reality against each other” (Cohen, 1996, p. 110).
The Mediator as Interpreter: Bridging the Intercultural Communication Gap

This explains the particular need for a mediator according to Cohen. Alongside the classic tactics described in mediation literature (see for example: Bercovitch, (1992); Bercovitch & Wells, (1993), Cohen argued that “the mediator can perform three specifically cross-cultural roles: the interpreter, decoding and explaining the parties’ culturally encoded messages and enabling them to communicate intelligibly; the buffer, helping to protect high face-salient disputants from painful and unwelcome confrontation; and the coordinator, synchronizing the discordant negotiating conventions of the rivals and enabling coordinated solutions to emerge at each of the various stages of the talks” (p. 111).

“Mediation theory, like game theory, assumes that players in a bargaining game play by the same rules. However, they may not even be playing the same game. The assumption of common knowledge is legitimate when one is examining mediation within a given society, but it is seriously misleading when the mediator is obliged to span cultures, as is increasingly the case in international relations… In the study of mediation, we should start out by examining three things: the cultural meanings of key concepts; traditional assumptions about mediatory roles; and the conventions governing mediation and negotiation in the societies in question. Rather than treating culture as a secondary influence on players’ performance within the game, it deserves to be recognized for what it is: the metasystem of signification that assigns meaning to the game in the first place” (Cohen, 1996, p. 125).
Herrman (2006) theorized that “if all mediation or negotiated intervention occurs in a context, then cultural and institutional frameworks shape any intervention process. They help define the thinking of anyone involved in a conflict well before they sit down to problem-solve” (p. 9). She suggested that not only are the parties shaped by culture but the mediators are as well. Culture may help explain why individuals elect to become mediators. The research on the role of culture in conflicts and conflict resolution may also be applicable to why the individual chooses to become a mediator.

In Chapter 2, the literature on the role of the environment and impact of traumas on life choices, development and perceptions, was summarized along with discussion of the more recent theories that see career development as a system. These two fields of study suggest that “trauma” which may include exposure to events (that may be violent or of a conflict nature) among others, would impact the career choice. These theories could also provide some insight into why individuals who have experienced trauma (which some psychologists (See for example: Resnick, Kilpatrick, Dansky, Saunders, & Best (1993); Ulman & Brothers, (1988)) suggest that all individuals have experienced by adulthood) elect to become mediators.

**Summary**

Lang and Taylor (2000) stated that “mediators, as individuals, have been shaped by social learning and life experiences, and they have also been shaped by their profession and its unique blend of ideas and beliefs. They experience
the world through the tinted lenses of their knowledge and experience” (p. 93).

Lang and Taylor referred to what mediators know—their accumulated personal knowledge and understanding, which includes facts, models, theories, and core beliefs—as their constellation of theories. They defined a constellation of theories as “the sum of all the mediator knows, regardless of how that knowledge was acquired” (p. 93). They explained that “a mediator’s constellation of theories usually includes ideas and knowledge about such concepts as the nature of mankind and the nature of aggression, restorative justice, models of and approaches to mediation, the ethics of practice, and laws and other factors that are relevant to their work “ (p. 94). Lang and Taylor believed that “unifying and basic theories rest on something even more fundamental: the core beliefs and values that each mediator brings to the profession. These beliefs and values are deeply rooted theories that all people carry with them that help them to explain complex, abstract ideas such as truth, justice, love, fairness, and trust. These core theories are developed early in life and are grounded in experience“ (p. 103).

Four theories – basic human needs, world-view, nested conflict theory, social impact, and cognitive dissonance/consistency – have been explained in this chapter. Some or all of these theories that apply to the individual within conflict situations along with the role of culture may help explore the decision to become a mediator. The theories that have been presented in this chapter will help examine the “constellation of theories” of the mediators in this research.
5. Methodology and Research Design

Introduction

In the introductory chapter, the researcher articulated how this project came to be and the rationale for why this study was needed. The theoretical framework for the study was also discussed along with an overview of the problem to be investigated. In this chapter, the researcher will discuss in more detail the problems that were investigated, the working hypothesis, and the research design.

Research Interests, Questions and Hypotheses

As stated in Chapter 1, the researcher proposed to examine the factors that influence the individual's decision to become a mediator, utilizing conflict resolution theories and other general social science theories. A review of the literature in earlier chapters showed that career choices and the influence on those choices start early in life. In Chapter 2, the researcher discussed developmental theories that noted the decisions about careers and occupations starts as early as ten years of age. The literature also revealed that the occupations or careers selected are influenced by input from aspects of one's life such as parents, community, and/or critical events. A summary of conflict resolution theories that appear to relate to career choices was presented in Chapter 4. The literature helped to identify the key concepts that this
research project needed to consider in order to explore the central questions. The researcher constructed a rough mapping of possible relationships between exposure to significant events, career choices, and the decision to intervene in conflict situations.

Central Questions Revisited

As stated in Chapter 1, the central questions of this research focus on:

1. What life circumstances, events, or factors do mediators and other conflict interveners believe were significant in leading them to make the choice to become a conflict intervener;

2. What (if any) impact does the “background” of mediators and other conflict interveners have on the arena or types of conflicts in which the mediator/conflict intervener practices; and

3. Is there any relationship between the identified background factors/events and the arena or types of conflicts in which they intervene?

The researcher is interested in exploring:

1. Why do individuals choose to become mediators?\(^{10}\)

2. What are the one or two primary or dominant reasons why individuals choose to become mediators?

3. What life circumstances or events influenced the individual’s decision to become a mediator?

\(^{10}\) The research is including in the term “individuals who choose to become mediators” those who initially selected conflict resolution, as well as those who may have gravitated to conflict intervention through work in other fields.
4. Do individuals choose to become conflict interveners to strive to fulfill their own basic needs or to make sense of who they are and how they relate to others (e.g. to keep their world-view consistent)?

5. Is there a relationship between the level of the environmental system in which significant career decision-making background events occurred (intrapersonal, microsystem, mesosystem, exosystem, or macrosystem) [Figure 4] and the arenas or levels of conflict (intrapersonal, societal, national, transnational, international, or global) in which mediators choose to intervene?

6. Does the mediator perceive that he/she has more to offer in the arenas of conflict or levels of conflicts that correspond to the environmental system level in which identified significant life circumstances or events occurred that shaped the choice to become a mediator?

In addition, there were secondary research questions. Secondary questions included:

1. What are the identified factors within the literature as to why individuals choose to become mediators?

2. What, if any, particular events were significant in leading mediators to be interested in conflict intervention?

3. What types of conflict situations did mediators encounter as children, adolescents, and young adults?

4. Did mediators come from what they perceive as “complicated childhoods”?

5. Do mediators believe that they tried to make sense of a world of conflict as they grew up?

6. If so, what did they do to try to make sense of the world of conflict as they grew up?

7. Does the mediator’s background have an impact on the types of conflicts in which, as a mediator, he/she prefers to intervene?
8. Do mediators believe that their background impacts their mediation style?

9. What aspects of his/her background, does the mediator believe, influence his/her mediation style?

With regard to secondary questions, the researcher sought to ascertain what impact experience with conflict situations had on the decision to become a mediator. The researcher was interested in how these experiences with conflict affect the types of cases which the mediator chose to specialize.

Additionally, the researcher was trying to ascertain if the environmental level of life circumstances and events identified by the mediator as being influential correlate with the arena or dimension of conflict in which the mediator practiced or worked. It is this researcher’s opinion that such a correlation may occur because of the individual’s need to obtain cognitive consistency and to maintain internal consistency with his/her world-view, especially as it relates to a need to make sense of who they are and how they relate to others.

**Hypotheses**

Based on the research questions, it is hypothesized that: the mediator identified the experience of conflict in his/her background as a factor that impacted the decision to become a mediator; that one category of background factors (circumstances/events) had more of an impact on the decision to be a mediator than others; that he/she identified his/her background as impacting the types of cases selected or accepted to mediate; and that the background of
mediators impacts their self-perception of where they chose to work as mediators in cases with the same themes as those of significant situations that they encountered.

Based on the topic of this exploratory study and the above hypothesis, the following hypotheses are presented:

Hypothesis # 1  The mediator identifies the experience of conflict in his/her background as a factor that impacted the decision to become a mediator.

Hypothesis # 2  The mediator indicates that one category of background factors (circumstances/events) have more of an impact on the decision to be a mediator. Any observed differences are not merely chance variations to be expected in a random sample taken from a uniform distribution.

Hypothesis # 3  The mediator identifies exposure to conflict as a component of background.

Hypothesis # 4  The mediator identifies his/her background as impacting the types of cases that are selected or accepted to mediate.

Hypothesis # 5  The mediator identifies his/her background as impacting his/her mediator style.

Hypothesis # 6  The mediator identifies his/her background as impacting his/her chosen realm as mediator in any types of cases.

Hypothesis # 7  The background of mediators impacts their self-perception of where they chose to work as mediators in cases with the same themes as those of significant situations that they encountered.

Hypothesis # 8  The background factors that were experienced in childhood and that impacted the decision to become a mediator had more impact on the decision to be a
mediator than background factors that occurred later in life.

The researcher tried to ascertain if individuals chose to become mediators and/or conflict interveners to strive to fulfill their own basic needs or to make sense of who they are and how they relate to others (e.g. to keep their world-view consistent). Since this research is primarily explorative in nature, the researcher looked for rival hypotheses that may explain results obtained from the research in general but especially with regard to theories that may explain the choice to become a mediator and/or conflict intervener.

Prior Study

A prior pilot study was conducted by the researcher as a part of a research methodology class in 1999 (Marshall). In that study, thirty subjects were asked to indicate their exposure to a list of events and to indicate if they believed the events impacted the types of cases mediated and their effectiveness as mediators. (The list of events was generated by the researcher with input from other students in the methodology class). Results from the survey indicated there was a relationship between the events experienced and the types of cases handled. Due to the small sample size, the nature of the relationship was not clearly identified.
Procedures

Design

In this study, the researcher proposed to take the concepts identified in the pilot study and conduct a further exploration of what, if any, type of relationship existed between events, types of cases undertaken, and arenas in which mediators choose to practice. This present research utilized a multi-hybrid research strategy to explore the hypotheses. The research will include six phases of data collection (See Table 1). The data collection consisted of a background summary of the high profile mediators, if available; interviews of high profile mediators; surveys of mediators; surveys of those studying to be mediators; and surveys of those who were trained in conflict resolution or meditation and elected not to mediate.

This research explored the backgrounds of only one type of intervener -- mediators and third parties who utilize meditation skills or techniques to resolve/transform conflicts. Limiting the research to this type of third party provided a homogeneous sample of individuals who have some shared qualifications or skills that could be compared and contrasted utilizing the questions in the hypothesis section. The research included individuals who identified themselves as conflict interveners, mediators or other third parties who utilized mediatve skills or techniques to resolve/transform conflicts, conflict interveners, mediators or other third party individuals who were currently students in conflict resolution programs in colleges, students in conflict
intervention training programs in nonacademic settings, and individuals who underwent conflict intervention training in conflict resolution programs but who decided not to mediate.

**Data Collection**

Phase One of the data collection process consisted of a review of the backgrounds of prominent or “high-profile” mediators to identify life circumstances or events that were instrumental in their decision to become mediators or that resulted in them becoming mediators. This information was primarily obtained through biographical and autobiographical information that was publically available. Interviews were conducted with “high profile” conflict interveners/mediators where sufficient information could not be obtained from the literature. The researcher sought to interview five “high profile” conflict interveners/mediators. The “high profile” conflict interveners/mediators were identified based on name recognition or expertise in the conflict intervention field plus accessibility/availability for interviews. These “high profile” conflict interveners/mediators were asked the questions (Appendix B) from Sections Two, Four, Seven, and Eight of the self-report survey instrument (discussed below). The researcher requested that the “high profile” mediators complete Sections III to VIII of the survey online after the interview.

Phases Two, Three, Four, and Five of the data collection consisted of the administration of a self-report questionnaire with open-ended and closed-ended
questions to conflict interveners and/or mediators and students currently studying to become conflict interveners and/or mediators, as well as individuals who previously studied in the conflict resolution field. The survey (Appendix A) was conducted online utilizing survey collection software (SurveyMonkey). The use of the survey collection software was an efficient and relatively inexpensive collection tool since neither the researcher nor the respondents would incur travel costs to complete the survey. SurveyMonkey permitted respondents to complete the survey at any time of the day and from any location. Conflict interveners/mediators (Phase Two), students (Phases Three and Four), and individuals who received mediation training but chose to not mediate (Phase Five) were invited via email to complete the on-line survey. Email addresses were requested from professional organizations for mediators so that the researcher could send an email containing a link to the survey. The email invitation directed all potential participants to the link for the survey. The researcher contacted conflict resolution/mediation training institutions and graduate academic institutions with conflict resolution degree programs to request that they invite students and alumni to take the on-line survey.

**Survey Instrument**

The on-line survey (see Appendix A) contained eight sections. In the first section of the survey, the researcher asked mediators and students to complete the Thomas/Kilmann Conflict Assessment Instrument if they had not previously done so. Since the researcher was engaged in an exploratory study to
determine if there are any patterns in the types of conflict that mediators may have experienced and their choice to become mediators or conflict interveners, respondents were asked to complete the Thomas/Kilmann Conflict Assessment Instrument to provide data that may help to determine if patterns exist in this population with regard to how conflict has been handled. The results of the assessment were recorded. If they had previously taken the instrument, they were asked to share the prior outcomes.

In Section II, participants were asked a series of open-ended questions about their experience as a conflict intervener. Each mediator was asked to identify his/her conflict resolution roles, identify events that led to him/her becoming conflict intervener, and to share information about career choices/decisions. They were also asked to discuss the types of cases they typically handled.

Section III of the survey requested participants to respond to questions about their mediation experience. The respondents were asked about mediation experience, including length of time as a mediator, duration of career, number of cases mediated, amount of mediation training, and average number of cases mediated per month. They were asked to identify their types of conflict intervention experience such as adjudicator, arbitrator, advocate, etc. (Appendix A contains a list of questions that were asked). Participants were asked, in Section IV, to provide demographical information. The information asked
included age, gender, race, educational level, family composition, and occupations of parents and siblings.

In Section V, each respondent was provided a list of circumstances and events (Appendix A) and asked to indicate whether he/she had experienced any of them directly or indirectly. To attempt to address the forgetfulness factor, a list of events and circumstances were provided to help facilitate recall\textsuperscript{11}. They were given an opportunity to list any other circumstances, events, or other significant factors not on the list that they may have experienced that influenced the decision to become a mediator or led to becoming a mediator.

If the respondent indicated that he/she had experienced a particular circumstance or an event, he/she was asked a series of questions about the experience. The respondents were asked at approximately what age he/she experienced the event or circumstance and whether the event was experienced directly or whether the mediators viewed others experiencing the event or circumstance. If the mediator indicated he/she viewed the event or circumstance, the mediator was asked to identify the physical, psychological, and emotional proximity of the event/circumstance’s participants to him or herself. The mediator was asked to indicate the degree to which the event influenced them personally. The mediator was then asked to indicate whether the events identified had any impact on their mediator case type preferences.

\textsuperscript{11} The term “events” is defined as any life circumstances and life events including relationships that the mediator perceives as significant in the decision to become a mediator.
Section VI of the survey asked questions about how the mediator first learned of mediation and how he/she came to make the decision to become a mediator. In Section VII of the survey, the mediator was asked to identify factors that impacted the choice to become a mediator. Specifically the mediator was asked what events most contributed to the choice to become a mediator. The mediator was asked about the types of cases he/she preferred to handle and the types of mediation cases in which each mediator felt uniquely qualified to handle. The mediator was asked to list knowledge, abilities, traits, characteristics, and/or skills he/she feels makes them a “good” mediator. The mediators were also asked to explain how they felt identified knowledge, abilities, traits, characteristics, and skills make them a “good” mediator.

In Section VIII of the survey, respondents were asked questions about the dimension of conflict (individual, societal/national, transnational/international, or global) in which he/she preferred to work. Lastly, participants were asked to respond to two open-ended questions. These were: Have you ever felt that a case was “too close” to you to mediate because of past events in your life? If yes, what events have you experienced that make you feel the case was “too close” to you?

**Research Participants**

As stated earlier in this Chapter, the research participants were individuals who identified themselves as mediators or who use mediative skills in their work. This group also included individuals who were students in conflict resolution.
programs in colleges, and individuals who were students in mediation training programs in nonacademic settings.

**Sampling Strategy**

For Phases One and Two of the data collection, the researcher utilized a cluster sampling technique that involves dividing the population into a number of units or clusters, each of which contains individuals having a range of characteristics (Robson, 1993). The researcher divided the mediator population into one of five categories (clusters) (See Table 1) based on the type of cases that may comprise the greatest percentage of their caseload. The mediators were placed in clusters to be able to invite individuals from each unit or cluster to complete the on-line survey. The clusters would permit the researcher to ascertain if any similarities or patterns exist within those who practiced within an arena.

Potential participants for Phase Two were identified from several sources. Lists of mediators were requested from professional organizations for mediators such as the Conflict Resolution Services. Since the professional mailing lists of such organizations were not provided an email invitation was sent via organizations requesting members or subscribers to list serves to complete the survey. Another source of potential participants was organizations that had alternative dispute resolution programs. A list of names and email addresses of mediators was requested from the organizations but it was not provided. The researcher provided the internet link of the survey to the organizations and
requested them to email the invite to their mediators. Organizations were also asked to send the link to the survey in electronic newsletters that were distributed to its members.

The researcher also attempted to obtain study participants with community mediation experience by contacting several community mediation programs to obtain permission to send the email invitations to staff members and volunteers who are mediators. Likewise the researcher contacted consultants who specialize in international (i.e., global or transnational) (Jeong, 2000); (Rosenau, 1990) and/or national disputes or conflicts (involves individuals within a nation\textsuperscript{12} and may include public disputes\textsuperscript{13}) to obtain names and email addresses of mediators. To obtain a list of mediators who operate in the court arena, the researcher contacted court systems that utilized mediation and provided the link to the survey to be distributed to their mediators.

In Phase Three of the data collection, an email invitation to complete the survey was sent to students in graduate academic programs specializing in

\textsuperscript{12} Jeong (2000) indicates that a “nation is defined in reference to distinct ethnographic features and self-consciousness of a collective cultural entity. National identity is developed by a sense of political community that shares common institutions and a single code of rights and duties for its members. National political communities also encompass definite social space, a well demarcated and bounded territory, with which members identify and to which they feel they belong” (p. 230).

\textsuperscript{13} Carpenter and Kennedy (1988) define public disputes as “controversies that affect members of the public beyond the primary negotiators. Public disputes nearly always involve one or more levels of government – often as party, usually as a decision maker.” They add that “public disputes tend to be more complex, and they demand attention to factors that are unimportant or nonexistent in disagreement in which only two parties are involved” (p. 4).
conflict resolution via their educational institution. These students were provided a survey similar to the one used in Phase Two.

Phase Four of the data collection process involved the surveying of students in non-academic mediation training programs. These students were provided the link to the same survey as utilized in Phase Three. It was expected that all students in these training programs wish to become mediators in contrast to the students in the graduate academic conflict resolution programs who may wish to conduct research and/or teach.

The researcher projected a survey data collection period of approximately eight weeks. If the researcher had not obtained a minimum of 100 respondents at the end of the eight week period, the collection period was to have been extended until at least 100 responses have been obtained, or the researcher felt that the potential field of study participants had been exhausted.

**Ethical Implications (Trust and Confidentiality)**

All participants were informed that the objective of the study was to examine mediators' backgrounds and career choice. All participants were adults over the age of 18 from non-vulnerable populations. Information was not obtained from children, adults with impairments in understanding or communication, or adults who are being detained. All participants were asked to complete and sign a consent form prior to participating in the research (see survey in Appendix A). Confidentiality was be maintained for all participants at all
times. Names were not attached to responses except for the responses of "high profile" mediators; in that case, person-identifiable information was removed from all the respondent’s responses. No published information was identifiable as belonging to or linked to specific participants other than the "high profile" mediators whose information had been previously published in biographical or autobiographical documents. In terms of students, faculty participation was sought to encourage students to complete on-line surveys, but names of particular students were not obtained. Only the researcher accessed the raw data of the survey. The researcher’s committee was able to review the results of the analysis of the data but no person-identifiable information was shared with committee. Data was secured in a locked file cabinet while the study was in progress and upon completion of the study.

Participants were not paid to participate in the study. No participants were pressured to participate or to continue to participate in the study. Participants were able to stop participation at any time and withdraw consent at any time in the study.

Participants in the study were provided any information necessary to complete their understanding of the research. The researcher obtained email addresses of participants, if they indicated a desire to have an abstract of the completed study. Abstracts of the study will be sent out to interested participants upon the completion of the research.
Delimitations and Limitations of the Study Design

It is recognized that there are advantages and disadvantages of surveys (Robson, 1993). A survey was utilized as the primary data collection tool because it is a resourceful way of retrieving information about the mediation experiences plus the decision to become a mediator from a large number of mediators and mediator trainees. The use of an electronic survey collection tool was also an efficient method of obtaining a large amount of data at a relatively low cost in a short period of time. It allowed for confidentiality, which may have encouraged frankness when sensitive areas such as backgrounds were involved. The researcher acknowledges that individuals who did have some childhood trauma that led to their decision to become a mediator may have been less likely to respond to a survey of any kind on this topic or to discuss it with a stranger in an interview.

A disadvantage of surveys is that they are subject to the bias that occurs with self-reporting and error due to forgetfulness and/or embellishment of information (Robson, 1993). Another major disadvantage of surveys is that there is a typically low response rate. The researcher, in an attempt to address the expected low return rate, attempted to obtain 1000 to 1200 email addresses for Phase Two with the goal of having 360 completed surveys returned. For Phases Three and Four, a goal of 150 completed surveys was anticipated. The researcher acknowledges that there was some difficulty to get participants to
participate in a lengthy multi-component survey instrument. The large numbers of email invitations were sent to try to counter the anticipated lower response rate as a result of surveys in general and the multi-component specifically.

In addition to dealing with any potential bias created in the choice of data collection approaches, the researcher had to manage her own bias. The researcher is a psychologist by training and has a belief that most adult decision-making and behavior can be traced to events that occurred during early childhood. The researcher’s twenty-five years of experience in Human Resources (especially in recruitment/staffing) has also convinced her that many adults do not consciously choose an occupation due to interests but often due to external factors like availability of jobs, location of work, and salary desires and needs. The researcher has also observed in her years in the Human Resources area that individuals often remain in careers or jobs for various reasons that are not necessarily related to an interest in the actual work.

The researcher’s years of experience in Human Resources has prepared her to ask difficult and personal questions about events that influence individuals’ occupations and careers while maintaining her objectivity. During the interviews for this study, she called upon those interviewing and listening competencies to ask questions openly and to use active listening to record what was stated by the respondents. The researcher’s many years of experience facilitating conflict resolution within a large organization was also useful in analyzing data collected
with regard to mediators who work with conflicts between two individuals as well as within groups and organizations.

**Data Analysis Plan**

Research information was collected for each mediator. Data was analyzed across mediator work categories or groups based on the types of cases that were the respondents’ primary focus in mediation. Each mediator's data was analyzed to determine if mediators in the category demonstrated a relationship between their backgrounds and the choice to become a mediator, types of cases mediated, and self-perceived effectiveness as a mediator (See Table 1 for listing of groups). The data was analyzed at the group level to determine if any one category of mediator demonstrated more of a relationship between their background and types of cases mediated, and self-perceived effectiveness as a mediator than other categories.

**Comparison and Contrast of Demographic Information**

The statistics compiled included descriptive statistics and tabulation of data (a joint distribution between the discrete variables). Content analysis was used to analyze the narrative data collected. The researcher initially compiled descriptive statistics for all mediators and students in Phases Two, Three, and Four of the research. Descriptive statistics were compiled on the "high profile" mediators in Phase One. The descriptive statistics ascertained if individuals in each category of mediators shared similar demographic characteristics (age,
race, gender, educational level, MBTI, Thomas-Kilmann preference, and occupations of parents’ and siblings). The descriptive statistics compiled included the mean, mode, and median.

**Mediator Experience and Career Choices: Factors, Type, and Priority**

The researcher utilized descriptive statistics to ascertain the amount and length of mediation experience of the mediators and students. Specifically the researcher compiled statistics on the mean, mode, median, and range for the amount of mediation training, the number of mediators certified, number of mediations participated in, length of time as a mediator, and the average number of cases mediated per month. After the descriptive statistics for each group were computed, a tabulation of data (a joint distribution between the discrete variables) was utilized to analyze the numeric data. Content analysis was used to analyze the narrative data collected.

**Exposure to Events**

The circumstances or events on which mediators were asked to report their experience were broken into four circumstances/event patterns. The four circumstances or event patterns were overt violence, societal fairness, legal issues, and personal identity or worth. The mediators were asked to self-report on the exposure to events and their proximity to the event when it was experienced. The researcher examined data to determine if there was any relationship between demographic factors of each of the five or six work
categories of mediators (age, race, gender, educational level, MBTI, Thomas-Kilmann’s preference, and occupations of parents’ and siblings) and each of the seven following factors.

The factors were:

1. How each mediator first learned of mediation;
2. How each individual came to make the choice to be a mediator;
3. Types of cases each mediator preferred;
4. Types of mediation in which each mediator felt he/she was most effective;
5. Circumstances/events that each mediator felt most contributed to their choice to become a mediator;
6. The circumstances/events that each mediator felt influenced the types of cases he/she wished to handle; and
7. The circumstances/events that each mediator believed influenced their effectiveness as a mediator.

After all this data was entered, the researcher compared the circumstance/event patterns experienced by each mediator and by each category of mediators. This approach helped the researcher determine if any significant difference exists between the observed number of responses which fall into each of the four circumstance/event patterns backgrounds and the expected number based on the hypothesis for the category of mediators.

The researcher compared responses for the mediators on the four questions to the responses given about significant circumstances/events. The responses to the following four questions were used: influential factors in deciding to become a mediator; types of mediation cases preferred; types of cases in which mediator believes his or herself is most effective; and types of
cases in which individual background is believed to influence mediator effectiveness. The circumstance/event characteristics which were used included: circumstance/event patterns experienced by each mediator; average proximity rating for each circumstance/event pattern; number of exposures per circumstance/event pattern; degree of influence of each event circumstance/pattern; and perceived effectiveness per circumstance/event pattern.

Responses to Open-Ended Questions on the Survey

Content analysis for themes was conducted on the last two questions of the survey. The two questions were: “Have you ever felt that a case was ‘too close’ to you to mediate because of past events in your life?” and “What events did you experience that made you feel the case was ‘too close’ to you?” The answers to these two questions enabled the researcher to explore the research question as to whether a mediator's background, with circumstances/events similar to the case being mediated, facilitated the effectiveness of the mediator (self-perceived and reported). If the mediator believed that it did improve his/her effectiveness, was this effectiveness due to possession of a “shared circumstances/events” with one or more of the parties? The answers to the second question provided insight into whether there was a certain point beyond which the shared circumstances/events were “too close” for the mediator to be effective. It was also hoped that the answers to the question would indicate if
there was a degree of shared experience at which the mediator believed that the shared circumstances/events hindered his/her effectiveness. Importance of themes were be identified by analyzing the frequencies of similar ideas or thoughts that were mentioned by the respondents in their discourse.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORIES OF MEDIATORS BASED ON TYPES OF CASES</th>
<th>PHASE 1</th>
<th>PHASE 2</th>
<th>PHASE 3</th>
<th>PHASE 4</th>
<th>PHASE 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review of Backgrounds of “High Profile Mediators” (Background, autobiographical and/or interviews)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Survey of Students in Academic Programs Specializing in Conflict Resolution (Self-Report Questionnaire with Open and Closed-ended Questions)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Survey of Individuals Who Received Training in Mediation But Elected to not Mediate (Non Academic) (Self-Report Questionnaire with Open and Closed-ended Questions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Mediators</td>
<td>1 Mediator</td>
<td>200 Mediators invited to complete survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Will attempt to invite up to 25 to complete survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intra-Organizational (ADR Programs) Mediators</td>
<td>1 Mediator</td>
<td>200 Mediators invited to complete survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Mediators</td>
<td>1 Mediator</td>
<td>200 Mediators invited to complete survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Mediators</td>
<td>1 Mediator</td>
<td>200 Mediators invited to complete survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Mediators</td>
<td>1 Mediator</td>
<td>200 Mediators invited to complete survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Categories Mediators</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>200 Mediators invited to complete survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Data Collection

The Research Instrument

The primary data collection instrument for the research was the survey. As detailed in the Research Methodology Chapter, the plan was to survey mediators, students in academic programs specializing in conflict resolution, students in mediation training non-academic programs, and individuals who received training in mediation (in non-academic programs) but elected not to mediate. The methodology called for a self-report questionnaire with open- and closed-ended questions.

Designing the Survey Instrument

The researcher commenced the designing of the survey by reviewing the instrument that she developed and used in the small pilot study in 1999 (Marshall, 1999). The 1999 instrument was a paper and pencil multiple choice questionnaire designed by the researcher of this dissertation. The researcher realized that, based on feedback received at the time of the pilot, the survey required some modification.

Utilizing the instrument that was distributed in the pilot study, the researcher obtained feedback from respondents to the pilot study as well as
feedback from fellow graduate students and professors from the Institute of Conflict Analysis and Resolution at George Mason University to develop the research instrument (survey) that was to be used for this research. The researcher also obtained input and feedback regarding the various versions of the survey from mediators. The mediators who provided input came primarily from the alternative dispute resolution programs (ADR programs) of a local government and public school system as well as some mediators associated with a community mediation program in Northern Virginia. The researcher is one of the mediators in the local government ADR Program. The researcher had served as the administrator of that ADR program in 2000 and on the Board of Directors of the community mediation program for a number of years.

The researcher received guidance and directions from the members of the dissertation research committee on the types of questions as well as the wording of the same. The design phase was a very lengthy process because the researcher drafted and redrafted questions based on feedback provided by the individuals noted above (hereafter referred to as the volunteer test reviewers and testers). Once the draft instrument and the research proposal were approved by the Human Subjects Review Board of George Mason University, the researcher put the survey into the selected software.

**Selection of Method of Collecting the Data**

Due to the projected number of respondents to the current research, the researcher realized that the collection of a paper and pencil questionnaire was
not the most efficient method of obtaining data. With the increase in survey
techniques and instruments as well as changes in the technology associated with
the administration of surveys, the researcher sought another method of obtaining
responses. The researcher elected to utilize survey software that is designed to
create surveys on the Internet.

**Selection of Software**

The tool that was selected was SurveyMonkey. This on-line survey
designer software has a single purpose of creating professional on-line surveys
quickly and easily. A major advantage of the software is that the results may be
viewed on-line as they are collected in real-time. The software also permits the
researcher to view live graphs and charts, as well as get individual responses.
Powerful filtering within the software would allow the researcher to display only
the responses of interest. The software permits a download of the summary of
results in multiple formats as well as a download of all the raw data collected
either as a spreadsheet or in database format. The collected data remains
absolutely private in SurveyMonkey (the email addresses are not saved) and can
only be accessed by the researcher. The researcher selected this software
because of its ease of use and based on the recommendations of the Graduate
Research Section of the George Mason University library staff and the
University’s Information Technology (IT) department.
Getting the Data into the Collection Tool

The survey was initially designed using word processing software with the intent to later import the document into the survey software. It was anticipated that the original document could easily and quickly be “put into” or imported to the survey software. Unfortunately this did not prove to be the case. The selected survey software (SurveyMonkey) did not permit the importing of a word processing document. The questions had to be retyped into the survey software. The researcher also encountered problems with designing the questions in the software because the logic and the manner in which the questions had been drafted in the word processing software did not correspond to the logic and manner in which questions could be presented in the survey software.

The researcher had to redraft the questions. The “stem” of the question as well as the manner in which answer choices could be asked had to be modified from the document that had been prepared in the word processing format to match the software tool. A major complication in entering the questions into the software was the creation of custom “skip logic” for the questions. The survey was designed such that depending on what the answer was to a particular question, the respondent would be directed to a particular path of questions or “trees of logic” (custom skip logic). These various “tree branches” would then loop the respondent back to questions that all respondents were being presented. However in other cases, a “tree branch” would result in a respondent exiting the survey based on their response. The designing of the custom skip
logic was difficult due to the number of questions as well as the various possible “branch choices” that had to be developed to afford respondents a chance to provide relevant answers based on their specific experiences. An example of a question that required complex skip logic was: Do you consider yourself a conflict intervener? There were three possible responses. These were: 1) Yes, which if selected, would take the respondent to questions about whether he/she is currently a conflict intervener; 2) No, which if selected, would take respondent to questions about their conflict intervener status – e.g. questions asking about whether the individual had ever been a conflict intervener; or 3) No, not presently; I plan to become a conflict intervener in the future. If this latter choice was selected, it would take respondents to questions about whether he or she is a conflict intervener trainee.

After the questions were redrafted and entered into SurveyMonkey, the volunteer test reviewers and testers reviewed and/or completed the survey. Each time the questions were modified, the researcher requested the volunteer test reviewers and testers to examine/test the survey again. Unfortunately the researcher did not have experience with on-line survey software and had to master a steep learning curve. After the researcher became familiar with the software, another updated version of the software was released which required the researcher to familiarize herself with the newer version so that the survey could be completed. After numerous changes and redrafting of the questions and the logic trees and countless hours of testing and retesting by the volunteer
test reviewers and testers, the instrument was placed on the web and released to receive responses.

**Administration Challenges**

Regrettably, after the instrument was released, several complications occurred. In spite of the hours of testing, several responders complained early in the data collection process that the software took them to the end of the survey although they only had been provided answers to a few questions. Since the instructions had forewarned that the survey should take approximately forty-five minutes to complete, these initial responders correctly realized and reported that something was wrong. The researcher had failed to anticipate that if individuals skipped questions, the “tree logic” would not correctly direct or redirect individuals back to the next set of questions. The instrument had to be closed while the changes to the logic trees were made and retested by the volunteer test reviewers and testers. The revised skip logic redirected individuals to the next part of the survey if they skipped questions.

Although the problem was identified quickly based on feedback, it is unknown how many individuals may have accessed the instrument when the problem was occurring, became frustrated, elected not to continue, tried to take the instrument while it was off-line being “fixed”, and did not attempt to take the instrument again.
Modifications to the Survey

The proposed survey (Appendix A), as described in the methodology and research design, contained eight sections. In the first section of the survey, the researcher planned to ask mediators and students to complete the Thomas/Kilmann Conflict Assessment Instrument if they had not previously done so. The results of the assessment were then to be recorded on the survey. If they had previously taken the instrument, they were to be asked to share the prior outcomes.

The original design envisioned having the responders to this research survey, who had not previously taken the Thomas/Kilmann Conflict Assessment Instrument, to complete the Thomas/Kilmann Conflict Assessment Instrument as a part of the research survey. To permit this to occur, the survey responders had to first learn what the survey required by opening the survey. This approach also would have required the responders to then stop taking the research survey and to access and complete the Thomas/Kilmann Conflict Assessment Instrument (hereafter referred to as Thomas/Kilmann Instrument). After completing the Thomas/Kilmann instrument, the responders to the research survey would be expected to return to and continue with the on-line research survey. To have successfully implemented this plan would have required that the responders to move between the research instrument, the paper copy of the Thomas/Kilmann instrument, and then back again to the on-line research survey.
Paper Thomas/Kilmann Instrument

There were several unanticipated complications which impacted the feasibility of having responders take the Thomas/Kilmann Instrument. Although the instrument is often used within academic settings, for individuals not associated with an academic institution to complete the instrument would have required the purchase of the Thomas/Kilmann Instrument, and then getting the paper copy of the instrument to the individuals who have agreed to take the survey that is the subject of this research. Utilizing the paper instrument would have placed an additional burden on the respondent to mail the Thomas/Kilmann Instrument back to the researcher. Once the researcher received the Instrument, the researcher would have needed to have Thomas/Kilmann Instrument assessment by a qualified individual (the researcher is not so trained). Confidentiality would have been a factor if the responses to the Thomas/Kilmann Instrument were assessed and reviewed by another individual. Obtaining someone to assess the responses to the Thomas/Kilmann Instrument and the costs of having the instrument assessed were also concerns. Another obstacle, which would have been presented by the use of the paper Thomas/Killmann Instrument, was the matching of the paper response with the on-line survey responses. Specifically the researcher would have needed a methodology to code the paper instruments so that they could be paired with the on-line survey to have a respondent’s responses from both tools linked. This would have introduced additional concerns of confidentiality. The numerous challenges of
the paper approach of utilizing the Thomas/Kilmann Instrument resulted in the researcher eliminating this as a viable option.

**Additional Obstacles – On-line Thomas/Kilmann Conflict Assessment Instrument**

The researcher briefly considered another option of having the respondents take the Thomas/Kilmann Instrument on-line and then return to the on-line survey for this research. This option was not pursued because the likelihood that an individual would: sign on to the on-line survey, realize they need to exit the on-survey, exit the on-line survey software, sign on to another website to take the Thomas/Kilmann Instrument at another on-line site, and then after completing the conflict assessment instrument, sign back on to the on-line survey to complete the on-line survey for this research, seemed highly unlikely to occur.

The logistical issues of directing survey responders from the on-line survey in SurveyMonkey to another external website to take the Thomas/Kilmann Instrument and then return to the on-line survey at the conclusion of the Thomas/Kilmann Instrument presented challenges that could not be easily addressed. The other reason this option was not considered is that, since the instrument had to be purchased in advance, it was unclear how the researcher could pay in advance and then convey that information to the individuals who planned to take the on-line survey for this research. Costs of having the
instrument assessed along with the ease of having the assessment conducted were also factors in the choice to eliminate this approach.

To simplify the collection of the information for this section, the researcher elected to modify the section of the survey that would have asked for the completion of the Thomas/Kilmann Instrument and instead requested individuals to indicate their preferences if they had previously taken the instrument. The section was reduced to one question that was inserted in the demographics section of the on-line survey along with questions about the responders’ Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI). The disadvantage of this approach is that if a respondent had not taken the Thomas/Kilmann Instrument or could not recall their preferences from the instrument, that information could not be reported on the on-line research survey or might not be reported correctly. In addition, since responses to the Thomas/Kilmann Instrument tend to be situation specific (Thomas & Kilmann, 1974), the preferences may have changed over time.

As described in the methodology and research design, in Section II of the on-line survey, the participants were asked a series of open-ended questions about their experience as a conflict intervener, their conflict resolution roles, events that led to becoming a conflict intervener, and information about career choices/decisions (Note: Section I was the introduction to the survey and the informed consent). They were also asked to discuss the types of cases handled. Section III requested participants to respond to questions about their mediation experience (length of time as a mediator, duration of career, number of cases
mediated, amount of mediation training, and average number of cases mediated a month). Questions were presented about their types of conflict intervention experience such as adjudicator, arbitrator, advocate, etc. Participants were asked, in Section IV, to provide demographical information such as age, gender, race, educational level, family composition, occupations of parents and siblings, Myers-Briggs’ Type Indicator (MBTI), and their Thomas/Kilmann Instrument preference.

In Section V, the survey design asked respondents to indicate whether he/she had experienced any of the listed events. Section V was a very lengthy section because respondents were asked multiple questions for each listed event as noted in the instructions for the section (Figure 6, 7, and 8). The list of events is noted in Appendix B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Events Experienced - Instructions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You will be presented with some events and situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For each event or situation listed, you will be asked if you experienced (participated in, observed, or know about) the event/situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you indicate that you &quot;experienced&quot; the event, you will be asked three additional questions regarding that event. The additional questions are:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) For the event you experienced, please indicate your age when you first experienced the event or situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) For the event/situation you experienced, indicate to what extent the event or situation may have influenced, impacted, or affected you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) For the event experienced, please specify the impact or influence the event had on your life.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6 – Events Experienced - Instructions
Survey responders were first asked if they experienced the event and how they experienced the event. Specifically they were asked:

**Sample Follow-up Event Experience Question:**

59. Event #1 - Others could not present their side of story

- Did not experience
- Personally involved in/participated in this event/situation
- Members of my nuclear family were involved in such an event/situation
- Members of my extended family were involved in such an event/situation
- An acquaintance that I regularly interacted with in my neighborhood, church/place of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation
- An acquaintance that I did not regularly interact with in my neighborhood, church/place of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation
- I was present when the event/situation occurred, but I was not acquainted with the participants
- I observed event/situation on television, in a movie, heard about it on the radio or read it in a newspaper, magazine, book or the Internet, but I did not personally know the participants
- Do not know/Cannot remember

**Figure 7 - Sample Event Follow-up Experience Question**

If the responder indicated they had experienced the event, they were presented with three additional questions. They were asked:
**Figure 8 - Sample Event Follow-up Age and Influence Question**

If the responder indicated that they had not experienced the event, they were "skipped" to the next event.

In Section VI, respondents were asked questions about how the mediator first learned about mediation and how he/she came to make the decision to become a mediator. In Sections VII, the researcher asked participants to identify factors that impacted their choice to become a mediator. In Section VIII, respondents were asked about the dimension of conflict (individual,
societal/national, transnational/international, or global) in which he/she prefers to work. Lastly, participants were to be asked to respond to two open-ended questions. These were: Have you ever felt that a case was “too close” to you to mediate because of past events in your life? If yes, what events have you experienced that make you feel the case was “too close” to you?

Because of the manner in which questions had to be presented in the software due to “skip logic” and the “logic” trees, the survey was presented in smaller sections than originally designed and in a different order. All the topics that were in the designed survey were included in the on-line survey. The sections of the on-line survey were:

- Introduction
- Informed Consent Form
- Questions or Concerns about Survey
- Experience as a Conflict Intervener
- Are You Currently A Conflict Intervener?
- Specific Events That Resulted In Decision to Become a Conflict Intervener
- Conflict Intervention – Vocation/Occupation
- Career Choices
- Conflict as a Profession
- Preferred and Non-Preferred Types of Cases
- Types of Cases Trained To Handle
- Prior Intervention in Conflict
- Questions For Those Previously a Conflict Intervener
- Conflict Intervener Student or Trainee
- Not a Conflict Intervener – Ever Considered Being One
Mediation Experience
Use of Mediative Skills
Amount of Mediator Experience
Certification
Demographics
Events Experienced and the Influence or Impact
Additional Events Experienced But Not Listed
Factors That Impacted Choice to Become an Intervener/Mediator
Ranking Of Factors That Impacted Choice to Become An Intervener/Mediator
Mediation Cases Preferences
Arenas in Which Intervene
Thanks to Participants

**Recruiting Subjects/Respondents**

The research plan called for the survey to be distributed to individuals who identify themselves as conflict interveners, mediators, or other third parties who utilize mediative skills or techniques to resolve/transform conflicts, individuals who are students in conflict resolution programs in colleges, and students in conflict intervention training programs in nonacademic settings.

The respondents were divided into three groups or phases for data collection. Phase Two was targeted to Conflict Interveners/Mediators. Phases Three and Four focused on collection of data from students. Although the targeted response groups were called Phases, once the survey was released for responders to complete, individuals from any of the three groups or phases could complete the survey concurrently or at any time. Data collection was not a
sequential collection process according to the phases or groupings partly because the researcher had no way to control where the link to the survey was forwarded.

To obtain possible responders (mediators) for the Phase Two (See Design Plan in Chapter 4) of the research, the researcher planned to send the survey to individuals whose email addresses could be obtained from professional organizations for mediators. The researcher also planned to obtain study participants with community mediation experience by contacting community mediation programs to obtain permission to send the email invitations to staff members and volunteers who are mediators. Likewise the researcher intended to contact consultants who specialized in international or national disputes or conflicts to obtain names and email addresses of mediators. To obtain a list of mediators who operated in the court arena, the researcher planned to contact court systems that utilize mediation and obtain a list of names and emails of mediators. The email invitation was to have directed all potential participants to the link for the survey. The secondary strategy for soliciting individuals to complete the survey, if the researcher was unable to obtain email addresses for direct request to the mediators, was to ask professional organizations, ADR programs, and the staff of court programs that utilized mediation, to email their members and ask the members to take the survey.

The research plan had to be modified due to the reluctance of professional organizations to supply the email addresses of its members. Some of the
organizations reported that since members typically received numerous unsolicited emails, the majority have requested that their electronic contact information not be shared. The largest professional organization for mediators in the United States (ACR) would not provide email addresses of its membership. The researcher asked if the organization would be willing to send an announcement to the members of the list serve seeking mediators/conflict interveners to complete a survey for graduate research but unfortunately the policy of ACR is to not distribute surveys of this nature to its members. The organization indicated that the researcher could possibly include the survey in its electronic newsletter (ACR Update) as a paid advertiser, because the newsletter only includes ACR-related activities. Since the submitted approved proposal had not mentioned that paid advertising was to be used to obtain participants, the researcher decided to try other approaches to obtain individuals to complete the survey.

After realizing that the researcher was unable to access the membership of one of the largest mediator associations, the researcher obtained the contact information for other associations and organizations whose membership was primarily mediators and/or conflict resolvers. Although some organizations were also unwilling to provide a list of the email addresses of its membership, many were willing to send out information to their membership via a list serve announcement. The researcher sent emails to these organizations to request that they would send an email or list serve announcement to their members or
subscribers asking them to complete the survey. Some of the organizations to which the researcher sent such requests included:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Organization</th>
<th>Types of mediators or mediator specialization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EPA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfax County Public Schools Mediators</td>
<td>ADR; Organizational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfax County Government</td>
<td>ADR; Organizational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendees to a Meeting of Court Mediators</td>
<td>Court ADR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky State University Program</td>
<td>Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antioch University McGregor Program</td>
<td>Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennesaw State University Program</td>
<td>Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution (ICAR), George Mason University</td>
<td>Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Ohio Program</td>
<td>Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Office of Dispute Resolution</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Virginia Mediation Service (NVMS)</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Commission on Dispute Resolution</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYC-DR mailing list (New York City Dispute Resolution) by John Jay College DRC</td>
<td>Various - Community, ADR, Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCA</td>
<td>Various – An Organization of Minority Mediators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Mediator (Rachael Barbour)</td>
<td>ADR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT Forums</td>
<td>International; Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internationalpeaceandconflict.ning.com</td>
<td>International; Community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 9 – Name of Organizations Sent Request to Distribute Survey**

On one occasion, when the researcher contacted the administrator of a state alternative dispute resolution program to see if the request for participants could be emailed or sent via list serve to its membership, she was informed that the announcement could not be sent. The administrator did point out that although she could not send that request because members (in response to a list serve survey) had indicated they did not want to their email addresses shared or
to receive email messages, the addresses of individual members who were certified to mediate in the state was public information and could be obtained on their website. Due to the length of the list of members and the amount of research that would have been required to obtain each email address, the researcher elected not to pursue this approach due to the initial timeline for collecting data.

The process of trying to “distribute the survey” (solicit responders for Phase Two) was both frustrating and enlightening. The researcher came to quickly learn how privacy and organization regulations, as well as individuals’ preferences regarding privacy, dictated the venue that would post the request. Although the obtaining of email addresses was generally not a viable approach, the wide usages of list serve announcements facilitated the dissemination of the announcement requesting participants to complete the survey. The availability of contact information via the world-wide web was also very useful in sending emails to request individuals to send out the list serve announcements.

Phases Three, Four, and Five of the data collection were to have been the completion of the survey by three categories of students. To obtain the participation of students, the researcher planned to contact graduate academic institutions with conflict resolution degree programs (Phase Three), conflict resolution/mediation training institutions (Phase Four), to request that they invite students to take the on-line survey. Phase Five was to have been individuals who had received mediation training and/or conflict intervention training in a non-
academic conflict resolution programs but chose not to mediate. This group will be discussed in the next section (Control Group).

A difficulty encountered while trying to obtain “contacts” to send the emails to students was that a number of these individuals were on vacation and/or did not respond to emails in a timely manner. The survey was opened to receive responses during the summer, a time of year when some college students are not taking classes. The impact of attempting to collect data during the summer months may have been affected by the fact that students are less likely to check emails and/or respond to surveys if not taking classes. The opposite impact may have been felt in that, because individuals associated with academic institutions (staff, faculty and students) did not have the demand of coursework and other assignments, they may have been more available to complete a survey during the summer. The researcher was unable to determine the impact of collecting data during the summer months.

The researcher did not ask for email addresses of students after the issues of the privacy of emails had been encountered when trying to solicit responders for Phase Two (Mediators). Requests were sent via email to either a known contact of the researcher at graduate academic institutions or to a name at a graduate academic institution provided by a known contact (Referred Contact). When the request was sent to a referred contact, the researcher mentioned the name of the person who had provided the contact information and/or with whom the person being contacted had a prior association. Email
requests to ask non-academic conflict resolution/mediation training institutions, such as community mediation centers, were also sent via email. The names of conflict resolution/mediation training institutions and graduate academic institutions with conflict resolution degree programs are identified in Figure 9.

Control Group

The methodology and research design had stated that Phase Five of the survey was to focus on individuals who had received mediation training and/or conflict intervention training in a non-academic conflict resolution programs but had chosen not to mediate. The researcher had planned to personally send an email to this small number of individuals and invite them to complete the survey after obtaining their email address from conflict resolution programs. It was hoped that individuals who underwent conflict intervention training in conflict resolution programs, but decided not to mediate, could be included in the study as a control group. This control group pattern of exposure to conflicts would have been contrasted with the third parties who elected to actually utilize mediative skills or techniques to resolve/transform conflicts. When the researcher was unable to obtain email addresses of individuals from organizations, it was not feasible to identify this fifth group of individuals and send them email invitations. The researcher was not able to ascertain if individuals meeting the criteria were recipients of the announcements that went out via the list serves, or if they saw the announcement and self-selected out of the survey.
Research Participants

As noted above, the research focused on individuals who identify themselves as mediators, individuals who are students in conflict resolution programs in colleges, and individuals who are students in mediation training programs in nonacademic settings. For Phases Two, Three, Four, and Five of the data collection, the researcher planned to utilize a cluster sampling technique that involved dividing the population into a number of units or clusters, each of which contains individuals having a range of characteristics (Robson, 1993).

Across four phases of data collection (Phases Two, Three, Four, and Five), the researcher planned to divide the mediators and students into one of five categories (clusters) based on the type of cases that comprise the greatest percentage of their caseload. Group One was to be composed of individuals who indicated that the majority of their cases were in the arena of interpersonal conflicts or disputes. Group Two was to be composed of individuals who indicate that the majority of their cases were mediated within organizations as a part of employee alternative dispute resolution programs or grievance programs. Group Three would be individuals who indicated that the majority of their cases were mediated in community disputes. It was anticipated that these individuals would primarily work under the auspices of community mediation programs. Group Four would be individuals who mediate under the auspices of programs doing international or national interventions. Group Five would be composed of individuals who work in court mediation programs. The researcher anticipated
that it may have been necessary to add a Sixth Group of mediators entitled “Other” for mediators who did not specialize in one of the categories or who have more than one specialization. Obtaining responses from mediators in the five different mediation environments was designed to afford the researcher a heterogeneous sample of mediators with varying levels of expertise, backgrounds, types of cases in which they intervene, incentives, and motivations for mediating (See Table 1 in Chapter 5).

To facilitate the contacting of mediators who met the background specifics of the five clustered groups, the research plan called for the researcher to obtain potential participants for Phase Two, Three, and Four by obtaining a list of mediators from professional organizations for mediators such as the Conflict Resolution Services. Whereas it was anticipated that the professional mailing lists of such organizations would contain arbitrators, ombudspersons, and attorneys as well as mediators, only individuals who self-identify as third party conflict interveners who use mediative skills to resolve/transform conflicts were to be sent an email invitation to complete the survey. Furthermore the research design, which anticipated 1000 to 1200 surveys, to be distributed in Phase Two, 250 in Phase Three and Four, called for 200 of the surveys to be sent to mediators who indicated that the majority of their cases were in various arenas such as interpersonal conflicts or disputes, organizations, community mediations, etc. (See Table 1).
Since the researcher could not obtain a list of mediators to send personal email invitations to complete the on-line survey, the researcher could not control for the fact that only individuals who self-identify as third party conflict interveners who use mediative skills to resolve/transform conflicts received the invitation to complete the survey. As described early in this chapter, the researcher sent emails to these organizations to request that they send an email or list serve announcement to their members or subscribers asking them to complete the survey. Data collection was not targeted according to the anticipated categories or clusters partly because the researcher had no way to control where the link to the survey was forwarded. Although the researcher could not control who received the “invitation” to complete the survey, since respondents were asked to indicate the types of cases they mediated, the researcher planned to look for clusters among the mediators in terms of types of cases when examining the data.

**Collection of Information on Prominent or “High Profile” Mediators**

Phase One of data collection was to be a review of the backgrounds of five prominent or “high-profile” mediators (hereafter referred to as H-P Mediators) to identify life circumstances or events that were instrumental in their decision to become mediators or resulted in becoming mediators. It was anticipated that this information would be primarily obtained through biographical and autobiographical information as available. The design called for interviews of the H-P mediators if sufficient information could not be obtained from the literature.
According to the research plan, the H-P mediators were to be identified based on the literature review and accessibility/availability for interviews. These H-P mediators were to be asked the questions from sections from Sections Two, Four, Seven, and Eight of the self-report survey instrument of the on-line survey instrument (Appendix B). The researcher planned to request that the H-P mediators complete Sections III to VIII of the survey online. The researcher also attempted to have a racially and gender diverse group.

**Locating the Prominent or “High-Profile” Mediators to be Interviewed**

Biographical and autobiographical information was not readily available on five prominent or “high-profile” mediators (H-P mediators). As with other aspects of the research, the researcher had to utilize an alternative approach to that which had been planned. The researcher conducted interviews via a sampling approach to obtain information on (H-P mediators).

Since the number of individuals to be interviewed was small in number, probability sampling was not possible. Probability sampling is possible when the researcher is able to specify the probability that any person will be included in the sample (Robson, 1993). In his discussion of surveys, Robson noted that small-scale surveys commonly employ non-probability samples because “they are less complicated to set up and are acceptable when there is no intention or need to make a statistical generalization to any population beyond the sample surveyed” (1993, p. 140).
The researcher utilized purposive sampling. Specifically, the researcher utilized a type of quota sampling called dimensional sampling. Names of prominent or H-P mediators to be considered for interviews were obtained based on a dimensional sampling strategy. In dimensional sampling, “the various dimensions thought to be of importance in a sample are incorporated into the sampling procedure in such a way that at least one representative of every possible combination of these factors or dimensions is included in the sample” (Robson, 1993, p. 141). The researcher, with the assistance of the members of her dissertation committee, identified the characteristics (dimensions) that she should strive to include in the interview sample (interview population). Specifically she needed to have a diverse group that includes ethnicity, gender, a number of years of mediation or conflict resolution experience, and various types of disputes in which the mediator specialized.

Snowball sampling was utilized to obtain the names of possible interviewees. In snowball sampling, “the researcher identifies one or more individuals from the population of interest. After they have been interviewed, they are used as informants to identify other members of the population, who are themselves used as informants, and so on” (Robson, 1993, p. 142). Nine individuals were interviewed as a part of the prominent or H-P mediators group. Originally the researcher planned to interview only five but in an attempt to reach a more diverse group, the numbers of interviews conducted were increased. The number was also increased because several individuals interviewed strongly
suggested the name of another mediator or conflict intervener who they felt it would be valuable to interview. Five females were interviewed and four males. The interviews were conducted between March 2007 to March 2008, with the majority being conducted between March 2007 and May 2007. All the interviewees were of White, Caucasian, non-Hispanic racial background except one. Although the obtaining of individuals to complete the on-line survey was difficult, it was relatively easy compared to obtaining interviews with the H-P mediators.

Because of the nature of the work of the H-P mediators, their schedules were booked far in advance. The researcher asked 21 H-P mediators for an interview. The majority of the requests were sent via email. The emails referenced the individual who had recommended that the researcher contact the prominent mediators to request an interview. One request was initially made by telephone and followed up by email confirmation. One request was sent via the mail. This request was declined. There were various reasons that the H-P mediators were not interviewed. Some of the individuals contacted for an interview expressed an interest in the topic and expressed a willingness to cooperate but schedules precluded the conducting of interviews within the time period initially planned for the interviews (Spring 2007). Others did not respond to the email requests. The accessibility of the prominent or H-P mediators may have also been affected by the fact that the interviews were being conducted in late spring and early summer when a number of people travel and/or are on
vacation. Based on feedback from some of the individuals contacted, a number of the H-P mediators are also associated with academic institutions and seem to utilize their summer months when not teaching, to practice conflict resolution in various community, national, and/or international conflicts that prevented them from being accessible.

**Missed Interviews**

The researcher had one interview scheduled but when the scheduled interviewee received the email with the list of events that would be discussed during the interview, she indicated that looking at the topic of the interview, she would not be participating. Another individual had consented to be interviewed but the interviewee and researcher “missed” each other due to a telephone call confirming a change in location not being received in a timely manner. The interview and the researcher were never able to reschedule the interview.

**How Interviews Were Conducted**

Since a number of the interviewees were located in a different state than the researcher and the researcher works a full time job that restricted travel, she elected to conduct all interviews via the telephone. One of the telephone interviews were conducted via Skype since the interviewee was located in another country and if a traditional telephone service had been used, the cost would have been prohibitive for the researcher. Prospective interviewees were contacted by either telephone or email to request their participation in the
The interviews lasted approximately forty-five minutes to one hour. The researcher conducted the interviews from a home office. In addition to audio recording the conversation, the researcher also took written notes. The interview was semi-structured format. Robson (1993) describes the semi-structured interview as one “where the interviewer has worked out a set of questions in advance, but is free to modify their order based upon her perception of what seems most appropriate in the context of the ‘conversation’, can change the way they are worded, give explanations, leave out particular questions which seem to be inappropriate with a particular interviewee or include additional ones” (p. 231). At the end of each interview, the researcher asked the interviewee if he/she had any questions about the nature of the research. Based on the questions posed, the researcher provided information about the dissertation research. Due to the time constraints in setting up the interviews and of the subjects’ availability,
the H-P mediators were not asked to complete Sections III to VIII online as had been planned.

Summary

Although the researcher needed to deviate from the original research plan and design, the researcher was able to utilize the current technology to obtain 171 responses to an admittedly very lengthy survey.
7. Data Analysis of Mediators and Their Backgrounds

Treatment of the Data

As described in the methodology and research plan (Chapter 5), the researcher compiled descriptive statistics for all mediators and students collected via the on-line survey and on the "high profile" mediators interviewed in Phase One of data collection. The descriptive statistics will be discussed in this chapter. The results of the analysis of event patterns experienced by the mediators using measures of variability will be discussed in the next chapter.

The descriptive statistics were performed to ascertain if individuals in the three categories of mediators who completed the survey (current mediators, past mediators and students), plus the high profile mediators who were interviewed, shared any demographic characteristics (age, race, gender, educational level, Myers-Briggs Instrument (MBTI), Thomas-Kilmann preference, and/or occupations of parents and siblings).

On-line Survey Participation

The number of individuals who accessed the on-line survey (Appendix 1) was 171. Only 72 (42%) of the participants completed the entire survey. A completion was recorded if the participant arrived at the last question and clicked the “done” button. The completion rate may be misleading due to the fact that
the questions in the on-line survey utilized “skip logic”. Participants were directed to a particular path of questions or “trees of logic” (custom skip logic based on the answers they gave). Once the path or branch of a particular question was addressed, these various “tree branches” looped the participant back to questions that all participants were presented. However in other cases, a “tree branch” would result in a participant exiting the survey based on their response. Based on how questions were designed using the skip logic, no one participant would have answered all questions in the survey.

Another factor that contributed to the completion rate may be the option granted participants to skip questions. The initial instructions given for the survey indicated that individuals were free to decline to answer any questions. Specifically, individuals were asked in Question 1 to read and acknowledge the following statement:

“I have read the Informed Consent Form and I understand that:

- My participation is entirely voluntary;
- I am free to refuse to answer any question (except for Questions 1 and 2)\(^{14}\); and
- I am free to withdraw at any time.”

A review of the responses of individual participants indicated that some elected to skip questions and not provide responses. Some responders continued on after skipping questions and completed other sections whereas other responders stopped participating in the survey. The number of individuals who responded to each question also varied greatly even within a section of the

\(^{14}\) Question 2 asked participants, after reading the Informed Consent Form, if they agreed to participate in this study.
survey, further supporting that individuals were selective with regard to which questions they elected to answer.

A concern that arose after the survey was launched was whether the target population (conflict interveners and mediators) had been reached. Although the researcher encountered difficulties in distributing the survey to conflict interveners and mediators as planned (discussed in Chapter 6) and could not obtain a list of mediators to whom to send personal email invitations to complete the on-line survey, the survey responses suggested that the target population was indeed reached. Of the responders to the survey, 85.5% (131) answered “yes” to the question “Do you consider yourself a conflict intervener?” Other responses to the survey offered additional information on the roles responders played in conflict intervention. In response to the question, “Do you intervene in conflicts (to facilitate resolution) as a vocation/occupation, adjunct to a vocation/occupation or an avocation?”, 46.6% (41) indicated that they intervened in conflicts as a vocation/occupation as opposed to 44.3% (39) who did so as adjunct to a vocation/occupation (data was not obtained as to whether those who intervened as an occupation did so full or part time). A smaller percentage (9.1%) indicated that they intervene as an avocation.

Although almost all of the responders (91%) indicated that they either intervened in conflict as an avocation or as an adjunct to an occupation, only 63.6% (56) indicated that they were currently intervening in conflict as a profession. Another 11.4% (10 responders) indicated that they previously
intervened. A small number of the responders (13) indicated that they were currently students in the conflict resolution field and planned to become a conflict intervener. Somewhat surprising for the researcher, was that a much smaller number of those responding to the on-line survey indicated that they have experience serving as a mediator. Only 45 of the 54 individuals who elected to answer this question about mediation experience indicated that they had such experience (additional specifics about responses to questions about mediator experiences will be discussed later). The responses to these four questions provided support to the likelihood that the survey reached the targeted population that is, conflict interveners and/or mediators albeit ones who saw themselves as intervening or have intervened in conflicts in differing roles and to differing extents.

High-Profile Mediators Telephone Oral Survey Participation

The number of High-Profile mediators (H-P mediators) interviewed totaled nine. All the H-P mediators completed the entire survey (Appendix 2) by telephone after signing the written consent written form (Appendix 3). It is possible that some of the H-P mediators may have taken the on-line survey as well, but the researcher had no way of knowing due to the fact that the survey was anonymous. All of the H-P mediators indicated that they currently intervene in conflicts. Due to the limited number of H-P mediators interviewed, the analysis of the data from these mediators will be examined as one category.
Comparison and Contrast of Demographic Information

Demographic data was compiled for the individuals who responded to the on-line survey (henceforth called responders) as well as for the nine H-P mediators who were interviewed by telephone (hereafter called H-P interviewees). The demographic information is discussed below for each of the two groups (responders and interviewees) under categories of gender, age, race, residency, education, conflict style preferences indicators (using the Myer-Briggs type indicator and the Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Assessment), family characteristics with regard to occupations, and conflict resolution experience.

Demographic Information of the Responders and H-P interviewees - Gender

Of those who responded to the on-line survey, 83 (49%) elected to answer the question about gender. Of the 83, 58 (70%) of the responders indicated female for gender and 30% noted male. Among the H-P interviewees all nine (9) responded to the question about gender. Four (44%) indicated female and five (56%) specified male. The greater percentage of males among the H-P interviewees may be reflective of the fact that a number of those who first worked in the conflict resolution field (forerunners) were males and a number of those who, at present, have “higher profiles” and/or more years of experience in the field are males.

Demographic Information of the Responders and H-P interviewees - Age

Of the 171 total participants, only 82 (48%) addressed the question about age. Participants were afforded an opportunity to select from one of six age
categories between 21 and over 60 (no responders selected the age bracket of less than 21). Since the responders were not asked to give specific ages, only age categories can be referenced (see Figure 10). Of the responders, the greatest numbers (35.4%) were between the ages 51 and 60. The next largest age group that responded to the survey was between the ages of 41 and 50 (22%). The over 60 age category was represented at 13.4%. Twelve responders (14.6%) indicated they were between the ages of 21 to 30 and twelve (14.6%) indicated they were between the ages of 31 to 40.

The H-P interviewees reported their ages as between 45 and 76, with the average age being 59. Of the H-P interviewees who responded to the question, 44% were between the ages 51 and 60, and the over 60 age category was also 44%. The between 41 and 50 age category was at 11% for the H-P interviewees.

Of the responders who indicated they were students or intended to become students, seven of the 13 responders selected the age bracket of 21 to 30. Five who indicated they were students or planned to become students selected the age bracket of 50 to 60. The majority of the responders to the question about being or becoming a student also indicated that they had already completed a degree (Bachelor – 7 and Masters – 3). This information suggested the self-identified students responding to the survey were not the traditional beginning college students deciding on an initial college major and were more likely returning to school or making a career change; that is, were older adults.
As shown in Table 2, the ages of the responders and the H-P interviewees were not dissimilar from the ages of other groups of mediators previously surveyed in Georgia, Nevada and Florida. The specifics of these studies were discussed in Chapter 3.

**Demographic Information of the Responders and Interviewees - Race**

With regard to the racial background, 77.8% of the responders (63 of the 81 responding) self-identified as White, Caucasian, non-Hispanic. African-American and African descent was indicated by 12.3% (10 individuals), followed by Asian or Pacific Islander at 3.7% (3 individuals), and Hispanic at 2.5% (2 individuals). The number of responders self-identified as multi-racial was 3.7% or 3 individuals. No responders indicated that they were of Native American or of Alaskan Native background.
With regard to the racial background of the H-P interviewees, 89% (eight of the nine) self-identified as White, Caucasian, non-Hispanic. Only one H-P interviewee was a minority identified as of African-American and African descent. No other racial or cultural background was represented among the H-P interviewees.

As shown in Table 2 below, the racial composition of the responders and the H-P interviewees was not dissimilar from the racial compositions of other groups of mediators surveyed in Georgia, Nevada and Florida. In this research and in the other studies mentioned, the majority of the mediators presented were White, Caucasian, non-Hispanic. Greater racial diversity may exist among mediators than was captured in this research. A review of the literature found that the demographics of volunteer community mediators mediating in some community mediation programs were higher in number of minorities (individuals of African American/African, Hispanic and Asians descent) (see for example: DuBow & McEwen (1995); Schwerin, (1995); Pipkin & Rifkin, 1984). It is not known what percentage of responders to the survey participated in community mediation programs.

Table 2 - Mediator Demographic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>On-line survey respondents</th>
<th>Age - years</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Educational Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N = 82*</td>
<td>21 – 20 = 0%</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>Bachelor degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 – 40 = 14.6%</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Master's degree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Although 171
accessed the survey, approximately 82 answered each demographic question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 - 60</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 +</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American / African Descent</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-racial</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Juris Doctorate</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.D</td>
<td>1.20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H-P Interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 - 60</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 +</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White, Caucasians, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American / African Descent</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Birkoff (2000) study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26-40</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White, Caucasians, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Caucasian, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White, Caucasian, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61+</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White, Caucasian, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Caucasian, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Georgia Mediators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26-40</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Caucasian, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Caucasian, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Caucasian, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61+</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Caucasian, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Caucasian, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nebraska – Office of Dispute Resolution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White, Caucasian, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Caucasian, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Florida - Office of Dispute Resolution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White, Caucasian, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Caucasian, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Most of mediators were attorneys but business professions also prominent in numbers

Note: Most are health and human service workers
Residency of the Responders and H-P interviewees

With regard to residency, 100% of the survey responders indicated that they resided within the United States. The survey may have been sent outside of the United States but there is no way of knowing given the on-line nature of the survey link. The lack of survey participants from outside of United States may have been due to the survey being presented in English only. There was one suggestion made after the survey was released to have the survey presented in Spanish so that a group of mediators who practice in Mexico and South America could complete the survey but the researcher did not have the language skills to do the conversion nor the technological skills to create dual surveys (one in Spanish and one in English) in SurveyMonkey and successfully merge the results.

With regard to the residency for the H-P mediators, eight of the nine (89%) of the H-P interviewees indicated that they currently resided within the United States. The one that was not residing within the United States at the time of the interview had previously resided in the U.S.

Educational Levels of the Responders and H-P interviewees

Survey participants were asked to indicate the highest grade of school completed. Of the 84 (49%) who elected to answer the question, all responders indicated that they had completed high school and some college (Figure 11). Nineteen percent (16 individuals) reported completing a Bachelor’s degree. The majority of the survey participants (77.3%) reported having obtained a Master’s
degree or a more advanced level of education. Of the participants, 44% completed a Master’s degree (37 of 84 responses); 21.4% indicated they possessed a Juris Doctorate (JD); 2.4% possessed a Doctorate of Philosophy (Ph.D.); and 1.20% have obtained a Doctorate of Education (Ed.D.). Seven individuals (8.3%) indicated that they possessed multiple advance degrees such as a Certificate of Social Work (CSW) and J.D., J.D. and a Master’s degree, two Master’s degrees, or were in the process of obtaining another degree (three participants were currently pursuing a Ph.D.).

Six of the H-P interviewees indicated they possessed a Ph.D., one reported holding a Master’s and two noted completion of a Bachelor’s degree. The educational levels of the respondents and the H-P interviewees were similar to those of the mediators from previous studies as summarized in Table 2. In summary, the survey responder was demographically most typically a White, Caucasian, non-Hispanic between the ages of 51 and 60, who possessed a Master’s degree or higher whereas the average interviewee was a White, Caucasian, non-Hispanic male over the age of 51 with a Ph.D.
Indicators of Conflict Style Preferences

Two questions were asked of the survey responders as well as of the H-P interviewees that focused on how they handle conflict. These two questions asked the mediators to share how they had previously measured on the Myers-Briggs Instrument and the Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Assessment Instrument. The responses to these two indicators of conflict style preferences are discussed next.

**Myers–Briggs Instrument of the Responders and H-P interviewees**

The Myers-Briggs Instrument (MBTI) measures an individual's preference according to four scales: Introversion/Extroversion, Sensing/Intuition, Thinking
Feeling and Judging/Perceiving. The combination of these preferences produces a four-letter type that describes the individual's preferences along all four scales. Some studies have explored MBTI preferences as related to the field of conflict intervention. Smith (2007) in examining what work had been done on personality with the MBTI, noted that “the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Myers & McCauley, 1985) has credibility and wide spread use in the law and mediation community (Fisher, 1992)). Legal practitioners have developed an interest in the use of the MBTI in student learning of negotiation (Peters, 1993), legal interviewing (Peters & Peters, 1990) and mediation (Fisher, 1992))“ (p. 2).

Only 31(18%) of survey responders answered the question that requested their Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI). Of those who responded, the most frequent type indicators specified were ENTJ (6 responses), ENFP (6 responses), ISTJ (5 responses) and INFP (4 responses). Other indicators volunteered were ISFJ (1 response), INTJ (2 responses), ISFP (1 response), ENTP (2 responses), ESTJ (2 responses) and ENFJ (2 responses). Although the number responding to this question was small, it was noted that 21 of the 30 people (70%) responding to the question were female. The breakdown on the various scales were: Introversion/Extroversion - 42% (13 responders) to 58% (18 responders); Sensing/Intuition - 29% (9 responders) to 71% (22 responders); Thinking/Feeling - 55% (17 responders) to 45% (14 responders); and Judging/Perceiving – 58% (18 responders) to 42% (13 responders). This limited
number of responses showed overall a group that reported being higher on the Extroversion, Intuition, Thinking and Judging scales.

Seven of the H-P interviewees had taken the Myers-Briggs instrument but only six could recall their indicator. All six reported a different type. The MBTI types noted in this group were: ENTJ, INTJ, ENFP, INTP, ENFP, and INFP. The breakdowns on the various scales were: Introversion/Extroversion - 50% each; Sensing/Intuition - 100% Intuition; Thinking/Feeling - 50% each; and Judging/Perceiving – 33% to 67%. This limited number of responses showed overall a group who reported being relatively equally displayed on the Extroversion/Introversion scale and the Thinking/Feeling scale while having a preference for the Perceiving and Intuitive side of the other two scales. All of the H-P interviewees have “N” listed as a part of their indicator. Since the HP interviewees are senior mediators or experts in the field, it makes sense that they are more "N" since they need to be individuals who see the "big picture". Among the responders, 22 of the 31 (71%) also have “N” in their indicator suggesting that they are of the same population as the H-P interviewees.

In comparing the type indicator of the H-P interviewees and the responders, the most noticeable differences on the Myers-Briggs scales were the Judging and Perceiving scales. The majority of the H-P interviewees indicated a preference for the Perceiving (67%) side of the scale as compared to 42% of the responders. Baker (2004) (as noted by Smith, 2007) theorized that the mediator who was higher on perceiving scale would focus on providing
disputants with time to commit to a resolution versus the mediator with the judging preference who would focus on providing disputants with time to change one’s mind.

It was also interesting that on the Sensing and Intuitive scales, both groups were higher on the Intuitive than the Sensing side of the scale. This represented 71% of the responders and 100% of the H-P interviewees. Baker (2004) theorized that the mediator who is high on the Intuition scale (a preference for gaining conceptual information) will be more focused on the possibilities for resolving the dispute than the individuals high on the Sensing scale (a preference for gaining concrete information) who will be more focused on the facts of the dispute. Baker’s theory has yet to be tested. Baker’s theories are similar to Riskin’s (1994) mediator techniques grid which showed how mediators defined their roles along an evaluative-facilitative continuum and how mediators defined the problem presented by the parties to the conflict along a narrow-broad continuum. Each mediator, according to Riskin, differs with respect to their beliefs about the nature of the scope of mediation and their assumptions about the parties’ expectations.

Three patterns were most frequently reported among the small sample of responders and H-P interviewees – NFP, NTJ and STJ. A study that has explored quantitative links between mediator personality and mediation style was presented at the 14th Annual conference for Mediators in Florida (Evans, Ramminger & Nichols, (2005)). Evans, et. al. hypothesized that the specific
dominant mediator personalities would be related to the mediator's behavior (Smith, 2007). Individuals with NFP in their profile were seen as demonstrating highly original, open-minded and inspirational ingenious problem solving that was receptive of others’ view points. The mediator’s behavior that one could expect from individuals with NFP was one of letting parties control the process and spending more time engaging in creative problem resolution than they would be in reviewing the case facts. The NFP was represented by 10 of the 31 responders and three of the H-P interviewees in this research.

Among the three most frequent patterns, “J” (Judging) and “T” (thinking) were also frequent. The individual with judging as a part of their predominant orientation is a person concerned with “making decisions, planning operations or organising activities (p. 14, Myers-Briggs, 1996)” (cited in (Adler, 1927). The “T” or thinking dimension would focus on helping disputants come to a conclusion that respects principles of general application such as law (Baker, 2004).

**Thomas- Kilmann Conflict Assessments of the Responders and H-P Interviewees**

The Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Inventory provides information on how different conflict-handling modes or styles affect personal and group dynamics. There are five conflict-handling modes based on two underlying dimensions: assertiveness and cooperativeness. Assertiveness is the degree to which one tries to satisfy his/her own concerns. Cooperativeness is the degree to which
one would try to satisfy the other person’s concerns. The five modes of conflict-handling style are:

- Competing – this style involves high assertiveness and low cooperativeness and is a style in which one tries to satisfy their own concerns at the expense of the other person’s;
- Avoiding – involves low assertiveness and low cooperativeness and the conflict is not addressed and therefore one does not address either the needs of him/herself or the other person;
- Compromising – this style has moderate assertiveness and moderate cooperativeness with one trying to find an acceptable solution that is mutually acceptable and fulfils the needs of both parties at least partially. It differs from collaborating in that some needs may be sacrificed in order to have others met;
- Collaborating – this style is one with high assertiveness and high cooperativeness; when collaborating one works with the other person to find a solution that satisfies both individuals’ concerns; or
- Accommodating – this approach involves low assertiveness and high cooperativeness and it means neglecting one’s own concerns to satisfy those of another person.

Responders were asked to indicate the results of their assessment if a Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Assessment had previously been completed. Of the 42
individuals who responded, 25 (60%) individuals indicated that Collaborating was their number one preferred style of addressing conflict. Accommodating and Compromising were identified as the next most frequent styles with each receiving 5 responses (1.2%) respectively. The least preferred styles of addressing conflict were Competing (indicated by 40%) and Avoiding (31%).

Four of the H-P interviewees (66% of those responding) indicated that Collaborating was their preferred conflict style. Two (33%) indicated that Accommodating was their first preference style. The other three H-P mediators could not recall their preferences and/or whether he/she had ever completed the instrument.

**Family Demographics of the Responders and H-P interviewees**

Responders were asked to answer several questions regarding their parents or the individuals who served in the role of parents while he/she was growing up. Each responder was also asked to answer questions about their siblings. The questions focused on the occupations of parents and siblings and their use of conflict resolution skills in occupations and the community. The responses to these questions are discussed next.

**Siblings and Birth Order**

Eighty respondents (96.4%) indicated that they have or had siblings whereas 3.6% were only children (See Figure 12). Thirty-one percent (25) of the respondents indicated they have/had one sibling; 36.3% (29) have/had two siblings; 16.3% (13) have/had three siblings; 10% (8) have/had four siblings;
2.5% (2) have/had five siblings; 1.3% (1) have/had six siblings; 1.3% (1) have/had seven siblings; and 1.3% (1) have/had nine siblings. With regard to the H-P interviewees, three interviewees (33.3%) were only children, three have/had one sibling (33.3%), one have/had two siblings, one three siblings, and one five siblings (11% each).

![Pie chart showing the distribution of siblings among survey responders.]

**Figure 12 - Data on the Number of Siblings of the Survey Responders**

Of the 78 responders to the question about birth order, “What is your birth order? (Example: Enter 1 of 3 if you are the first born of three children; enter 2 of 3 if you are the second born of three children, etc.)”, almost half (47.4%) of the responders indicated they were first-borns; 28.2% are middle children with regard to birth order; and 24.4% were born last in their family. Of the six H-P interviewees who have/had siblings, two (33.3%) were first-borns, one was born
last in their family and the remaining three (50%) were middle children with regard to birth order.

Beginning in the late 1920s with increased popularity beginning in 1950s, some psychologists emphasized that birth order had an impact on the formation of the personality and other aspects of the life. The "birth order" concept has long been a favorite of psychologists such as humanist Alfred Adler. Adler was the first well-known dissenter from Freud's school of thought. Adler became the father of what he called "individual psychology" or "style of life" (Adler, 1927, 1956, Ansbacher & Ansbacher, 1956, 1967). He shifted the motivational emphasis from biological instincts to social relationships (Counseling Methods Survey: Theories/Theorists & Terminology, 2010).

According to Zajonc and Markus (1975),

"there has been much theorizing about birth order effects in the past. Speculations about birth order effects range from ideas about uterine fatigue to economic factors (Clarke, 1916). Psychological explanations of birth order effects (Schachter, 1959; Sears, 1950) invariably invoke the relationship of the child to its mother. Since Schachter's (1959) work on affiliation, a vast array of consequences have been imputed to birth order. Studies can be found that relate birth order to visual acuity (Becker, 1965)), artistic creativity (Eisenman, 1964), schizophrenia (Farina, Barry, & Garmezy, 1963; Schooler, 1964), pain tolerance (Gelfand, 1963), tolerance of frustration (Glass, Horwitz,
Firestone, & Grinker, (1963), suicide (Lester, (1966)), marital adjustment (Levinger & Sonnheim, (1965), conformity (Sampson, (1962), sociometric choice (Schachter, (1964), alcoholism (Smart, (1963), volunteering for experiments (Ward, (1964), social facilitation (Innes & Sambrooks, (1969), juvenile delinquency (Sletto, (1934), and even extrasensory perception (Green, (1965)). Most recent reviews of the subject matter, however, doubt whether birth order data, with its instability, warrant any theorizing at all. One investigator (Bradley, (1968) writes that, 'After a century of research on birth order it still appears necessary to know what differences occur before a theoretical model can be augmented. Once outcome variables are identified, explorations can turn to why differences occur, (p. 50)'. The viewpoint embodied in this paper may be fairly summarized by a single sentence: Ordinal position at birth has been shown to be related to significant social parameters, though the reasons behind the relations are as yet unknown or at best dimly apprehended (p. 48)'' (p. 76)

Although more recently some psychologists such as Dr. Kevin Leman (1985) and Dr. James Dodson (2004, 2007) advocated the importance of the birth order concept, as a key determinant of human personality traits, Tierney (1983) reported that research "has not proven it. Tierney said: "Birth order theory makes an appealing neat way to categorize human beings -- like astrology, but with scientific trappings ..." (p. 16) After reviewing 35 years of research (some 1500 studies), Ernst and Angst (1983) the reached a simple
conclusion: "On a scale of importance, the effects of birth order fall somewhere between negligible and nonexistent " (p. 16). Bobgan and Bobgan (1990) also reported that numerous studies have shown that the concept of birth order as significant in formation of personality characteristics significant is unfounded. Studies have also examined the relationship between birth order and intelligence. Rogers, Cleveland, van den Oord and Rowe (2000) (among others, see (Zajonc & Mullally, 1997) indicated that the apparent relationship between birth order and intelligence has been a methodological illusion. Although the researcher found some studies that examined the predominance of first born in some occupations (discussed in the literature review in Chapter 2) the literature review did not locate any studies that addressed birth order with regard to conflict interveners or mediators.

**Occupations of Parents or Parental Figures**

The occupations that the responders identified as being held by parents totaled 173. Since some responders indicated that multiple occupations were held by parents or individuals serving in the role of parents when the responders were growing up, it is not possible to compute what percentage of parents served in each occupation. Some of the most frequently listed careers included: educator/education related (26 responses); homemaker/housewife (21 responses); business/sales (29), research related (7); attorney/legal (6); and engineering (6). Other occupations listed included: factory worker, farmer, therapist, bookkeeper, bus driver, artist, social worker, politician, contractor/
construction and seamstress. None of the responders listed mediator as an occupation held by a parent, but in response to the question, “Did your parents, or the individuals who served in the role of your parents when you were growing up, use conflict intervention skills in their career/occupation?”, 32 (38.6%) responded yes. With regard to the question, “Did your parents, or the individuals who served in the role of your parents when you were growing up, use conflict intervention skills in their role in the community?”, 19 (23.2%) responders indicated their parents did utilize the skills.

As was found with the responders, none of the H-P interviewees indicated that their parents held careers as mediators or conflict interveners. The types of careers held by their parents of the H-P interviewees included: physician, homemaker, farmer, teacher, stock broker, custodian, clergy, accountant, engineer, salesman, secretary, and kitchen helper. The most frequently mentioned occupation was homemaker (also the second most frequent occupation mentioned by the on-line survey responders) which may be reflective of the fact that many women did not work outside of the home in the 1940s and 1950s, when five of the H-P interviewees (and at least 35% of the responders) were growing up. To the question “Did your parents, or the individuals who served in the role of your parents when you were growing up, use conflict intervention skills in their career/occupation?” – only 22% or two
H-P interviewees said yes. With regard to the question “Did your parents, or the individuals who served in the role of your parents when you were growing up, use conflict intervention skills in their role in the community?”, 77.8% (seven) of the H-P interviewees indicated their parents did use the skills. It may be noteworthy that in 1940 and 1950s, conflict resolution was not yet a concept specifically identified as an occupation.

**Occupations of Siblings**

Of the 178 current occupations listed for siblings of the responders, the most frequently listed careers included: education/teaching, physician/medical related, attorney, management/business/sales, computer related, student, and homemaker. Occupations presently held by the siblings of H-P interviewees included: physician, teacher, nurse, assistant to professor, attorney, web site manager, seminary president, artist/painter, and executive assistant.

The majority of the siblings of the responders have never been conflict interveners or mediators. Only 6.3% responded in the affirmative to the question, “Are (were) any of your siblings conflict interveners or mediators?” Although only six percent of the responders indicated that a sibling had been a mediator or conflict revolver as an occupation, approximately one third of the responders (34.6% or 27 responders) indicated that their siblings used the conflict intervention skills in their occupations as noted in response to the question, “Do (or did) your sibling(s) use conflict intervention skills in their career/occupation?” Very few of the responders identified their siblings as
utilizing the skills within the community. Nine percent of the responders said yes to the question, “Do (did) your sibling(s) use conflict intervention skills in his/her role in the community or as an avocation?”

None of the H-P interviewees have a sibling who has or had an occupation as a conflict intervener according to the responses provided. The H-P interviewees indicated that some siblings used conflict intervention in an occupation and/or in the community. Two of the H-P interviewees answered yes to the question that a sibling uses the conflict intervention skills in their occupations as noted in response to the question, “Do (or did) your sibling(s) use conflict intervention skills in their career/occupation?” Fifty percent of the H-P interviewees (three of six H-P interviewees answering the question) identified a sibling as utilizing the skills within the community or as an avocation.

One of the statements that caused this researcher to start to think about the backgrounds of mediators was Patrick Phear who commented “that all the ‘good mediators’ he knows come from what he calls ‘complicated’ childhoods in which they grew up ‘desperately needing to make sense of a world of conflict’” (Sarat, 1994, p. 236). Since the majority of the mediators indicated that they were not only children, if Phear’s statement has validity, one would expect siblings of the mediators to have also experienced similarly complicated backgrounds. Furthermore if true, then questions arise as to not only why the mediators choose to become mediators (one of the questions of this research), but why have the siblings elected to not pursue an occupation to help resolve
conflict. Although not the subject of this research, another question that comes to mind is do the occupations selected by the siblings of conflict interveners and/or mediators have any factors in common with the occupation of mediator or do the various occupations of the siblings of conflict interveners and/or mediators have similar attributes?

**Personal Career Path Choices of Responders and H-P interviewees**

**Career Choice of Conflict Intervention**

One of the exploratory questions that the research sought to elicit information about was whether individuals had “actively” selected or planned a conflict resolution career versus whether the career had evolved out of other careers or life endeavors and/or experiences. In response to the survey question asking if the responders chose conflict intervention as a career, 48 individuals (53.9%) indicated that they did so, while 41 (46.1%) did not. However, in response to the question, “Was the choice to become a conflict intervener your first career choice?”, only 16% of the 83 responders indicated that it was. The other 84.1% (74 of the 88 who responded to this question) who indicated that this was not their first choice, articulated a diverse number of other careers that they had held prior to becoming conflict interveners. Some of the careers that responders held prior to becoming a conflict intervener or studying conflict resolution included: legal-related professions (attorney, paralegal, judge) – 14%, business-related professions – 15%, teacher/professor – 10.5%, actor/artist/art
dealer – 7%, computer-related professions – 6%, and writing-related careers (writer/editor/speechwriter) – 6%.

Of the eleven students who responded to the survey, 91% indicated that they have or intend to select conflict intervention as a career but as reflected in the career path decisions of other conflict interveners, most had not selected a career as a conflict intervener as their first career. Only 50% of the students indicated that becoming a conflict intervener was their first career choice. Most of the students indicated they had previously had careers in business or computer-related areas.

All of the H-P Mediators were selected for participation in the interviews due to their expertise and known work in the field of conflict resolution. Perhaps unsurprising, the majority of the them (89%) reflect the same negative answer given by the responders with regard to whether intervening in conflicts was his/her first career choice. Only one of the nine indicated that based on his religious beliefs and the value systems of his family and community, he had pursued conflict intervention as a career. Each interviewee followed a very individualized “path” to become an intervener. Since some of the H-P interviewees helped to form or shape the field, they volunteered or tried various intervention strategies to address conflict situations while involved in other occupations. Some of the fields of work engaged in or careers previously held included national security, the Peace Corps, anthropology, training within organizations and communities, work with Native Americans on reservations,
peace work with NGOs and schools, work with human services, and various governmental agencies at the local and national levels.

Overall, the profile of responders reflected an individual whose parents were neither conflict interveners/mediators nor people who noticeably used conflict intervention skills in their jobs or the communities. The profile also revealed that the responder was most likely a first born with a sibling who did not engage in conflict resolution as a career/occupation but whose sibling may utilize conflict resolution skills at work although not in the community.

What Is In a Title?

When asked to respond to a list of terms (facilitator, ombudsperson, arbitrator, and mediator) to describe their work as a conflict intervener, a variety of terms were selected as shown in Figure 13. On-line survey responders were asked, "If you indicated in the prior section that you consider (or once considered) yourself a conflict intervener, please indicate which, if any, of the following terms describe your work as a conflict resolver." Participants could check all the terms that applied. The majority indicated that they considered themselves mediators (97.4%). Facilitator was also a term that seemed to resonate with those who responded to this question (74%). A smaller percentage of the participants indicated that they identified with the term arbitrator (16.9%) or ombudsman (15.6%). An additional option was presented in the question for participants to indicate any other terms that they used to identify themselves while engaging in conflict intervention work. Some other terms that
responders used to describe their work as a conflict revolver were: coach/conflict coach, consultant, conciliator, teacher/trainer, back-channel coordination, neutral investigator, collaborative lawyer, community organizer/representative, and user of mediative skills in the performance of job.

H-P interviewees also used a variety of terms to describe their roles. Only two indicated that mediator was a term they used to refer to their role or work. Some of the terms used by the H-P interviewees to describe themselves or their work included: process guide, facilitator, convener, situation assessor, moderator of dialogues, peace builder, conflict transformation, trainer, and dispute system designer. Several of the H-P interviewees noted that either he/she did not use titles to describe their role but instead chose to explain the processes that were used to assist individuals or that he/she detailed the various situation specific terms they typically used when they were intervening.

The variety of terms used by the responders and H-P interviewees to describe their work, seemed to reflect the various roles described in the literature. Laue (1978), Moore (1986), Mitchell (1981), Herrman (2006), Fisher and Keashly (1991), Zartman and Touval (1985), Touval and Zartman (1989) and Bercovitch, (1997) explained that a conflict intervener or mediator may serve differing roles in a conflict or may utilize different names for their roles within a conflict.
Each responder was also asked to discuss when he/she uses their mediation skills. Specifically they were asked to respond to the question, “You have indicated that you consider yourself a mediator or previously considered yourself a mediator. Do you use your mediative skills when you are not mediating?” All the responders to this question (N=39) answered in the affirmative which further suggested that the skills are being used regardless of what title or name is used for the role of the intervener or process the intervener uses. Some of the skills that were identified as being used outside of mediation included: listening/active listening, coaching, reflecting, reframing, questioning, analyzing information, acknowledging, finding common ground, clarifying,
paraphrasing, summarizing, practicing neutrality, developing options, reality testing, empathy, and the use of ground rules.

The Path to Becoming a Conflict Intervener

As expected in a field with individuals from a variety of educational disciplines and career backgrounds, the responders to the on-line survey reported numerous avenues that led to becoming a conflict intervener. Mediators were asked to “Please briefly describe the series of career choices or decisions that led you to becoming an intervener or to study conflict resolution.” Eighty-five individuals responded to the question. Although each story is unique, based on the responses, the researcher loosely grouped the statements about the series of career choices or decisions into categories. The categories were: formal education/training (represented the most frequent number of responses - 28 of the 85); training provided by employer; career or work in a field (such as human resources, military, international experience, Federal environmental policy experience, or responsibility for a federal policy dialogue or conciliator in civil rights) that required conflict resolution skills; work in an allied social science field; legal practice (attorneys) that began to include other interventions (11 of the 85 responses); personal experiences with conflict or the judicial system that was not satisfactory; becoming a parent (mentioned by multiple responders); following the steps/guidance of family members or a mentor; personal epiphany or revelation that the mediator or conflict resolution would be a better fit to personal values.

15 Responders were not specifically asked to indicate how they became a mediator.
that other conflict resolution approaches; or lastly personal value system (for example one responder noted that “I was brought up in the Church of the Brethren, so I had a mind-set of peace and reconciliation”).

The responses provided to the open-ended questions reflect those provided to the forced choice questions (multiple choice) asked later in the online survey. In response to the question “How did you become interested in being a mediator?”, 30.3% (20 responses) of the 66 who responded to the question indicated that it was due to “collateral duties to primary job tasks”. The second most selected choice was “second career choice” with 21.2% (14 responses). Other responses included “avocation” selected by 15.2% (10 responses), “work in the community” as selected by 10.6% (7 responses), and “primary career choice” selected by 7.6% (5 responses). Tied for the second most frequent selected responses was “Other”, receiving 15.2% (10 responses). Information shared under the “Other” category revealed that the responders became interested in being a mediator via school or training, referrals or suggestions by a friend or family member, volunteer role in the community, new career for middle age or divine guidance.

Based on the responses to the open-ended and the closed-ended questions, most of the responders to the survey indicated that introduction to becoming a conflict intervener or mediator was via either a formal education or training in conflict resolution. In further support of the importance of education or training as a “door” that led to conflict intervener roles, in response to the
question on the on-line survey, “How did you first learn of the process of mediation?”, the most frequent response selected was via school or university (selected by 31.8% or 21 of the 66 who responded to the question). Another circumstance that was reported as being significant on the path to becoming a conflict intervener was being in a career or work in a field that required conflict resolution skills or collateral duties to primary job tasks. One additional circumstance that was frequently reported as having pointed individuals to becoming an intervener or mediator included the pursuit of a career change. Since the "high-profile" mediators are known in the field, the researcher has elected to not share the individual stories of the steps on their paths to become conflict interveners to maintain confidentiality.

Conflict Intervention Experience

Types of Cases Handled

With regard to the types of types of cases handled, 58 survey responders, who indicated that they intervene in conflict as a profession, routinely handled a variety of cases so that the numbers of cases noted were greater than the number of responses to this question. The types of cases most frequently reported as being covered were: family related (included juvenile issues, divorce, custody, domestic/ family) noted 39 times; work place issues (included employee relations, discrimination, employee disputes, employee and supervisor disputes, and discrimination and other EEO issues) also mentioned 39 times; business
issues (included commercial, consumer and contract disputes) listed 16 times; and community (8 responses); and civic (5 responses).

Responders were asked to indicate “How many cases do you handle in a month? (A case is an intervention with parties in a specific conflict situation. One case may involve multiple contacts with the parties including pre-evaluation, intake, one or more sessions and follow-up)”. The majority of the 33 responders (57.9%) indicated they handle less than five cases per month and spend an average less than five hours per month mediating.

**Types of Cases Prefer to Handle**

Several questions on the survey inquired about the types of cases mediators addressed, what types of cases they preferred versus those they preferred not to handle and why. In the opening section of the on-line survey, responders were asked a series of open-ended questions on types of cases preferred. Fifty-four percent of those who responded to the questions indicated there were cases they preferred to handle. Types of cases responders preferred to work on included those related to family (divorce, custody, domestic), workplace disputes, and business.

Similar types of preferred cases were selected under the multiple choice section of the survey. In response to the question of which types of mediation cases mediator prefer to handle, the majority selected work place relationships (80% or 48 out of 60 responses) and work place organizational conflicts (70% or 42 out of 60 responses) as shown on Figure 14. As shown in Figure 15,
responders also expressed that they are especially qualified to handle cases that involve workplace relationships and workplace organizational conflicts. Among the H-P interviewees, it was expressed that they felt qualified to handle complex multi-party conflict, entrenched parties, small business, international conflicts, workplace with multi-parties, multi-party cases in environmental issues, international with deep-rooted conflict, organizational, restorative justice cases, civil war and aftermath, and intergovernmental conflict.

![Preferred Mediation Cases](image)

**Figure 14 - Preferred Mediation Cases**
Types of Cases Prefer Not to Handle

Responders also indicated that there were types of cases they preferred not to handle or choose not to handle. Fifty six percent (31 out of 55 responses) expressed having a preference. The types of cases most preferred to not be handled included those related to domestic relations/family disputes and divorce. Other types of cases not preferred were those related to business, community racial conflicts, politics between countries, “egregious human rights violations on part of state and non-state actors”, landlord-tenant, neighbor and noise disputes, cases involving physical violence, political issues, violence, behavioral disorders, commercial arbitration and/or mediation, offender-victim mediation and probate cases.

Outside of one H-P interviewee who did not have any cases he would prefer to not handle, the others had preferences. Cases some would prefer to
not handle included divorce, community, commercial cases, organizational –
public, two-party (cited as “not interesting”), construction, dialogues where trying
to change relationships, family, and “run-of the mill” neighborhood conflicts.
Based on this list, it appeared that the H-P interviewees were accustomed and
preferred to dealing with large more complicated mediations.

**Types of Cases Trained to Handle**

Responders indicated that they have been specifically trained to handle
cases involving mediations between two parties, child custody, divorce, general
disputes, interpersonal, organizational, human resources, workplace, small
claims, and policy. Seven out of 47 responders indicated that they were
comfortable handling all types of cases whereas other responders expressed a
comfort with handling only certain types of cases such as workplace disputes,
community, and family/domestic. H-P interviewees noted that they were
qualified to handle cases with multi-issues, where the divorce parties were
entrenched, workplace and/or employee disputes, multi-party complex, multi-
party, small claims, domestic issues, and deep-rooted conflict dialogues.

**Metaphor**

Survey responders were asked to respond to the question “If you were to
use a metaphor to describe your role as a conflict intervener, what would it be?
Please describe your role in the metaphor.” Forty-two responders elected to
address this question. Some of the metaphors provided short one or two word
responses that utilized typical mediator titles (such as facilitator, facilitative mediator or coach facilitator) whereas others provided very elaborate descriptions of the mediator’s roles. Some of the metaphors shared by the responders included references to being a symbol of safety or rescue, which steers parties during storms; serving as a guide/teacher/role model; being a resource to help mend the parties, the issues and fix relationships; and creator of the “climate” or “environment”.

In the category of being a symbol of safety or rescue, which steers parties during storms, some of the statements shared included: bridge; I am the bridge between the river banks; bridge builder; a lighthouse; I help people navigate turbulent waters and difficult times in their lives, sometimes by helping them understand the consequences of the choices they make; I see myself as the eye in the storm; as a Harbor Pilot who is used to steer a valuable cargo through treacherous waters. (I'm the Harbor Pilot!); and I am the guide over the rushing waters, who helps them to find the stones on which they can step, to get across the river, safely to the other side, through the conflict and able to move forward on the paths of their lives.

With reference to metaphors that seem to fit into the category of serving as a guide/teacher/role model, the following were provided: referee of a game or dance instructor (sometimes I feel like I am in the middle trying to keep things fair and allow the game to go on; - Other times I feel like I am helping folks learn to
dance together or find a new way to do the dance); On-ramp to a highway of self-determination; I am a gardener. Sometimes I seed, sometimes I prune, sometimes I guide, sometimes I weed, sometimes I water, sometimes I wait for the rain, sometimes I harvest, sometimes I cut down. As with the gardener, sometimes the intervener’s role is to destroy as well as to raise up. It’s important that we take ownership of that; function as a social traffic officer…self explanatory; I am the path to resolution; cruise director on Noah’s Ark; neutral bird that only listens and parrots; dove in flight; depends on the situation. Coach/cheerleader when I am helping people make decisions about how to handle a conflict; and I am the listener who helps you to hear yourself and the other. I am the acceptor of your concerns and emotions. I am the patience which helps you to see the path. I am the questioner who helps you to choose your path.

Other metaphors suggested the mediator served as a resource to help mend the parties the issues and fix relationships. Metaphors in this category included: my role is like a tool someone would use to repair or build something; glue; untying a knot; “This is really tough. The one that comes to mind is that my work is like being a locksmith. (I know, that’s a simile.) I think that people—especially in the multi-party, multi-agenda mediations with which I work—are each like the spring-loaded cylinders in a lock and they are jammed into a non-working position. My job is to be the locksmith that helps them to see their way to
unjamming their cylinders so that the tumblers will click when the key—which they collectively hold—is inserted and turned to unlock the solution. How’s that fer thinkin' on my feet?”

Another group of metaphors presented the mediator as a role model or “climate” or weather creator. Some metaphors in this category were: “I see myself as a conduit for a better reality; I provide a voice to the voiceless”; “The first thing that comes to mind is a "healer," although I'm not sure that is accurate. I practice a transformative form of conflict intervention. Often people have severed ties with the relationship and don't know how to reach out to repair the breach. The work I do seems to not only heal the relationship, but transform it into something new and stronger.”; “I am the listener who helps you to hear yourself and the other. I am the acceptor of your concerns and emotions. I am the patience which helps you to see the path. I am the questioner who helps you to choose your path.”; “A peace officer comes to a home to resolve a conflict between two parties. The role of the peace officer is first to calm the emotions, then to help the parties identify the real issues of conflict and potential solutions that both parties can live with; and I remain calm and rational, and help to pull the parties in that direction”.

The “High Profile” mediators also provided metaphors. Some of the metaphors shared by this group included: trampoline and “when I start to jump a reaction occur”; filler of vases – put in rocks, little rocks, sand and fill-up and they
find their level; creator of sanctuaries – generate creative sanctuary, acknowledge, affirm and empower; herding cats – try to get very disparate parties together; building a puzzle – think role is to help parties put puzzle together, look at the pieces; move around, see how they fit – texture, shape and how they go together; get the borders; role of holding all things together – spider web (too icky); like network (boring word) ocean being some kind of ship or anchor in tumulous times; some combination of a fly on a wall – objective 3rd party watching conflict unfold in front of me; old cartoon – devil & angel on shoulder – voice of conscience – helping them look at pros and cons of situation (voice of reason); similar to a doctor – diagnose what seems to be working and prescribe what is not; a course of action to address; Peacemaker; and Catalyst – acknowledge the largest elements are already present; catalyst is small but necessary key to unlock the action; present as needed – get out of the road and let action occur.

**Mediator Experience – Number of years**

Responders were asked to answer the survey question “If you consider yourself a mediator currently, how long have you mediated?” As pictured in the graph below, the length of experience of responders who are currently mediators was varied. Of the 76 who addressed the question, approximately 37% had less than five years experience while 16% had five years but less than 10 years of experience. Approximately 33% indicated they have 10 years or more of experience.
experience. Some responders who describe themselves as mediators (11 or 14.5%) indicated they were not currently mediating. This was in contrast to the number of responses (26) to the question “If you previously considered yourself a mediator, how long did you mediate?” In response to the second question, the average mediator who is no longer considering him/herself a mediator, 26.9% had more than 10 years of mediating experience before stopped mediating. Almost half of those no longer mediating (46%) had less than three years of experience before stopping with 62% having less than five years of experience before ending this role. While approximately half of the responders have 5 or more years of experience, H-P interviewees have on average between 15 to 30 years of experience with two having 27 years and five having 30 or more years of intervention experience.

**Figure 16 - Years of Mediating Experience**
As pictured in Figure 16, the length of experience of responders who are currently mediators was varied. Of the 76 who addressed the question, approximately 37% had less than five years experience while 16% had five years but less than 10 years of experience. Approximately 33% indicated they possessed 10 years or more of experience. Some responders who describe themselves as mediators (11 or 14.5%) indicated they were not currently mediating. This was in contrast to the number of responses (26) to the question “If you previously considered yourself a mediator, how long did you mediate?” In response to the second question, the average mediator who is no longer considering him/herself a mediator, 26.9% had more than 10 years of mediating experience before stopped mediating. Almost half of those no longer mediating (46%) had less than three years of experience before stopping with 62% having less than five years of experience before ending this role. While approximately half of the responders have 5 or more years of experience, H-P interviewees have on average 24 years of intervention experience.

**Where Do They Mediate?**

When asked to indicate in which countries or provinces do you mediate, responders (56) indicated that they serve in a variety of places around the globe including the United States, Puerto Rico, Jordan, Latin America, Asia, India, Pakistan, Kenya, UK, Portugal, Canada and Afghanistan. Replies to the follow-up question of “if you mediate in the United States, indicate in which state(s) you
mediate?” revealed that most of the responders practice in Georgia, New York and Virginia. This is not surprising given that an invitation via email was sent to several organizations and list serves of mediators in these three states. Of the sixteen participants who indicated that they previously but no longer mediated, only one had mediated outside of the U.S.

Of the H-P interviewees who were currently mediating, five indicated that they sometimes mediate outside of the U.S. Although the H-P interviewees were not specifically asked to list the places where they had mediated or intervened in conflict, during the course of the interview some of the places were referenced. Places mediated include Kenya, Liberia, Israel, Pakistan, Solomon’s Island, Pacific Islands, and Burundi.

Certification

The majority of the responders (47) who resided in a state where certifications to mediate are issued, indicated they were currently certified (75.6%). Only three H-P interviewees were certified.

Training as a Mediator

Of the seventy seven who answered the questions as to whether they had received training as a mediator, all indicated they had. Over 80.3% (61 responders) indicated they have received over 60 hours of training while the remaining 19.7 (15 individuals) have received less than 60 hours. The
amount of mediation training H-P interviewees possessed ranged from no specific formal training in mediation to well over 500 hours. Several of the interviewees indicated they had training in facilitation instead of mediation.

**Mediative Skills**

Mediators are trained to use certain skills when formally intervening in a case. The researcher inquired of the responders as to whether they used those skills (referred to as mediative skills) when not formally mediating. The question that was presented was “You have indicated that you consider yourself a mediator or previously considered yourself a mediator. Do you use your mediative skills when you are not mediating?” Thirty-nine individuals indicated they did so. In response to the question “Do you use mediative skills when you are not mediating?”, 35 individuals stated that they did. Mediative skills reported as being used included active listening, paraphrasing, reframing, reflecting, clarifying, organizing, recording, acknowledging, caucusing incorporated in intra-organization, inter-organization, inter-communal and intra-communal situations, remaining neutral to avoid becoming positional, finding common ground, facilitating bringing others to common ground, and evaluative analysis of facts. The skills were also reflected as providing a way to be neutral and maintain the confidentiality of the case and “always asking questions to get to the true interests”. Several responders indicated they used the skill all the time. It was stated by one responder as “I use listening skills all of the time, both as a trainer and when working with colleagues in the office”. Situations where the
responders indicated they used the skill included: in contract negotiations with
the union, in grievance resolution, in resolving employee disputes, in mediation
between clients and our company, our company and outside consultants, family
decision-making, employee disputes, in training and in getting along with my
peers. H-P interviewees indicated they did use mediative skills outside of formal
mediations. Skills used included “all the tools in the tool box”, straight facilitation,
identifying issues, getting people to tell their story, facilitating others to hear the
other person’s side of the story, and skills used in a moderator’s role.

Arenas Where Mediate

In response to the forced-choice question of “In which of the following
arenas do you typically mediate cases?”, the majority of the 55 responders to this
question indicated interpersonal (83.6% or 20 responses), followed by Intra-
Organizational (56.4% or 31 responses), Intra-Community (38.2% or 20
responses), and Inter-Organizational (36.4% or 20 responses). Fewer
individuals mediate between Inter-Community (10.9% or 6 responses), Intra-
national (7.3% or 4 responses) or International (1.8% or one response). The H-
P interviewees indicated they mediated cases in the international, national with a
country focus, community within community, within sovereign areas (tribes);
national (“with the U.S. on a national level”), and community. They also reported
addressing cases that involved multi-party complex, restorative justice and civil
wars and aftermaths.
In reference to where the responders preferred to mediate, the responses are similar to where they actually mediate. Expressed preferences by arenas were: interpersonal - 82.5%, Intra-Organizational (within organizations) - 59.6%; Inter-Organizational (between organizations) - 47.4%; Intra-Community (within community) - 43.9%; Inter-Community (between communities) - 24.6%; International (between countries or nations) - 15.8% and Intra-national (within a country or nation) - 12.3%. The H-P interviewees indicated they preferred to mediate with multiple parties, workplaces, international and national within a state, international between countries, and within sovereign areas (tribes).

Are Cases “Too Close” to Mediate?

Two questions about the closeness of a case on the possible impact on the mediator’s comfort were asked. The two questions were: “Have you ever felt that a case was ‘too close’ to you to mediate because of past events in your life?” and “What events did you experience that made you feel the case was ‘too close’ to you?” The majority of the responders to the on-line survey indicated that they had not encountered a case that they felt was too close to mediate because of past events in their life. With regard to the question “have you ever felt that a case was “too close” to you to mediate because of past events in your life?, those who selected no were 84.2% (48 of 57 responses) compared with those who indicated yes at 15.5% (9 responses). Of those who indicated they had experienced a situation in which a case was “too close”, some reasons noted
were “I was the supervising officer for a probationer who was a party in an insurance dispute. I had to recluse myself from the mediation”; “Counter transference is always an issue but one has to learn to use it as a tool in the process instead of an obstacle to be overcome”; “Personal constitution”; “Divorce/custody cases where children are involved and the parties lie. The children become victims in their parent's battle”; and “extreme controlling behavior”. The responses appear to suggest that for this group of responders there is rarely a point beyond which the shared circumstances/events are “too close” for the mediator to be effective. The H-P interviewees were not asked this question.

Summary

The stories of the responders are varied and many reported different life events and circumstances have resulted in their career decision to become mediators. Their metaphors provide powerful examples of how they perceive themselves and their roles in conflict intervention. This group of current mediators (64% are presently handling cases) are generally a highly educated group (Bachelor’s degree or higher) who have received 60 plus hours of training in mediation. They have numerous years of mediation experience (30% have three to 10 years of experience with over 33% have more than 10 years of experience) and preferred collaboration as their preferred style of responding to conflict. They are often the first person in their families to intervene in conflicts formally but some reported parents and sibling use the skill in the community and
in their careers. This group of mediators acknowledged being mediators but also identified with other terms for the role they play in conflict intervention (facilitator being the most frequently used term).
8. Impact of Events Experienced by Mediators

Introduction

As indicated in the research and methodology design in Chapter 5, a survey was conducted of mediators, students of academic institutions specializing in conflict resolution studies, and students of mediation training programs to identify circumstances/events that were significant in their decision to become a mediator. The purpose of the survey was to explore what, if any, type of relationship exists between events, types of cases undertaken, and arenas in which mediators choose to practice. The research utilized a multi-hybrid research approach consisting of a background summary of the High Profile mediators, interviews with High Profile mediators and surveys of current mediators and student studying mediation.

In the first sections of the survey, the responders were asked to provide their Thomas/Kilmann Conflict Assessment Instrument results, Myers-Briggs results, and information about their experience as a conflict intervener, including his/her conflict resolution roles, identify events that led him/her to becoming a conflict intervener, and career choices/decisions. They were also asked to discuss the types of cases they typically handled and information regarding mediation experience, (including length of time as a mediator, duration of career,
number of cases mediated, amount of mediation training, and average number of cases mediated per month). Lastly they were asked to provide demographical information. The demographic information and questions about the training of mediators and their types of experiences were analyzed in the prior chapter.

In the same survey, respondents were provided a list of circumstances and events (Figure 17) and asked to indicate whether he/she had experienced any of them directly or indirectly. (The instructions are shown in Figures 6, 7, and 8 in Chapter 6). To attempt to address the forgetfulness factor, a list of events and circumstances was provided to help facilitate recall. They were also afforded an opportunity to list any other circumstances, events, or other significant factors not on the list that they may have experienced that influenced the decision to become a mediator or led to becoming a mediator.

If the respondent indicated that he/she had experienced a particular circumstance or an event, he/she was asked a series of questions about the experience. The respondents were asked at approximately what age he/she experienced the event or circumstance and whether the event was experienced directly or whether the mediators viewed others experiencing the event or circumstance. If the mediator indicated he/she viewed the event or circumstance, the mediator was asked to identify the physical, psychological, and emotional proximity of the event/circumstance’s participants to him or herself. The mediator was asked to indicate the degree to which the event influenced them personally. The mediator was then asked to indicate whether the events
identified had any impact on their mediator case type preference. The H-P interviewees were also presented with the list of events and asked to indicate if they too had experienced them.

1. Situation where others did not have an opportunity to present their side of a story
2. Unfair business practices
3. Altercation involving physical violence
4. Altercation involving personal verbal attack (raised voices, profanity, etc.)
5. Individual(s) suing an individual, business, group or organization or being sued by an individual, business, group or organization
6. Participant in a formal court proceeding
7. Attendance at a formal court proceeding (you were not a party in the proceeding)
8. Heard of others going to court
9. Visit to an attorney’s office
10. Non-violent Demonstrations/Protests
11. Violent Demonstrations/Protests
12. Civil Unrest on Mass Scale
13. Acts of physical violence – Not during civil unrest
14. A complaint resolution process other than through the court system
15. Racially/ethnically diverse neighborhood
16. Racially/ethnically diverse neighborhood with tensions due to differences
17. Overt prejudice due to race, gender, handicap or religious beliefs
18. Covert/subtle prejudice due to race, gender, handicap or religious beliefs
19. Parents divorce during your childhood
20. Child sexual abuse/incest
21. Psychological abuse of children
22. Alcohol abuse
23. Drug use
24. Mental illness
25. Frequent physical relocation
26. Separation from family
27. A parent’s remarriage
28. Parent’s separation
29. Custody battle for children
30. Enrollment in social science or social justice class/seminar
31. Religious beliefs or education
32. Family history of advocacy or community involvement
33. While performing a profession in which conflict was prevalent, recognizing the need to use other approaches
34. Discussion of or awareness of social justice issues
35. Work, travel or residency in other countries

Figure 17 - List of Events/Situations Used in On-Line Survey
The purpose of the reporting on the experiencing of the events was to conduct an exploration of what, if any, type of relationship exists between events, types of cases undertaken, and arenas in which mediators choose to practice. The responses regarding the events will be discussed next in this Chapter.

**Grouping of Events**

The on-line survey responders were presented with thirty-five events (see Figure 17.) The H-P interviewees received a list of thirty-three events which is available in Appendix C.\(^{16}\) Due to the number of events that responders were asked to indicate if they had experienced; the researcher grouped the circumstances or events into four circumstances/event patterns to facilitate data analysis. The four patterns were overt violence, societal fairness, legal issues, and personal identity or worth. The researcher initially assigned the events to one of four circumstances or event patterns based on a pilot study conducted as part of a research class assignment (Marshall, 1999). After assigning the circumstances/events to the four patterns using their assigned event number in Figure 18, the researcher asked experienced mediators to critique the groupings to offer feedback as to the accuracy, completeness and usefulness of the groupings. Based on the feedback received the research arrived at the patterns shown in Figures 18 and 19.

\(^{16}\) The list of events for the on-line survey was prepared after the telephonic interviews had been started for the interviewees. The list of events was modified and expanded based on feedback from the individuals who tested the on-line survey.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Category</th>
<th>Category Title</th>
<th>Events Assigned to the Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Event Category I</td>
<td>Overt violence</td>
<td>3, 11, 12, 13, 17, 20,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Category II</td>
<td>Societal fairness</td>
<td>1, 10, 14, 30, 32, 33, 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Category III</td>
<td>Legal issues</td>
<td>2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 28, 29,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Category IV</td>
<td>Personal identity or worth</td>
<td>4, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 31, 35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 18 - Categories of Circumstances and Events

**Event Category I – Overt violence**

3. Altercation involving physical violence  
11. Violent Demonstrations/Protests  
12. Civil Unrest on Mass Scale  
13. Acts of physical violence – Not during civil unrest  
17. Overt prejudice due to race, gender, handicap or religious beliefs  
20. Child sexual abuse/incest

**Event Category II- Societal Fairness**

1. Situation where others did not have an opportunity to present their side of a story  
10. Non-violent Demonstrations/Protest  
14. A complaint resolution process other than through the court system  
30. Enrollment in social science or social justice class/seminar  
32. Family history of advocacy or community involvement  
33. While performing a profession in which conflict was prevalent, recognizing the need to use other approaches  
34. Discussion of or awareness of social justice issues

**Event Category III – Legal Issues**

2. Unfair business practices  
5. Individual(s) suing an individual, business, group or organization or being sued by an individual, business, group or organization  
6. Participant in a formal court proceeding  
7. Attendance at a formal court proceeding (you were not a party in the proceeding)  
8. Heard of others going to court  
9. Visit to an attorney’s office  
28. Parent’s separation  
29. Custody battle for children

**Event Category IV – Personal Identity or Worth**

4. Altercation involving personal verbal attack (raised voices, profanity, etc.)  
15. Racially/ethnically diverse neighborhood  
16. Racially/ethnically diverse neighborhood with tensions due to differences  
18. Covert/subtle prejudice due to race, gender, handicap or religious beliefs  
19. Parents divorce during your childhood  
21. Psychological abuse of children  
22. Alcohol abuse  
23. Drug use  
24. Mental illness  
25. Frequent physical relocation  
26. Separation from family  
27. A parent’s remarriage  
31. Religious beliefs or education  
34. Work, travel or residency in other
Number of Survey Responders

Between sixty-seven and seventy-one individuals responded to each question that asked them to indicate whether they had experienced thirty-five events or situations. If they indicated that they had experienced a specific event or situation, they were then asked three follow-up questions per event. The follow-up questions asked their age when they first experienced the event; extent the event or situation may have influenced, impacted or affected them; and to specify the nature of the impact or influence on their life (positive, negative, neutral or did not know).

Events Experienced

The events that were reported as being experienced the most included:

- Altercation involving personal verbal attack (raised voices, profanity, etc.);
- Visit to an attorney’s office;
- Covert/subtle prejudice due to race, gender, handicap or religious beliefs;
- Religious beliefs or education;
- Discussion of or awareness of social justice issues; and
- Work, travel or residency in other countries.
These events were all reported as being experienced by over 75% of the mediators personally, their family and/or a close acquaintance i.e. “experienced in close physical or psychological proximity”. Other events that were reported as being experienced by a large percentage of the mediators, included:

- Unfair business practices;
- Altercation involving physical violence;
- Heard of others going to court;
- Racially/ethnically diverse neighborhood;
- Overt prejudice due to race, gender, handicap or religious beliefs;
- Enrollment in social science or social justice class/seminar;
- Family history of advocacy or community involvement; and
- While performing a profession in which conflict was prevalent, recognizing the need to use other approaches.

All of these events were reported as being experienced by over 60% of the mediators, their family and/or a close acquaintance (See Table 4).

**Age at Which Events were Experienced and the Type of Influence**

The respondents were asked to indicate the age at which they first experienced the events. Most of the events, twenty-five of the thirty-five (71%), were reported as being first experienced as a young adult (ages 18 to 35). Events experienced as a young adult were reported as being of strong influence (twenty-two of the twenty-five events or 88% of the events). The nature of the influence on the young adults was perceived as being negative about half of the
time (thirteen of the twenty events experienced). For the events where the influence was reported as being positive, the number of individuals reporting such (61.5%) was generally higher than for the negative events (55%) (See Table 4).

Although the researcher had anticipated that events experienced as a child would have a significant impact on the decision to become a mediator, very few events (only seven) were reported as being first experienced as a child. The events that were reported as being experienced as a child included:

- Situation where others did not have an opportunity to present their side of a story;
- Altercation involving physical violence;
- Racially/ethnically diverse neighborhood;
- Parents divorce during your childhood;
- Psychological abuse of children;
- Religious beliefs or education; and
- Family history of advocacy or community involvement.

The events that were first experienced as a child were reported as having a strong degree of influence (the scale was strong influence, some influence, slight influence, no influence and Do not know/Cannot remember). Two of the events experienced in childhood had the highest of the negative influence ratings across all age groups for all events. These were – Altercation involving physical violence (70.2% of responders reported influence as negative) and Psychological
abuse of children (73.3% of responders reported influence as negative). The literature on trauma suggested that traumas that occurred earlier in life have a greater impact. It should also be noted that some of the highest positive influence scores were also given to events reported as first being experienced in childhood. These included: Family history of advocacy or community involvement (93% of responders reported positive influence) and Religious beliefs or education (75.4% of responders reported positive influence). This limited data suggested that events experienced by mediators as children may have had tremendous impact on career choices many years later. The literature on career choice as summarized in Chapter 2 indicated that some models of career stated that various inputs are transferred into outputs of career activities (Young & Friesen, 1990). Other research suggested that one’s career choice may be a part of or impacted by an individual’s world-view (Gysbers et al., 2003), which in turn is acquired via the enculturation process. The human development literature also emphasized the formative influence of feedback from the external world. The events experienced by the mediators as children would have been a portion of that feedback that in turn may have impacted on the career choice according to the systems models of career choice.

**Categories of Events Most Experienced**

Mediators were also presented with the list of thirty-five events and asked to “list in rank order the letter that corresponds to the five events/situations that most impacted on your decision to become a mediator (1= the event from the list...
that had the most impact on your choice to become a mediator; 5 = event that had the least impact on your choice to become a mediator”). The greatest number of events that the mediators reported as having an impact on their decision to become a mediator was found in the Category II - Societal fairness (see Figures 18 and 19). The second greatest number of events that the mediators reported as having an impact on their decision to become a mediator was in the Category III – Legal Issues. Fewer events were reported as having an impact on their decision to become a mediator in Categories I – Overt Violence and Category IV – Personal Identity and/or Worth which had the fewest events reported as influencing the decision to become a mediator.

When the five events that mediators were asked to list as most having the most impact were tallied, the events identified most frequently by the 48 responders as significant in impacting their career choice to become a mediator, were:

- Event 1 - Situation where others did not have opportunity to present their story;
- Event 2 - Unfair business transaction;
- Event 17 - Overt prejudice due to race, gender, handicap or religious beliefs;
- Event 31 - Religious beliefs or education; and
- Event 34 - Discussion of or awareness of social justice issues.
If just the number one event identified by each mediator as having the greatest impact on the decision to become a mediator is noted, the most identified events were in Category III (reported by 13 responders or 33% of the responders) and Category IV events (reported by 12 responders or 30%). Category II events were indicated by 10 individuals or 25% as having the greatest impact on the decision. Category I events were infrequently listed as the having the most impact on the career decision to become a mediator. Only 12.5% or five responders identified events in this category as having the most impact on the career decision.

Based on this information, some mediators do believe that events experienced impacted their decision to become a mediator. Some also indicated that the events influenced the types of cases they handled as mediators. The events that the mediators indicated they experienced that had the greatest impact on their decision to become a mediator were:

- Situation where others did not have opportunity to present their story;
- Worked in a setting with prevalent conflict;
- Parents divorce during your childhood; and
- Participant in a court proceeding.

When asked “Do any of the events/situations that you have identified as having a high impact on your decision to become a mediator, influence the types of mediation cases you are interested in handling as a mediator?”, 45.5% (25 individuals) said it had an influence whereas, 54.5% (30 individuals) said it did
not. Responses to this question seemed to contradict the prior answers to the question discussed above where responders were asked to indicate the events that impacted on the decision to become a mediator. Possible explanations for why the answers to the two questions seem to be contradictory include that mediators may have a desire to increase competencies across many types of cases regardless of their backgrounds or that mediators are willing to attempt to mediate many different types of cases. Since the responses to this question are almost split equally for the affirmative and the negative, additional research would be necessary to ascertain if events/situations that were identified as having a high impact on the decision to become a mediator, influenced the types of mediation cases the mediator is interested in handling or if there are other unknown factor influencing the mediator's actions.

Many have been intrigued by some common themes in the personal histories of those drawn to mediation such as being victims of violence, victims of war, children of alcoholics, of divorce, of diasporas (to name just a few) and puzzled if mediators are drawn to healing the broken aspects of personal and geopolitical lives (Menkel-Meadow, 2003). Although additional research is necessary before one could conclude that common histories or traumas have occurred with mediators, the theories of basic human needs may help explain some of the similarity demonstrated among mediators who have experienced trauma. Basic human needs theory indicated that the needs are unalterable and nonnegotiable and must be satisfied. So regardless of what traumas have been
experienced, the mediators, like all humans would, according to basic human needs theory, strive to have those needs satisfied. This explorative research was not able to ascertain if mediation is a vehicle used to address those needs. The urge to fulfill the basic needs as well as actions taken to fulfill those needs may very well be an input into the world-view and in turn the career choice decision making.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Table 3 - Events Experienced by Mediators and the Impact</strong></th>
<th><strong>Number of Responders that Answered Question</strong></th>
<th><strong>Personally Experienced</strong></th>
<th><strong>Family Experienced Involved</strong></th>
<th><strong>Close Acquaintance Experienced</strong></th>
<th><strong>Total % that Experienced in “Close” Manner</strong></th>
<th><strong>Age at which the Most Responders Experienced Event</strong></th>
<th><strong>Degree of Influence</strong></th>
<th><strong>Positive or Negative Influence</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Situation where others did not have an opportunity to present their side of a story</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>43.20%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
<td>Child - 46% )</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Neg - 47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Unfair business practices</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>9.70%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>Y. Adult - 54.7%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Neg - 53.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Altercation involving physical violence</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td>Child - 44.0%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Neg - 70.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Altercation involving personal verbal attack (raised voices, profanity, etc.)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
<td>M. Adult - 51.6%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Neg - 47.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Individual(s) suing an individual, business, group or organization or being sued by an individual, business, group or organization</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
<td>Y. Adult - 62%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Neg - 39.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Participant in a formal court proceeding</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
<td>Y. Adult - 62%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Pos - 36.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Attendance at a formal court proceeding (you were not a party in the proceeding)</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>Y. Adult - 51.7%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Pos - 36.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Heard of others going to court</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>Y. Adult - 51.7%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Pos - 50.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Visit to an attorney’s office</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td>Y. Adult - 50%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Pos - 50.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Non-violent Demonstrations/Protests</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
<td>Y. Adult - 58.0%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Pos - 76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Violent Demonstrations/Protests</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>Y. Adult - 51.7%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Neg - 53.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Civil Unrest on Mass Scale</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>Y-Adult- 40%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Neg - 53.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Acts of physical violence -- Not during civil unrest</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>Y. Adult</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Neg - 68.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>A complaint resolution process other than through</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>Y. Adult &amp; Middle Adult -</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Pos - 82.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Racially/ethnically diverse neighborhood</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>Y. Adult - 39.2% &amp; Child - 32%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Pos. - 86.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Racially/ethnically diverse neighborhood with tensions due to differences</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>Y. Adult - 45.9%</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Pos. - 37.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Overt prejudice due to race, gender, handicap or religious beliefs</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
<td>Adult &amp; Y. Adult -28.6%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Neg. - 60.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Covert/subtle prejudice due to race, gender, handicap or religious beliefs</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
<td>Y. Adult - 51.7%</td>
<td>Strong/Some</td>
<td>Neg. - 62.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Parents divorce during your childhood</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>Child - 52.6%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Neg. - 36.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Child sexual abuse/incest</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>Y. Adult - 47.8%</td>
<td>Strong/Some</td>
<td>Neg. 59.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Psychological abuse of children</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>Child - 37.9%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Neg. - 73.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Alcohol abuse</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
<td>Y. Adult - 37.9%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Neg. - 60.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Drug use</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>Y. Adult - 40.6%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Neg. - 39.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Mental illness</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
<td>Y. Adult - 33.3%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Neg. - 46.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Frequent physical relocation</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>Y. Adult - 56.7%</td>
<td>Slight</td>
<td>Pos. - 56.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Separation from family</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>Y. Adult - 53.6%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Pos. - 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>A parent’s remarriage</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>Y. Adult - 44.0%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Neut. - 47.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Parent’s separation</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>Y. Adult - 31.0%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Neut. - 37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Custody battle for children</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>Y. Adult - 47.6</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Neg. - 57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Enrollment in social science or social justice class/seminar</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>Y. Adult - 70.5%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Pos. - 90.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Religious beliefs or education</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>87.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>87.9%</td>
<td>Child - 74.6%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Pos. - 75.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Family history of advocacy or community involvement</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>Child - 43.2%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Pos. - 93.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Strong Pos.</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Y. Adult - 50%</td>
<td>Adoles. - 31.6%</td>
<td>Pos. - 89.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>While performing a profession in which conflict was prevalent, recognizing the need to use other approaches</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
<td>Y. Adult - 59.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Discussion of or awareness of social justice issues</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>82.8%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>84.4%</td>
<td>Adoles. - Strong Pos. -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Work, travel or residency in other countries</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
<td>Y. Adult - Strong Pos. 91.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40.23%</td>
<td>8.47%</td>
<td>3.41%</td>
<td>52.11%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Conclusions and Implications

Introduction

This dissertation explored the background of mediators and what circumstances and events were identified as being influential in their career choice to become a mediator. The research also explored why individuals choose to become mediators and how events and circumstances experienced by a mediator impacted the choice to become a mediator as well as the types of cases the mediator chooses to handle. The researcher conducted a literature review on how career choices occur, mediator characteristics, and conflict resolution theories related to choosing to become a conflict intervener. An on-line survey was administered to mediators who currently or previously practiced in various arenas plus graduate students in the conflict resolution field. Telephonic interviews of “High-Profile” mediators were also conducted.

The demographic data obtained from the on-line survey and from the interviews of the “High-Profile” mediators were analyzed in the prior chapters. In addition, data related to events and circumstances that mediators indicated they had experienced along with the impact of experiencing the events had on their career choice to become a mediator and the nature of their mediation practice was discussed in the prior chapter.
Central Questions Revisited

As stated in Chapter 1, the central questions of this research focused on:

1. What life circumstances, events, or factors do mediators and other conflict interveners believe were significant in leading them to make the choice to become a conflict intervener;

2. What (if any) impact does the “background” of mediators and other conflict interveners have on the arena or types of conflicts in which the mediator/conflict intervener practices; and

3. Is there any relationship between the identified background factors/events and the arena or types of conflicts in which they intervene.

The researcher was interested in exploring:

1. Why do individuals choose to become mediators?

2. What are the one or two primary or dominant reasons why individuals choose to become mediators?

3. What life circumstances or events influenced the individual’s decision to become a mediator?

4. Do individuals choose to become conflict interveners to strive to fulfill their own basic needs or to make sense of who they are and how they relate to others (e.g. to keep their world-view consistent)?

5. Is there a relationship between the level of the environmental system in which significant career decision-making background events occurred (intrapersonal, microsystem, mesosystem, exosystem, or macrosystem) [Figure 4] and the arenas or levels of conflict (intrapersonal, societal, national, transnational, international, or global) in which mediators choose to intervene?
6. Does the mediator perceive that he/she has more to offer in the arenas of conflict or levels of conflicts that correspond to the environmental system level in which identified significant life circumstances or events occurred that shaped the choice to become a mediator?

In addition, there are secondary research questions. Secondary questions included:

1. What are the identified factors within the literature as to why individuals choose to become mediators?

2. What, if any, particular events were significant in leading mediators to be interested in conflict intervention?

3. What types of conflict situations did mediators encounter as children, adolescents, and young adults?

4. Did mediators come from what they perceive as “complicated childhoods”?

5. Do mediators believe that they tried to make sense of a world of conflict as they grew up?

6. If so, what did they do to try to make sense of the world of conflict as they grew up?

7. Does the mediator’s background have an impact on the types of conflicts in which, as a mediator, he/she prefers to intervene?

8. Do mediators believe that their background impacts their mediation style?

9. What aspects of his/her background, does the mediator believe, influence his/her mediation style?

With regard to secondary questions, the researcher tried to ascertain what impact experience with conflict situations had on the decision to become
a mediator. The researcher was interested in how these experiences with conflict affect the types of cases in which the mediator choose to specialize.

Additionally, the researcher was trying to ascertain if the environmental level of life circumstances and events identified by the mediator as being influential would correlate with the arena or dimension of conflict in which the mediator practiced or worked. It was this researcher’s opinion that such a correlation may occur because of the individual’s need to obtain cognitive consistency and to maintain internal consistency with his/her world-view, especially as it relates to a need to make sense of who they are and how they relate to others.

**Hypotheses**

Based on the research questions, eight hypotheses were formulated. It was hypothesized that: the mediator identifies the experience of conflict in his/her background as a factor that impacted the decision to become a mediator; that one category of background factors (circumstances/events) had more of an impact on the decision to be a mediator than others; that he/she identified his/her background as impacting the types of cases that are selected or accepted to mediate; and that the backgrounds of mediators impacted their self-perception of where they chose to work as mediators in cases with the same themes as those of significant situations that they had encountered.
Based on the topic of this exploratory study and the above hypothesis, the following hypotheses were presented:

Hypothesis # 1  The mediator identifies the experience of conflict in his/her background as a factor that impacted the decision to become a mediator.

Hypothesis # 2  The mediator indicates that one category of background factors (circumstances/events) have more of an impact on the decision to be a mediator. Any observed differences are not merely chance variations to be expected in a random sample taken from a uniform distribution.

Hypothesis # 3  The mediator identifies exposure to conflict as a component of background.

Hypothesis # 4  The mediator identifies his/her background as impacting the types of cases that are selected or accepted to mediate.

Hypothesis # 5  The mediator identifies his/her background as impacting his/her mediator style.

Hypothesis # 6  The mediator identifies his/her background as impacting his/her chosen realm as mediator in any types of cases.

Hypothesis # 7  The background of mediators impacts their self-perception of where they chose to work as mediators in cases with the same themes as those of significant situations that they encountered.

Hypothesis # 8  The background factors that were experienced in childhood and that impacted the decision to become a mediator had more impact on the decision to be a mediator than background factors that occurred later in life.
Exploring the Hypotheses

The researcher sought to ascertain if individuals choose to become mediators and/or conflict interveners in order to strive to fulfill their own basic needs or to make sense of who they are and how they relate to others (i.e. to keep their world-view consistent). Since this research was primarily explorative in nature, the researcher looked for rival hypotheses that could also explain results obtained from the research in general, but especially with regard to theories that may explain the choice to become a mediator and/or conflict intervener.

This explorative study collected a large amount of data in response to a broad number of questions. The responders to the survey were mediators who handled a variety of types of cases in numerous arenas. The data was not analyzed across mediator work categories or groups based on types of cases that were the primary focus of their mediation practices. The majority of the mediators, who responded to the on-line survey, indicated that they practiced across multiple categories of work versus focusing on one or two types. Since individuals could not be distinguished based on preferred work categories, their responses were treated as one group. Treating the responders as one group impacted on the testing of some of the hypotheses. Next the researcher summarized the conclusions regarding whether each of the eight hypotheses (and the related questions that formed the hypothesis) explored in this study were supported or not. In cases where the data was
non-conclusive, the researcher provided conclusions that could be drawn
based on the data and/or alternative explanations for the findings.

**Hypothesis # 1**

The researcher hypothesized that “the mediator identifies the
experience of conflict in his/her background as a factor that impacted the
decision to become a mediator”. The central questions and secondary
questions that contributed to the development of this hypothesis included:
What life circumstances, events, or factors do mediators and other conflict
interveners believe were significant in leading them to make the choice to
become a conflict intervener; Why do individuals choose to become
mediators? and What are the one or two primary or dominant reasons why
individuals choose to become mediators?

Mediators did identify conflict as a factor in their decision to become a
mediator, thus supporting this hypothesis. Although mediators were not
specifically asked if they felt that conflict was a factor in the decision to
become a mediator, several questions were asked in the survey instrument
that were designed to obtain information on whether the mediators believed
that conflict was a factor in the decision to become a mediator. First each
responder was asked to recount the path they traveled to become a mediator
and were later also to identify any events from the presented list of events
(many of which involved conflict) that were factors in the path. As noted in
Chapter 7, mediators who come from a variety of educational disciplines and
career backgrounds reported numerous avenues that led to becoming a conflict intervener. Many of the shared narratives addressed conflict situations as a part of the path to become a mediator. Examples of conflict situations that were shared included: growing up in a racist environment, conflict in the home when growing up, conflict in the workplace, raising a difficult child, racial conflict on the college campus, and a belief that litigation was too adversarial.

Responders were asked to list the five events (from a presented list) that had the most impact on the decision to become a mediator. The events reported most frequently as having the greatest impact were tallied. The events identified as significant in impacting the career choice to become a mediator most frequently by the forty-eight individuals responding to the question, were:

- Situations where others did not have opportunity to present their story;
- Unfair business transaction;
- Overt prejudice due to race, gender, handicap or religious beliefs;
- Religious beliefs or education; and
- Discussion of or awareness of social justice issues.

Mediators identified events/situations in the category of societal fairness (See Figure 18 and 19) as having the impact on the decision to become a mediator following by the category of events involving personal identity or worth.
Events that involved legal issues were also identified as having an impact on the decision. Events/situations in these three categories would involve conflict to differing degrees. To further explore this hypothesis in depth, additional information on the nature of the conflict that was experienced by each mediator and how they link this to their decision would be necessary. This type of information may be best obtained via personal interviews versus the use of an on-line impersonal survey instrument.

**Hypothesis # 2**

In Hypothesis # 2, the researcher proposed that “the mediator indicates that one category of background factors (circumstances/events) have more of an impact on the decision to be a mediator. Any observed differences are not merely chance variations to be expected in a random sample taken from a uniform distribution”. The central questions and secondary questions that contributed to the development of this hypothesis included: What life circumstances or events influenced the individual’s decision to become a mediator? and What, if any, particular events were significant in leading mediators to be interested in conflict intervention?

Mediators indicated that they had experienced some of the events listed in the four Event Categories. A difference was found in the categories of background factors that mediators expressed impacted their decision to become a mediator. Events in Event Category III (Legal Issues) were identified as having the greatest impact on the career choice decision. Event
Category II (Societal Fairness) was identified as having the second greatest impact on the decision to become a mediator. The hypothesis was supported, however due to the small sample (responders to these events); one needs to be cautious in making any claims that could be extracted to the general population of mediators.

**Hypothesis # 3**

In Hypothesis # 3, it was stated that the mediator identifies exposure to conflict as a component of background. The central questions and secondary questions that contributed to the development of this hypothesis included: What types of conflict situations did mediators encounter as children, adolescents, and young adults? Did mediators come from what they perceive as “complicated childhoods”? and Do mediators believe that they tried to make sense of a world of conflict as they grew up?

Mediators identified conflict as a component of background and thus supported the hypothesis. The conflict was identified in the open-ended questions presented at the beginning of the survey, as well as in the portion of the survey where mediators were asked to indicate if they had experienced any of the thirty-five events presented. Lastly it was identified as a component of the background in the portion of the survey where mediators were asked to list which of the events impacted on the decision to become a mediator. The research that was summarized in the literature review (Chapter 2), reported that trauma is experienced by most individuals by early
adulthood (Norris and Thompson, 1991) and that at least one traumatic event was experienced by one-third of prior subjects interviewed within their life span time (Breslau, Davis, Andreski and Peterson, 1995). Given that so many adults have experienced trauma, it is not surprising that the mediators identified conflict as a component of their background. The types of events these authors reported as being experienced by individuals in their research included sudden injury/serious accidents, physical assault, observing the death or serious injury of another person, news of sudden death or serious injury to a relative or friend, natural disasters, personal serious injuries, life-threatening situations or perceived life threat or threat of serious injury, and any other ‘extraordinarily stressful’ event. Many of these traumatic events involved situations of conflict. Some of the same types of “trauma” were captured in the four Event Categories that mediators were asked to select from in identifying the events that may have impacted their career choice to become mediators.

Hypothesis # 4

Hypothesis # 4 proposes that “the mediator identifies his/her background as impacting the types of cases that are selected or accepted to mediate.” The secondary question that contributed to the development of this hypothesis included: Does the mediator’s background have an impact on the types of conflicts in which, as a mediator, he/she prefers to intervene?
This hypothesis was not proven or disproved. A question was not
directly asked on the survey about the impact of the background on the types
of cases selected. Several questions were asked that it was anticipated
would provide insight into this relationship between the background of the
mediator and the types of cases handled. Questions that were asked focused
on type of cases mediated and types of case preferred to be mediated as well
as those not preferred to be mediated. Respondents were also asked to
address what types of mediation cases they felt uniquely qualified to handle.
Responses generally addressed education and training but not whether
background impacted on the types of cases that are selected or accepted to
mediate. In future research, to obtain this information, it would be advisable
to ask the mediator directly if his/her background impacted the types of cases
that were selected or accepted to be mediated.

Hypothesis #5

In Hypothesis #5, the researcher proposed that “the mediator
identifies his/her background as impacting his/her mediator style”. The
central questions and secondary questions that contributed to the
development of this hypothesis included: Do mediators believe that their
background impacts their mediation style? and What aspects of his/her
background, does the mediator believe, influence his/her mediation style?

Questions were asked that the researcher had hoped would provide
insight into the impact of the mediator’s background impact on mediator style.
One question inquired as to the mediators’ preferred style of responding to conflict (utilizing the Thomas/Kilmann Conflict Assessment Instrument).

Another question asked about the mediator’s Myers-Briggs Type Indicator which provided some insight into an individual’s preferred manner of interaction in various situations including those involving conflict interventions. Although the information from these various questions provided insight into the mediator population competencies, it did not address the question of this hypothesis. This hypothesis has not been proven or disproved. In future research, to obtain this information, it would be advisable to ask the mediators directly if his/her background is identified as impacting the mediator style.

**Hypothesis # 6**

Hypothesis # 6 predicted that “the mediator identifies his/her background as impacting his/her chosen realm as mediator in any types of cases.” The central questions and secondary questions that contributed to the development of this hypothesis included: What (if any) impact does the “background” of mediators and other conflict interveners have on the arena or types of conflicts in which the mediator/conflict intervener practices; and Is there any relationship between the identified background factors/events and the arena or types of conflicts in which they intervene?

The researcher anticipated that individuals would either mediate in cases that were in the same realm (individual, micro-system systems, meso-systems, exo-systems and macro-systems) (Sandole, 1993), as the events
experienced or that mediator would avoid cases in the realm in which he/she had experienced events. Questions were asked about the types of cases the mediators handled and preferred to handle as well as the arenas in which they mediated and would prefer to mediate. Mediators were also asked why they preferred the cases they handled and the realms in which they mediated.

Once mediators had indicated the events they had experienced, they were asked to respond to the question “Do any of the events/situations that you identified as having a high impact on your decision to become an mediator, influence the types of mediation cases you are interested in handling as a mediator?” Twenty responders indicated “Yes” while twenty-eight responders indicated “No”. Among those who indicated “Yes”, 47.1% (8 responders) indicated they typically mediated cases in the Intra-Community (within community) arena; 48.3% (14 responders) indicated they typically mediated cases in the Intra-Organizational (within organizations); and 46.5% (20 responders) indicated they typically mediated cases in the Interpersonal arena. Among responders who indicated that the events/situations that they had identified as having a high impact on their decision to become a mediator, had not influenced the types of mediation cases he/she was interested in handling as a mediator, 52% (9 responders) indicated they typically mediated cases in the Intra-Community (within community) arena; 51.7% (15 responders) indicated they typically mediated cases in the Intra-
Organizational (within organizations); and 53.5% (23 responders) indicated they typically mediated cases in the Interpersonal arena.

When asked “If the events/situations you listed influence the types of mediation cases you are interested in handling as a mediator, please specify which ones impact the types of cases handled”, eighteen responders provided a list of events. Among mediators who typically mediated in the Intra-Community (within community) arena, events identified were in Event Categories II, III and IV. Among mediators who typically mediated in the Intra-Organizational (within organizations) arena, some events identified as impacting cases handled were in all four categories. Among the mediators who indicated they typically handled cases in the interpersonal arena, the events identified as impacting cases handled were in all four categories but events in Event Categories II and III were noted more frequently. Due to the small number of responders to these questions, enough data was not available to draw any conclusions.

When each responder was asked to respond to an open-ended question asking why he/she preferred to handle the cases they had previously indicated they would rather address, the majority of the responses indicated that mediators found the work challenging and that they desired to try cases across many arenas and realms. It may be that the mediators tried a variety of cases to build competencies. Based on statements made by several individuals who were no longer mediating, another explanation for why
individuals mediated in many realms and areas may be that mediators were willing to accept almost any cases they were offered to obtain the work and experience and thus to make themselves more marketable. The survey did not specifically ask if the mediator identified his/her background as impacting his/her chosen realm as mediator in any types of cases and based on the nature of the responses to the related questions, the hypothesis was not proven or disproved.

It would be interesting to address this hypothesis in future research by asking the questions directly of mediators. Questions could focus on whether the mediator’s background had an impact on the arena or types of conflicts in which he/she practices and whether there is any relationship between the background factors/events identified as having an impact on the decision to become a mediator and the arena or types of conflicts in which they intervene. The questions could also be presented by asking the responders to observe a systems map such as Figure 4 or Figure 5 and to indicate what events they had experienced in any of the various realms that impacted on their career choice decision to become a mediator. Another approach may be to present a list of events separated into the various levels of environmental systems that affect individuals.

**Hypothesis # 7**

Hypothesis # 7 proposed that “the background of mediators impacts their self-perception of where they chose to work as mediators in cases with
the same themes as those of significant situations that they encountered.”

The central questions and secondary questions that contributed to the development of this hypothesis included: Is there a relationship between the level of the environmental system in which significant career decision-making background events occurred (intrapersonal, microsystem, mesosystem, exosystem, or macrosystem) [Figure 4] and the arenas or levels of conflict (intrapersonal, societal, national, transnational, international, or global) in which mediators choose to intervene? and Does the mediator perceive that he/she has more to offer in the arenas of conflict or levels of conflicts that correspond to the environmental system level in which identified significant life circumstances or events occurred that shaped the choice to become a mediator?

This hypothesis was not supported. Most of the mediators - 84.2% (48 of 57 responses) did not identify any cases as “too close” to them to mediate because of past events in their life. Only 15.5% (9 responses) indicated there were cases that were “too close” to mediate. The responses to this question suggested that for this group of responders there is rarely a point beyond which the shared circumstances/events are “too close” for the mediator to be effective.

**Hypothesis # 8**

Hypothesis # 8 indicated that “the background factors that were experienced in childhood and that impacted the decision to become a
mediator had more impact on the decision to be a mediator than background factors that occurred later in life.” The central questions and secondary questions that contributed to the development of this hypothesis included:

What types of conflict situations did mediators encounter as children, adolescents, and young adults? Did mediators come from what they perceive as “complicated childhoods”? Do mediators believe that they tried to make sense of a world of conflict as they grew up? If so, what did they do to try to make sense of the world of conflict as they grew up?

This hypothesis cannot be confirmed due to the fact that many of the events reported as being significant in the decision to become a mediator, were not reported as being experienced in childhood (ages 0 to twelve) by the majority of the mediators. In the section of the survey where mediators were asked to indicate which events they had experienced and the age at which they first experienced the events, only five events out of thirty-five were listed as being experienced first in childhood. These events included:

- Situation where others did not have an opportunity to present their side of a story (reported by as being personally experienced by 43% of mediators responding to question);
- Altercation involving physical violence (reported by as being personally experienced by 41% of mediators);
- Parents divorce during your childhood (reported by as being personally experienced by 18% of mediators);
• Psychological abuse of children (reported by as being personally experienced by 12% of mediators);

• Religious beliefs or education (reported by as being personally experienced by 88% of mediators; and

• Family history of advocacy or community involvement (reported by as being personally experienced by 66% of mediators).

It may be that more events were experienced by the mediators in childhood than were shared but that either time impacted recall and/or that the significance of the events had become less over time such that the event was no perceived as important. Another factor that may have impacted on the events identified as being experienced was that if events that occurred earlier in life were very traumatic, an individual may have been unwilling to share that information via an on-line survey. When asked to list the five events that had the greatest impact on the career choice to become a mediator, the events did not include all the events identified as being experienced first in childhood which may lend some support to the one of the proposed alternative explanations articulated above for why events were not noted.

One event that mediators indicated had the greatest impact on their decision to become a mediator were situations in which others did not have an opportunity to present their story was reported as being experienced in childhood (ages 0 to twelve). Other events experienced first in childhood and
that were also considered as having the greatest impact on the decision to become a mediator included discussions of or awareness of social justice issues and religious beliefs or education. Additional events that were listed as being significant in the decision to become a mediator, although not as frequently noted, (such as altercation involving physical violence and altercation involving personal attack) were reported as being experienced by children. Among the other events that were listed as having the greatest impact on the career decision to become a mediator, most were experienced as young adults or at later age. Since most children are not typically involved directly in the other types of events listed as having an impact on the decision to become a mediator, it would seem logical that the events would not have been experience by them.

Although this hypothesis cannot be confirmed due to the fact that many events reported as significant were not experienced by children, these events are noteworthy. This may potentially be an area of additional research to pursue since the limited results suggested that events encountered by mediators as children had an impact on their decision to become a mediator.

Recommendations for Further Research or for Changing Research Methodology

Modifying the Design of the Survey

The research design presented some challenges for the collection as well as the analysis of the data as noted previously. A number of challenges were associated with the on-line survey instrument. One of the challenges
was the length of the instrument which may have discouraged responders from completing the entire survey. In addition, the number of “logic trees” (which looped responders back to the main “path” of questions to ensure responders received all core questions) within the instrument, may have been perceived as asking redundant questions.

If the research design were to be replicated, it is strongly recommended that multiple versions of the surveys be prepared. If the research design is modified to afford multiple versions of the surveys, as the responders access the electronic link to the survey, the person accessing the survey on-line could choose which version of the survey to complete based on their self assessment of their primary arenas of practice or other life circumstances. Multiple versions of the survey could be also used to be distinguished between the responders based on amount of experience in the conflict resolution field, i.e. have one for students, one for those practicing currently and one for those previously “practicing” mediators. The researcher would need to define what is meant by the term “practicing”.

Having multiple versions of the survey would provide the opportunity to have a shorter instrument since responders will only receive questions appropriate to their specialty or arena of practice. This approach could also afford the opportunity to have the survey presented in additional languages other than English which will provide more experiential and cultural diversity among the responders. Having the multiple versions of the survey may also
assist in capturing the mediator responses by the arenas in which they practice which may provide a more uniform population for analysis.

When collecting demographic information from the mediators, the presentation of age choices within brackets limited the researcher’s ability to conduct analysis as desired of who was entering the field of conflict resolution and at what phases of their lives. If the research design would be replicated, it is suggested that the age groupings be broken up in smaller ranges to permit better analysis of the mediators or even more preferable, have the subjects identify their ages and the researcher may then group subjects responses during analysis as needed.

Additional design changes that would be recommended for future research would include asking demographic information earlier in the survey to ensure that, at a minimum, the researcher has this information should the responders elect to exit the survey before they completed it. This would be especially valuable if the instrument is not redesigned to shorten it based on audience specific versions.

It would also be useful to add a question or two to the survey about when the mediator began to practice. It is anticipated that this information would have permitted the researcher to determine if there is difference in the career choice decision paths of those who became conflict interveners or mediators a number of years ago versus the career choice decision paths of
individuals who have more recently entered the field. This information would provide insight into how the field is evolving as a profession.

In future research, it is recommended that the researcher more actively seek mediators who practice in the various arenas (interpersonal, community, national or international) to provide input as to how and why they entered the profession. In a field with multi-disciplinary backgrounds, greater diversity among the responders would provide rich data on the current state of the field of conflict resolution field in general and mediators specifically.

A review of the responses of individual participants indicated that some elected to skip questions and/or not provide responses. The number of total responses to each question also varies greatly further supporting the observation that individuals were selective with regard to which questions they elected to answer. If an electronic survey is used for additional research on this topic, it is suggested that the researcher explore the feasibility of eliminating the skip feature of the software and require responders to acknowledge at least having read the question before deciding to skip it. This would ensure that the survey is actually completed as designed and that the “logic trees” are taking responders through all the questions. The researcher must weigh whether the assurance of knowing that the individual saw all the questions is worth the possible risk of irritating some responders who feel forced to answer or acknowledge every question.
An unanticipated factor in the survey may have been the use of terms and how individuals interpreted them. Since participants in the field of mediation come from varied academic field and occupations, terminology is not consistently used. So although the researcher attempted to define terms, with her background, she may have unintentionally introduced her own bias with regard to how she had been taught conflict resolution and mediation. Although the researcher piloted the survey with a group of graduate students in the conflict resolution field and with a group of experienced mediators, this may not have been sufficient to ensure that terms were universally understood. It would be important if this research design is replicated for the researcher to clearly define the terms used and possibly have a group of subject manner experts or a Delphi Panel (Robson, 1993) help develop the questions or review the terms to ensure the survey contained clearly accepted and understood terminology.

Lastly, the events and circumstances that the researcher asked individuals to respond to were generated based on input from experienced mediators. After the survey had been designed and launched, the researcher became aware that other social science disciplines have development instruments that ask questions about life events (see for example, Life Events Checklists (Johnson & McCutcheon, 1980), or "Exposures to Community Violence (ECV) of Things I have Seen and Heard Survey" (Richters & Martinez, 1993). It would be usefully for future research if a researcher
delving into this subject would examine the existing instruments to see if they would be relevant, could be used intact, or at a minimum used as reference materials for designing the sections of the survey that asks about the experiencing of events or circumstances.

**Future Research**

Two aspects of this research would seem to point to the need for additional research. One would be the use of follow-up oral interviews to clarify answers provided to the on-line survey. The second would be the assessment of siblings of the mediators who completed the on-line interviews. Both of these potential areas of research are discussed below.

**Follow-up Interviews**

It would be interesting to conduct oral interviews with a random sample of respondents to the on-line survey who have consented (at the end of the on-line survey) to participate in follow-up interviews. The researcher would discuss the sphere of control in their mediation practice as reflected in their survey responses, discuss their style of conflict management and their experience with cases that they perceive as “too close” to mediate based on events they have experienced (See Appendix C). Using the levels of environmental systems that impact on career choices, based on Colin’s schema (1990) and the levels of dimensions of conflicts/arenas of conflict (loosely based on Sandole’s schema, (1993) the follow-up oral interviews would allow a researcher to ask the interviewee to identify which level they
thought applied to themselves presently and where they see themselves in five to ten years. After the interviewee has identified the levels that applied to their self, the interviewee could be shown the pattern that their initial responses revealed and asked to verify if he/she believed the pattern applied to them. They could be asked to identity or discuss any consequences that they foresee if the pattern applies or does not apply.

Follow-up oral interviews would afford a researcher the opportunity to ask the mediators to elaborate on answers to the two open-ended questions asked on the survey. The two questions are: Have you ever felt that a case was “too close” to you to mediate because of past circumstances or events in your life? What circumstances or events have you experienced that made you feel the case was “too close” to you? The mediator could be asked to explain what made the case seem “too close”.

Surveys work best with standardized questions where one has a confidence that the questions mean the same thing to different respondents, a condition which is difficult to satisfy when the purpose is exploratory. Since the known difficulties with surveys include the inability to clarify questions, it would be recommended that if similar future research were to be conducted based on this research design, either some of the surveys be administered in person and/or it would be useful to conduct follow-up oral interviews with the survey responders. The follow-up interviews could provide a forum for the researcher to assess if his/her categorization of the mediator’s levels of
environmental systems that impacted the career choices responders was correct.

**Assessing the Conflict Career Choice of the Siblings of Mediators**

Explorative research often results in additional questions being raised. As noted in Chapter 7, this researcher started to think about the backgrounds of mediators based on a statement made by Patrick Phear’s who commented “that all the ‘good mediators’ he knows come from what he calls ‘complicated’ childhoods in which they grew up ‘desperately needing to make sense of a world of conflict” (Sarat, 1994, p. 236). The demographic information collected during the research revealed that the majority of the mediators indicated that they were not only children, so if Phear’s statement has validity, one would expect siblings of the mediators to also have experienced similarly complicated backgrounds. Furthermore, if true, then additional questions arise as to not only why the mediators choose to become mediators (one of the questions of this research), but why have the siblings elected to not pursue an occupation to help resolve conflict. Another question that comes to mind is whether the occupations selected by the siblings of conflict interveners and/or mediators have any factors in common with the occupation of mediators or do the various occupations of the siblings of conflict interveners and/or mediators have similar attributes? To explore these questions that evolved from the research data, it would be interesting have
siblings of mediators take conflict style assessment instruments to compare their results to their mediator sibling.

**Career Choice for Mediators**

Lang and Taylor’s (2000) constellation of circles as summarized in Chapter 4 stated that mediators have been shaped by social learning and life experiences and its unique blend of ideas and beliefs. The systems model of career choice (Collin, 1990) saw life experiences as the foundation on which career choices were made throughout ones' life span. These events as well as the environmental system (inputs) that shape the events are constantly changing as are ones' assessment of career choices. Events impacting on the choice to become a mediator as reported by the mediators in the survey, frequently occurred in early childhood, adolescence and or early adulthood although many of the individuals did not enter the field of mediation until later in life which suggested that career choices were being shaped and reshaped over time. This is further supported by the many mediators who indicated that mediation was not their first career choice and by their metaphors or narratives which discussed the move to the conflict resolution field or towards mediation as a journey or path.

This exploratory study may serve as the beginning of a course of research focused on the events and life experiences of mediators which in turn could serve as the foundation to develop an assessment instrument that could be taken by individuals considering enrolling or currently enrolled in
universities or community mediator training programs along with others considering making a career change to assist in the assessment to determine if their life experiences (i.e. core constellation of circles) match those currently in the field. The information from such studies and possible assessment instruments would also be useful for current mediators who engage in reflective practice to help them become more cognizant of their own theory bases and assist them in articulating their deepest beliefs and theories, so that they can more effectively evaluate their levels of integration and internal consistency and thus improve their practice. Such information would also help bring mediation as a profession in line with other allied social science disciplines that utilize such assessments to engage in peer feedback, coaching and mentoring as well as to assist professionals who may be suffering from what is referred to in other occupations as the "wounded healer" syndrome in their self assessment.

Implications

Some logical questions that arise at the end of this research are what are the implications for professional practices or decision making, scholarly understanding of the field, theory building and/or for future research studies as the result of this study. This exploratory study, with input from multiple perspectives in the conflict resolution field, may serve as a reference and resource for individuals with a desire to join or study the conflict resolution field. The study may further the understanding of the development of the
profession of conflict resolution while enabling prospective mediators to determine if whether they shared similar experiences with current practitioners. The study may also assist practitioners as well as prospective mediators to engaging in self-reflection about prior events and circumstances do impact on one’s conflict resolution practices. In addition, the information may be taught as part of an introduction to the field.
Appendix A

On-Line Mediator Survey
1. Introduction

I am working on a dissertation at the Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution at George Mason University located in Fairfax, Virginia. My research focuses on the backgrounds of mediators.

As a part of my research, I am conducting a survey of conflict interveners/mediators. The survey contains eight sections, with closed-choice questions as well as open-ended questions about your background and your experience as a conflict intervenor and/or mediator. (In this survey, conflict intervenor or mediator refers to the third party who serves as a mediator as well as the third party who utilizes mediative skills or techniques to resolve/transform conflicts.)

You may take as much time as you feel necessary to complete each section. It is intended that each section be taken independently. (Please note that the questions may not appear in numerical sequence.) It is anticipated that the survey will take approximately 45 minutes to complete.

If you agree to participate, please complete the survey by October 31, 2007.

I will also be conducting oral interviews as a part of this research. If you wish to be considered for an interview after the completion of this survey, please complete the contact information at the end of Section 8.

If you have any questions please email me at bmarshal1@gmu.edu.

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey!

Betty Marshall, Doctoral Candidate
Institute of Conflict Analysis and Resolution
George Mason University
2. Inform Consent Form

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

RESEARCH PROCEDURES

This research is being conducted for a dissertation at the Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution at George Mason University located in Fairfax, Virginia. My research focuses on the backgrounds of mediators.

As a part of my research, I am conducting a survey of conflict interveners/mediators. The survey contains eight sections with closed-choice questions and open-ended questions about your background and experience as a conflict intervener and/or mediator. If you agree to participate, you will be asked to complete the survey, which takes approximately 45 minutes to complete.

In addition, I will also be conducting oral interviews as a part of this research. Oral interviews will be conducted with a small percentage of the mediators who indicate at the conclusion of the survey that they wish to be considered for participation in the follow-up oral interviews. You may complete the survey and opt not to consider participation in the follow-up oral interviews.

It is anticipated the oral interviews will take approximately 45 minutes. The oral interviews ask respondents to discuss the types of mediation cases handled, their style of conflict management, and their experience with cases that they perceive as “too close” to mediate based on events they have experienced.

After completing the survey, you may elect to indicate that you wish to be considered for participation in the follow-up oral interviews by completing the contact information at the end of Section 8 of the survey.

RISKS

There are no foreseeable risks for participating in this research. However, this component of the research will require you to reflect upon experiences in your life including your childhood. When one reflects upon their life, it may trigger very pleasant memories as well as painful memories. If you decide to participate, I would like to emphasize that:
- your participation is entirely voluntary;
- you are free to refuse to answer any question; and
- you are free to withdraw at any time.

BENEFITS

There are no benefits to you as a participant other than to further research in the study of the reasons why individuals decide to become conflict interveners. In addition, the benefits to the field of conflict resolution and specifically the backgrounds of mediators may provide some criteria for those who assign mediators to cases, i.e. to assist in better matching mediators to disputants to maximize successful outcomes. Such research may also provide information that will assist mediator mentors and other coaches of mediators in providing feedback to junior mediators on how their backgrounds are impacting their practices.
3. Informed Consent Form (continued)

CONFIDENTIALITY

The data in this study will be confidential. The researcher will not be assigning a number or other identifier but the survey is being conducted via electronic survey software (Survey Monkey). Survey Monkey does assign a number which only the researcher will be able to access. If you elect to provide contact information in Section 8 indicating you wish to be considered for a follow-up oral interview, the researcher be will be able to link the number assigned by Survey Monkey to your identity. Only the researcher will have access to the identification key. While it is understood that no computer transmission can be perfectly secure, reasonable efforts will be made to protect the confidentiality of your transmission.

Confidentiality will be maintained at all times. Names will not be attached to responses when you respond electronically. The results of the survey will be kept strictly confidential and will be available only to members of my dissertation committee and myself. Excerpts from the surveys may be part of the final dissertation, but under no circumstances will your name or any identifying characteristics be included in the dissertation. The interview notes will be kept strictly confidential and will be available only to the researcher. Excerpts from the interviews may be shared with members of my dissertation committee and be used as part of the final dissertation, but under no circumstances will your name or any identifying characteristics be included in the dissertation.

PARTICIPATION

Your participation is voluntary, and you may withdraw from the study at any time and for any reason. If you decide not to participate or if you withdraw from the study, there is no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. There are no costs to you or any other.

CONTACT

This research is being conducted by Betty Marshall, Institute of Conflict Analysis and Resolution at George Mason University. She may be reached at bmarsha1@gmu.edu for questions or to report a research-related problem. The Chair of the Dissertation Committee is Dr. Wallace Warfield and he may be reached at 703-993-3649. You may contact the George Mason University Office of Research Subject Protections at 703-993-4121 if you have questions or comments regarding your rights as a participant in the research.

This research has been reviewed according to George Mason University procedures governing your participation in this research.

CONSENT

I have read this form and agree to participate in this study.

The George Mason University Human Subjects Review Board has waived the requirement for a signature on this consent form. However, if you wish to sign a consent form, please email Betty Marshall @bmarsha1@gmu.edu.

If you agree to be interviewed, prior to your interview you will be asked to complete this section:

I agree to be audio taped 
I do not agree to be audio taped

Betty Marshall, Doctoral Candidate
Institute of Conflict Analysis and Resolution
George Mason University
Click "Next" to get started with the survey. If you'd like to leave the survey at any time, just click "Exit this survey". Your answers will be saved.
4. Voluntary

* 1. I have read the Informed Consent Form and I understand that:
   • my participation is entirely voluntary;
   • I am free to refuse to answer any question (except for Questions 1 and 2); and
   • I am free to withdraw at any time.

   ○ Yes
   ○ No
5. Consent

* 2. After reading the Informed Consent Form, I agree to participate in this study.

  ○ Yes
  ○ No
6. Questions or Concerns

3. You have indicated that either you do not understand that your participation is voluntary, you are free to refuse to answer any questions and/or you are not aware that you are free to withdraw at any time.

If you have questions or concerns about the survey, please feel free to contact, Betty Marshall, at bmarshal@gmu.edu.

Do you wish to continue with the survey?

☐ Yes

☐ No
7. Experience as a Conflict Intervener

The following section asks about your experience as a conflict intervener.

4. Do you consider yourself a conflict intervener?
   - Yes
   - No
   - No, not presently. I plan to become a conflict intervener in the future.
8. Currently A Conflict Intervenor

Questions in this section ask about your current role as a conflict intervenor.

5. Why do you consider yourself a conflict intervenor?

6. When you are serving as conflict intervenor, what term(s) do you feel best describes the role(s) you are in or the work you are doing?

7. What was the path you took to become a conflict intervenor?

8. Is there a specific event that you believe caused you to decide to become a conflict intervenor?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No
9. Specific event => decision to become a conflict intervener

9. Please describe the specific event that you believe caused you to decide to become a conflict intervener.
10. Conflict Intervention - Vocation/Occupation

10. Do you intervene in conflicts (to facilitate resolution) as a vocation/occupation, adjunct to a vocation/occupation or an avocation?

- [ ] vocation/occupation
- [ ] adjunct to vocation/occupation
- [ ] avocation

11. Did you choose conflict intervention as a career?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

12. Was the choice to become a conflict intervener your first career choice?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
11. Career Choices

13. You indicated that becoming a conflict intervener was not your first career choice, what other careers did you hold prior to becoming a conflict intervener or studying conflict resolution?

(Please briefly describe the series of career choices or decisions that lead you to becoming an intervener or to study conflict resolution.)

1st career choice/decision
2nd career choice/decision
3rd career choice/decision
4th career choice/decision
### 12. Conflict as a Profession

**14. Do you intervene in conflict as a profession?**

- [ ] Yes, I intervene in conflict as a profession
- [ ] No, but I previously intervened in conflict as a profession
- [ ] No, I do not intervene or have never intervened in conflict as a profession
### 13. Intervention in Conflict as a Profession

15. You have indicated that you intervene in conflict as a profession. What type of types of cases do you routinely handle?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st type of cases</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2nd type of cases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd type of cases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th type of cases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. How many cases do you handle in a month?

(A case is an intervention with parties in a specific conflict situation. One case may involve multiple contacts with the parties including pre-evaluation, intake, one or more sessions and follow-up.)

17. Are there any types of cases you prefer to handle?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
### 14. Preferred Cases

**18. What types of cases do you prefer to handle?**

1. Type of case preferred
2. Type of case preferred
3. Type of case preferred
4. Type of case preferred

**19. Why do you prefer to handle these types of cases?**
15. Cases Do Not Prefer

20. Are there any types of cases you prefer not to handle or choose not to handle?

☐ Yes

☐ No
16. Non-preferred Type of Cases

21. What types of cases do you prefer not to handle?
1 - non preferred type of case
2 - non preferred type of case
3 - non preferred type of case
4 - non preferred type of case

22. Why do you prefer not to handle these types of cases?
17. Cases Trained to Handle

23. What types of cases have you been specifically trained to handle?
   Type 1
   Type 2
   Type 3
   Type 4

24. What types of cases are you most comfortable handling?
   1
   2
   3
   4

25. If you were to use a metaphor to describe your role as a conflict intervener, what would it be? Please describe your role in the metaphor.
18. Prior Intervention in Conflict as a Profession

26. You have indicated that you previously intervened in conflict as a profession. What type of types of cases did you routinely handle when you intervened in conflict as a profession?

- 2nd type of cases
- 3rd type of cases
- 1st type of cases
- 4th type of cases

27. How many cases did you handle in a month?

28. Were there any types of cases you preferred to handle?
   - Yes
   - No
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 29. What types of cases did you prefer to handle? | 1. type of case preferred  
2. type of case preferred  
3. type of case preferred  
4. type of case preferred |
| 30. Why did you prefer to handle these types of cases? |                                                                 |
20. Cases Do Not Prefer - Prior Conflict Interveners

31. Were there any types of cases you preferred not to handle or chose not to handle?
   - Yes
   - No
21. Non-preferred Cases - Prior Conflict Interveners

32. What types of cases do you prefer not to handle?
1. non preferred type of case
2. non preferred type of case
3. non preferred type of case
4. non preferred type of case

33. Why did you prefer not to handle these types of cases?

22. Cases Trained to Handle - Prior Conflict Intervener

34. What types of cases were you specifically trained to handle?
   Type 1
   Type 2
   Type 3
   Type 4

35. What types of cases were you most comfortable handling?
   1
   2
   3
   4

36. If you were to use a metaphor to describe your role as a conflict intervener when you were serving as an intervener, what would it be? Please describe your role in the metaphor.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>23. Conflict Intervener Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

37. You have indicated that you do not consider yourself a conflict intervener. Did you previously consider yourself a conflict intervener?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
24. Previously a Conflict Intervenor

38. You have indicated that you no longer consider yourself a conflict intervener, when (what year) did you stop considering yourself a conflict intervener?

39. What event/situations caused you to stop considering yourself a conflict intervener?

40. When you served as conflict intervener, what term(s) do you feel best describes the role(s) you performed or the work you were doing?

41. Although you are not a conflict intervener at this time, are you currently enrolled in a conflict resolution training program or taking courses in conflict resolution?
   - Yes
   - No

42. Is there a specific event that you believe caused you to decide to become a conflict intervener?
   - Yes
   - No

43. If you indicated that there was a specific event that you believe caused you to decide to become a conflict intervener, please describe that event?

44. What was the path you took to become a conflict intervener?
45. Did you engage in conflict intervention as a vocation/occupation, adjunct to a vocation/occupation or an avocation?
   - [ ] vocation/occupation
   - [ ] adjunct to vocation/occupation
   - [ ] avocation

46. Did you select conflict intervention as a career?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

47. Was the choice to become a conflict intervener your first career choice?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

48. If becoming a conflict intervener was not your first career choice, what other careers did you hold prior to becoming a conflict intervener or studying conflict resolution?

(Please briefly describe the series of career choices or decisions that lead you to becoming an intervener or to study conflict resolution.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st career choice/decision</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2nd career choice/decision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd career choice/decision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th career choice/decision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

49. Did you intervene in conflict as a profession?
   - [ ] Yes, I intervened in conflict as a profession
   - [ ] No, but I intervened informally or in an un-official role

50. When you intervened in conflict as a profession, what types of cases did you routinely handle?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st type of cases</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2nd type of cases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd type of cases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th type of cases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
51. When you intervened in conflict as a profession, how many cases did you previously handle in a month?

52. When you intervened in conflict as a profession, what types of cases did you prefer to handle?
1 type of case
2 type of case
3 type of case
4 type of case

53. When you intervened in conflict as a profession, why did you prefer to handle these types of cases?

54. When you intervened in conflict as a profession, were there types of cases you preferred not to handle?
   □ Yes
   □ No

55. When you intervened in conflict as a profession, what types of cases did you prefer not to or chose not to handle?
1 - non preferred type case
2 - non preferred type case
3 - non preferred type case
4 - non preferred type case

56. When you intervened in conflict as a profession, why did you prefer not to handle these types of cases?

57. What types of cases were you specifically trained to handle?
   Type 1
   Type 2
   Type 3
   Type 4
58. When you intervened in conflict as a profession, what types of cases were you most comfortable handling?)

59. If you were to use a metaphor to describe your role as a conflict intervener (when you intervened in conflict as a profession), what would it be? Please describe your role in the metaphor.
25. Conflict Intervenor Student or Trainee

This section asks questions about your experience as an individual currently taking courses or in a training program to become a conflict intervener.

60. You indicated you are not a conflict intervener at this time but plan to become one. Are you currently enrolled in a conflict resolution training program or taking courses in conflict resolution?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61. You have indicated that you are currently a student in a training program to become a conflict intervener or studying conflict resolution. Why did you choose to train to become a conflict intervener or to study conflict resolution?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. What was the path you took to study conflict intervention?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. Is there a specific event that you believe caused you to study conflict and/or decide to become a conflict intervener or mediator?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Event - Student or Trainee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. If you indicated that there was a specific event that you believe caused you to decide to undergo training to become a conflict intervener or to study conflict resolution please describe that event?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Occupation/Vocation - Student/Trainee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. When you become a conflict intervener, do you plan to engage in conflict resolution as a vocation/occupation, adjunct to a vocation/occupation or an avocation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ vocation/occupation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ adjunct to vocation/occupation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ avocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| 66. Have you or do you intend to select conflict intervention as a career? |
| ☐ Yes                          |
| ☐ No                           |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>29. Career - Student/Trainee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

67. **Was the choice to become a conflict intervener your first career choice?**

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
30. Other Careers - Student/Trainee

68. If becoming a conflict intervener was not your first career choice, what other careers did you hold prior to becoming a conflict intervener or studying conflict resolution?

(Please briefly describe the series of career choices or decisions that lead you to becoming an intervener or to study conflict resolution.)

1st career choice/decision
2nd career choice/decision
3rd career choice/decision
4th career choice/decision
### 31. Cases - Student/Trainee

**69. What types of cases have you been specifically trained to handle?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**70. To date, what types of cases are you most comfortable handling?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**71. If you were to use a metaphor to describe your role as a conflict intervener, what would it be? Please describe your role in the metaphor.**
32. Future Student or Trainee

72. You indicated that you plan to become a conflict interenor in the future. However at present, you are not currently enrolled in a conflict resolution training program nor taking courses in conflict resolution. Do you anticipate beginning a training program or courses?

☐ Yes
☐ No

73. When do you anticipate (the year) beginning a training program or courses?

74. Why have you decided that you want to become a conflict intervener or to study conflict resolution?

75. The remainder of the survey focuses on mediation experience or conflict intervention that utilizes the skills of a mediator (mediative skills).

Do you have experience as a conflict intervener or mediator?

☐ Yes
☐ No
33. Considered Becoming a Conflict Intervener

76. Did you ever consider becoming a conflict intervener?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
34. Not a Conflict Intervener

77. You have indicated that you are not a conflict intervenor but once considered becoming one. Why did you previously consider becoming a conflict intervenor and/or mediator?

78. You have indicated that you are not a conflict intervenor but once considered becoming one. Why did you ultimately decide not to become a conflict intervenor?

79. The remainder of the survey focuses on mediation experience or conflict intervention that utilizes the skills of a mediator (mediative skills).

Do you have experience as a conflict intervenor or mediator?

- Yes
- No
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>35. Mediation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>80. Do you have experience serving as a mediator?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
36. Mediation Experience

Mediation experience would include interventions in which the third party serves as a mediator or the third party utilizes mediatve skills or techniques to resolve/transform conflicts.

81. If you indicated in the prior section that you consider (or once considered) yourself a conflict intervener, please indicate which, if any, of the following terms describe your work as a conflict resolver.

- [ ] facilitator
- [ ] ombudsperson
- [ ] arbitrator
- [ ] mediator
- [ ] Other (please specify)
37. Mediator?

82. If you did not select mediator as one of the terms that describe your work, did you previously consider yourself a mediator?

- Yes
- No
38. Mediator Using Mediative Skills

83. You have indicated that you consider yourself a mediator or previously considered yourself a mediator. Do you use your mediative skills when you are not mediating?

☐ Yes
☐ No
### 39. Mediative Skills in Non-mediation Settings

84. You indicated above that you do not consider yourself a mediator. Do you use mediative skills although you do not serve as a mediator?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
40. Mediative Skills?

85. Do you use mediative skills when you are not mediating?
   - Yes
   - No
41. Mediative Skills

86. Briefly describe some of the mediative skills you incorporate into your work.
### 42. Number of Years as Mediator

**87. If you consider yourself a mediator currently, how long have you mediated?**
- [ ] Less than 1 year
- [ ] 1 year to less than 3 years
- [ ] 3 years to less than 5 years
- [ ] 5 years to less than 10 years
- [ ] 10 years to less than 20 years
- [ ] 20 years or more
- [ ] Not currently a mediator

**88. If you previously considered yourself a mediator, how long did you mediate?**
- [ ] Less than 1 year
- [ ] 1 year to less than 3 years
- [ ] 3 years to less than 5 years
- [ ] 5 years to less than 10 years
- [ ] 10 years to less than 20 years
- [ ] 20 years or more

**89. Have you received training as a mediator?**
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

**90. Approximately how many hours of mediation training have you received?**
- [ ] Less than 60 hours
- [ ] More than 60 hours
91. Approximately how many mediations have you conducted since becoming a mediator/conflict intervener?

- Less than 25
- More than 25, less than 50
- More than 50, less than 75
- More than 75, less than 100
- More than 100
### 43. Mediation Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>92. Do you currently mediate cases?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 44. Mediate Currently

**93. In what countries or provinces do you mediate?**

1. 
2. 
3. 

**94. If you mediate in the United States, indicate in which state(s) you mediate?**

- AL
- AK
- AR
- AZ
- CA
- CO
- CT
- DC (District of Columbia)
- DE
- FL
- GA
- HI
- ID
- IA
- IL
- IN
- KS
- KY
- LA
- MA
- MD
- ME
- MI
- MO
- MN
- MS
- MT
- NC
- ND
- NE
- NH
- NJ
- NM
- NV
- NY
- OH
- OK
- OR
- PA
- PR (Puerto Rico)
- RI
- SC
- SD
- TN
- TX
- UT
- VA
- VT
- WA
- WI
- WV
- WY
95. How long have you been mediating cases?

- Less than 1 year
- 1 year to less than 3 years
- 3 years to less than 5 years
- 5 years to less than 10 years
- 10 years to less than 20 years
- 20 years or more

96. Approximately how many cases per month do you mediate?

- Less than 5
- More than 5, less than 10
- More than 10, less than 20
- More than 20, less than 30
- More than 30
- Other (please specify)

97. Approximately how many hours do you mediate per month?

- Less than 5
- More than 5, less than 10
- More than 10, less than 20
- More than 20, less than 30
- More than 30

98. Approximately how mediations have you conducted within the last year?

- Less than 5
- More than 5, less than 10
- More than 10, less than 20
- More than 20, less than 30
- More than 30
45. Certification

99. Is a certification to mediate issued in the state in which you mediate?
   - Yes
   - No

100. If yes, are you currently certified?
   - Yes
   - No

101. What does the certification permit you to do?
   - Mediate court referred cases
   - Other (please specify)
### 46. Previously Mediated

**102. In what countries or provinces did you mediate?**

1. 
2. 
3. 

**103. If you mediated in the United States, indicate in which state(s) you mediated?**

- [ ] AL
- [ ] AK
- [ ] AR
- [ ] AZ
- [ ] CA
- [ ] CO
- [ ] CT
- [ ] DC (District of Columbia)
- [ ] DE
- [ ] FL
- [ ] GA
- [ ] HI
- [ ] ID
- [ ] IA
- [ ] IL
- [ ] IN
- [ ] KS
- [ ] KY
- [ ] LA
- [ ] MA
- [ ] MD
- [ ] ME
- [ ] MI
- [ ] MO
- [ ] MN
- [ ] MS
- [ ] MT
- [ ] NC
- [ ] ND
- [ ] NE
- [ ] NH
- [ ] NJ
- [ ] NM
- [ ] NV
- [ ] NY
- [ ] OH
- [ ] OK
- [ ] OR
- [ ] PA
- [ ] PR (Puerto Rico)
- [ ] RI
- [ ] SC
- [ ] SD
- [ ] TN
- [ ] TX
- [ ] UT
- [ ] VA
- [ ] VT
- [ ] WA
- [ ] WI
- [ ] WV
- [ ] WY
104. You have indicated that you no longer mediate. When you were mediating, how long did you mediate cases?

- 1 year to less than 3 years
- 3 years to less than 5 years
- 5 years to less than 10 years
- 10 years to less than 20 years
- 20 years or more

105. When you were mediating, how many cases did you mediate per month?

- Less than 5
- More than 5, less than 10
- More than 10, less than 20
- More than 20, less than 30
- More than 30

106. When you mediated, how many hours did you mediate per month?

- Less than 5
- More than 5, less than 10
- More than 10, less than 20
- More than 20, less than 30
- More than 30

107. Approximately how many mediations have you conducted?

- Less than 25
- More than 25, less than 50
- More than 50, less than 75
- More than 75, less than 100
- More than 100
108. When did you stop mediating or decided you did not wish to mediate?

- During mediation training
- After completing mediation training
- While completing required cases for certification
- After receiving certification
- After having mediated beyond required cases
- Other (please specify)

109. Why did you stop mediating or decide you did not wish to mediate?
47. Demographic Information

This section will ask demographic questions about you and your family.

110. What is your gender?
- Male
- Female

111. What is your age?
- less than 21
- 21 to 30
- 31 to 40
- 41 to 50
- 51 to 60
- over 60

112. What is your racial background?
- White (Caucasian), Non-Hispanic
- African-American; African Descent
- Native American or Alaskan Native
- Asian or Pacific Islander
- Hispanic
- Multi-racial (please specify)

113. Where do you reside?
- United States
- Other Country
114. What is the highest grade of school you completed?

- Less Than High School
- High School graduate/GED
- Less than two years of college
- Associate's Degree
- More than two years of college but less than 4 years
- Bachelor's Degree
- Master's Degree
- Ph. D
- Ed. D
- JD
- ND
- Other (please specify)
### 48. Demographics - Parental Information

**115. Please list the careers/occupations of your parents or the individuals who served in the role of your parents when you were growing up.**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**116. Did your parents, or the individuals who served in the role of your parents when you were growing up, use conflict intervention skills in their career/occupation?**

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>49. Demographics - Parents' Career</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>117. Please describe how your parents, or the individuals who served in the role of your parents when you were growing up, used conflict intervention skills in their career/occupation?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Demographics - Parents in Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>118. Did your parents, or the individuals who served in the role of your parents when you were growing up, use conflict intervention skills in their role in the community?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Demographics - Parents' Conflict Intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>119. Please describe how your parents, or the individuals who served in the role of your parents when you were growing up, use conflict intervention skills in their role in the community.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Table |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>52. Demographics - Sibling(s)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>120. Do you have or did you previously have siblings?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
53. Demographics - Sibling(s)

121. How many siblings do you have (or did you have)?

- One
- Two
- Three
- Four
- Five
- Six
- Seven
- Eight
- Nine
- Ten
- Eleven
- Twelve

- Other (please specify)

122. What is your birth order?

(Example: Enter 1 of 3 if you are the first born of three children; enter 2 of
3 if you are the second born of three children, etc.)

_of_

123. Please list your sibling(s)' occupations.

1
2
3
4
5

124. Are (were) any of your siblings conflict interveners or mediators?

- Yes
- No
125. Do (or did) your sibling(s) use conflict intervention skills in their career/occupation?

  ○ Yes
  ○ No
54. Demographics - Sibling(s)' Careers

126. If your sibling(s) uses (or used) conflict intervention skills in their career/occupation, please describe how your sibling(s) uses (used) conflict intervention skills.
55. Demographics - Sibling(s) in Community

127. Do (did) your sibling(s) use conflict intervention skills in his/her role in the community or as an avocation?

- Yes
- No
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>56. Demographics - Sibling(s) Conflict Intervention in Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

128. If your siblings use conflict intervention skills in their roles in the community or as an avocation, please describe how they use conflict intervention skills.
57. Demographics - Assessment Tools

129. If you have completed the Thomas Kilmann Conflict assessment, please indicate the results of your assessment by placing numbers next to your preferred style of responding to conflict.

Assign one (1) to your strongest preference and five (5) to your least preferred style.

- Competing
- Collaborating
- Compromising
- Avoiding
- Accommodating

130. If you have taken the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), please select your MBTI.

- ISTJ
- ISFJ
- INFJ
- INTJ
- ISTP
- ISFP
- INFP
- INTP
- ESTP
- ESFP
- ENFP
- ENTJ
- ESTJ
- ESFJ
- ENFJ
- ENTJ
58. Events Experienced

You will be presented with some events and situations.

For each event or situation listed, you will be asked if you experienced (participated in, observed, or know about) the event/situation.

If you indicate that you "experienced" the event, you will be asked three additional questions regarding that event. The additional questions are:

(1) For the event you experienced, please indicate your age when you first experienced the event or situation.

(2) For the event/situation you experienced, indicate to what extent the event or situation may have influenced, impacted or affected you.

(3) For the event experienced, please specify the impact or influence the event had on your life.
59. Event # 1 - Others did not present story

131. Situation where others did not have an opportunity to present their side of a story

- Did not experience.
- Personally involved in/participated in this event/situation.
- Members of my nuclear family were involved in such an event/situation.
- Members of my extended family were involved in such an event/situation.
- An acquaintance that I regularly interacted with in my neighborhood, church/house of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.
- An acquaintance that I did not regularly interact with in my neighborhood, church/place of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.
- I was present when the event/situation occurred, but I was not acquainted with the participants.
- I observed event/situation on television, in a movie, heard about it on the radio or read it in a newspaper, magazine, book or the Internet, but I did not personally know the participants.
- Do not know/Cannot remember
60. Event 1 - Others did not present story

You have indicated that you "experienced" a situation where others did not have an opportunity to present their side of a story. Below are three follow-up questions about your experience.

132. How old were you when you first experienced the event?
- Child (0-12)
- Adolescent (13-17)
- Young Adult (18-35)
- Middle aged adult (36-60)
- Later in life (over 60)

133. To what extent did the event or situation you "experienced" influence you personally?
- Strong Influence
- Some Influence
- Slight Influence
- No Influence
- Do Not Know/Cannot Remember

134. If you indicated that experiencing the event influenced you, please specify the overall influence or impact the event had on your life.

Please indicate if the influence on you was:
- Positive
- Negative
- Neutral
- Do Not Know/Cannot Remember
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event # 2 - Unfair business transaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>135. An unfair business transaction</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Did not experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Personally involved in/participated in this event/situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Members of my nuclear family were involved in such an event/situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Members of my extended family were involved in such an event/situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- An acquaintance that I regularly interacted with in my neighborhood, church/house of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- An acquaintance that I did not regularly interact with in my neighborhood, church/house of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I was present when the event/situation occurred, but I was not acquainted with the participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I observed event/situation on television, in a movie, heard about it on the radio or read it in a newspaper, magazine, book or the Internet, but I did not personally know the participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Do not know/Cannot remember.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
62. Event 2 - An unfair business transaction

You have indicated that you "experienced" an unfair business transaction. Below are three follow-up questions about your experience.

136. How old were you when you first experienced the event?
- Child (0-12)
- Adolescent (13-17)
- Young Adult (18-35)
- Middle aged adult (36-60)
- Later in life (over 60)

137. To what extent did the event or situation you "experienced" influence you personally?
- Strong Influence
- Some Influence
- Slight Influence
- No Influence
- Do Not Know/Cannot Remember

138. If you indicated that experiencing the event influenced you, please specify the overall influence or impact the event had on your life.

Please indicate if the influence on you was:
- Positive
- Negative
- Neutral
- Do Not Know/Cannot Remember
63. Event # 3 - Altercation involving physical violence

139. Altercation involving physical violence

- Did not experience.
- Personally involved in/participated in this event/situation.
- Members of my nuclear family were involved in such an event/situation.
- Members of my extended family were involved in such an event/situation.
- An acquaintance that I regularly interacted with in my neighborhood, church/house of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.
- An acquaintance that I did not regularly interact with in my neighborhood, church/house of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.
- I was present when the event/situation occurred, but I was not acquainted with the participants.
- I observed event/situation on television, in a movie, heard about it on the radio or read it in a newspaper, magazine, book or the Internet, but I did not personally know the participants.
- Do not know/Cannot remember
64. Event 3 - Altercation involving physical violence

You have indicated that you "experienced" an altercation involving physical violence. Below are three follow-up questions about your experience.

140. How old were you when you first experienced the event?

- Child (0-12)
- Adolescent (13-17)
- Young Adult (18-35)
- Middle aged adult (36-60)
- Later in life (over 60)

141. To what extent did the event or situation you "experienced" influence you personally?

- Strong Influence
- Some Influence
- Slight Influence
- No Influence
- Do Not Know/Cannot Remember

142. If you indicated that experiencing the event influenced you, please specify the overall influence or impact the event had on your life.

Please indicate if the influence on you was:

- Positive
- Negative
- Neutral
- Do Not Know/Cannot Remember
65. Event # 4 - Altercation involving personal verbal attack

143. Altercation involving personal verbal attack (raised voices, profanity, etc.)

☐ Did not experience.
☐ Personally involved in/participated in this event/situation.
☐ Members of my nuclear family were involved in such an event/situation.
☐ Members of my extended family were involved in such an event/situation.
☐ An acquaintance that I regularly interacted with in my neighborhood, church/house of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.
☐ An acquaintance that I did not regularly interact with in my neighborhood, church/place of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.
☐ I was present when the event/situation occurred, but I was not acquainted with the participants.
☐ I observed event/situation on television, in a movie, heard about it on the radio or read it in a newspaper, magazine, book or the internet, but I did not personally know the participants.
☐ Do not know/Cannot remember
66. Event 4 - Altercation involving personal verbal attack

You have indicated that you "experienced" an altercation involving personal verbal attack (raised voices, profanity, etc.). Below are three follow-up questions about your experience.

144. How old were you when you first experienced the event?

- [ ] Child (0-12)
- [ ] Adolescent (13-17)
- [ ] Young Adult (18-35)
- [ ] Middle aged adult (36-60)
- [ ] Later in life (over 60)

145. To what extent did the event or situation you "experienced" influence you personally?

- [ ] Strong Influence
- [ ] Some Influence
- [ ] Slight Influence
- [ ] No Influence
- [ ] Do Not Know/Cannot Remember

146. If you indicated that experiencing the event influenced you, please specify the overall influence or impact the event had on your life.

Please indicate if the influence on you was:

- [ ] Positive
- [ ] Negative
- [ ] Neutral
- [ ] Do Not Know/Cannot Remember
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>67. Event # 5 - Individual(s) suing or being sued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>147. Individual(s) suing or being sued by an individual, business, group, or organization</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Did not experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Personally involved in/participated in this event/situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Members of my nuclear family were involved in such an event/situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Members of my extended family were involved in such an event/situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O An acquaintance that I regularly interacted with in my neighborhood, church/house of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O An acquaintance that I did not regularly interact with in my neighborhood, church/place of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O I was present when the event/situation occurred, but I was not acquainted with the participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O I observed event/situation on television, in a movie, heard about it on the radio or read it in a newspaper, magazine, book or the Internet, but I did not personally know the participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Do not know/Cannot remember</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
68. Event 5 - Individual(s) suing or being sued

You have indicated that you "experienced" Individual(s) suing or being sued. Below are three follow-up questions about your experience.

148. How old were you when you first experienced the event?

- Child (0-12)
- Adolescent (13-17)
- Young Adult (18-35)
- Middle aged adult (36-60)
- Later in life (over 60)

149. To what extent did the event or situation you "experienced" influence you personally?

- Strong Influence
- Some Influence
- Slight Influence
- No Influence
- Do Not Know/Cannot Remember

150. If you indicated that experiencing the event influenced you, please specify the overall influence or impact the event had on your life.

Please indicate if the influence on you was:

- Positive
- Negative
- Neutral
- Do Not Know/Cannot Remember
### 69. Event # 6 - Participant in a court proceeding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>151. Participant in a court proceeding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did not experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personally involved in/participated in this event/situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of my nuclear family were involved in such an event/situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of my extended family were involved in such an event/situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An acquaintance that I regularly interacted with in my neighborhood, church/house of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An acquaintance that I did not regularly interact with in my neighborhood, church/house of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was present when the event/situation occurred, but I was not acquainted with the participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I observed event/situation on television, in a movie, heard about it on the radio or read it in a newspaper, magazine, book or the Internet, but I did not personally know the participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know/Cannot remember</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
70. Event 6 - Participant in a court proceeding

You have indicated that you "experienced" being a participant in a court proceeding. Below are three follow-up questions about your experience.

152. How old were you when you first experienced the event?

- Child (0-12)
- Adolescent (13-17)
- Young Adult (18-35)
- Middle aged adult (36-60)
- Later in life (over 60)

153. To what extent did the event or situation you "experienced" influence you personally?

- Strong Influence
- Some Influence
- Slight Influence
- No Influence
- Do Not Know/Cannot Remember

154. If you indicated that experiencing the event influenced you, please specify the overall influence or impact the event had on your life.

Please indicate if the influence on you was:

- Positive
- Negative
- Neutral
- Do Not Know/Cannot Remember
71. Event # 7 - Attendance at a court proceeding

155. Attendance at a court proceeding (you were not a party)

○ Did not experience.

○ Personally involved in/participated in this event/situation.

○ Members of my nuclear family were involved in such an event/situation.

○ Members of my extended family were involved in such an event/situation.

○ An acquaintance that I regularly interacted with in my neighborhood, church/house of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.

○ An acquaintance that I did not regularly interact with in my neighborhood, church/place of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.

○ I was present when the event/situation occurred, but I was not acquainted with the participants.

○ I observed event/situation on television, in a movie, heard about it on the radio or read it in a newspaper, magazine, book or the Internet, but I did not personally know the participants.

○ Do not know/Cannot remember
72. Event 7 - Attendance at a court proceeding

You have indicated that you “experienced” being in attendance at a court proceeding (you were not a party). Below are three follow-up questions about your experience.

156. How old were you when you first experienced the event?

- Child (0-12)
- Adolescent (13-17)
- Young Adult (18-35)
- Middle aged adult (36-60)
- Later in life (over 60)

157. To what extent did the event or situation you “experienced” influence you personally?

- Strong Influence
- Some Influence
- Slight Influence
- No Influence
- Do Not Know/Cannot Remember

158. If you indicated that experiencing the event influenced you, please specify the overall influence or impact the event had on your life.

Please indicate if the influence on you was:

- Positive
- Negative
- Neutral
- Do Not Know/Cannot Remember
73. Event # 8 - Others going to court

159. Heard of others going to court

- Did not experience.
- Personally involved in/participated in this event/situation.
- Members of my nuclear family were involved in such an event/situation.
- Members of my extended family were involved in such an event/situation.
- An acquaintance that I regularly interacted with in my neighborhood, church/house of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.
- An acquaintance that I did not regularly interact with in my neighborhood, church/place of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.
- I was present when the event/situation occurred, but I was not acquainted with the participants.
- I observed event/situation on television, in a movie, heard about it on the radio or read it in a newspaper, magazine, book or the Internet, but I did not personally know the participants.
- Do not know/Cannot remember
74. Event 8 - Others going to court

You have indicated that you "experienced" hearing of others going to court. Below are three follow-up questions about your experience.

160. How old were you when you first experienced the event?

- Child (0-12)
- Adolescent (13-17)
- Young Adult (18-35)
- Middle aged adult (36-60)
- Later in life (over 60)

161. To what extent did the event or situation you "experienced" influence you personally?

- Strong Influence
- Some Influence
- Slight Influence
- No Influence
- Do Not Know/Cannot Remember

162. If you indicated that experiencing the event influenced you, please specify the overall influence or impact the event had on your life.

Please indicate if the influence on you was:

- Positive
- Negative
- Neutral
- Do Not Know/Cannot Remember
75. Event # 9 - Visit to an attorney’s office

163. Visit to an attorney’s office

- Did not experience.
- Personally involved in/participated in this event/situation.
- Members of my nuclear family were involved in such an event/situation.
- Members of my extended family were involved in such an event/situation.
- An acquaintance that I regularly interacted with in my neighborhood, church/house of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.
- An acquaintance that I did not regularly interact with in my neighborhood, church/place of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.
- I was present when the event/situation occurred, but I was not acquainted with the participants.
- I observed event/situation on television, in a movie, heard about it on the radio or read it in a newspaper, magazine, book or the Internet, but I did not personally know the participants.
- Do not know/Cannot remember
76. Event 9 - Visit to an attorney's office

You have indicated that you "experienced" visiting an attorney's office. Below are three follow-up questions about your experience.

164. How old were you when you first experienced the event?

☐ Child (0-12)
☐ Adolescent (13-17)
☐ Young Adult (18-35)
☐ Middle aged adult (36-60)
☐ Later in life (over 60)

165. To what extent did the event or situation you "experienced" influence you personally?

☐ Strong Influence
☐ Some Influence
☐ Slight Influence
☐ No Influence
☐ Do Not Know/Cannot Remember

166. If you indicated that experiencing the event influenced you, please specify the overall influence or impact the event had on your life.

Please indicate if the influence on you was:

☐ Positive
☐ Negative
☐ Neutral
☐ Do Not Know/Cannot Remember
77. Event # 10 - Non-violent Demonstrations/Protests

167. Non-violent Demonstrations/Protests

- Did not experience.
- Personally involved in/participated in this event/situation.
- Members of my nuclear family were involved in such an event/situation.
- Members of my extended family were involved in such an event/situation.
- An acquaintance that I regularly interacted with in my neighborhood, church/house of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.
- An acquaintance that I did not regularly interact with in my neighborhood, church/place of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.
- I was present when the event/situation occurred, but I was not acquainted with the participants.
- I observed event/situation on television, in a movie, heard about it on the radio or read it in a newspaper, magazine, book or the Internet, but I did not personally know the participants.
- Do not know/Cannot remember.
78. Event 10 - Non-violent Demonstrations/Protests

You have indicated that you "experienced" non-violent demonstrations/protests. Below are three follow-up questions about your experience.

168. How old were you when you first experienced the event?

○ Child (0-12)
○ Adolescent (13-17)
○ Young Adult (18-35)
○ Middle aged adult (36-60)
○ Later in life (over 60)

169. To what extent did the event or situation you "experienced" influence you personally?

○ Strong Influence
○ Some Influence
○ Slight Influence
○ No Influence
○ Do Not Know/Cannot Remember

170. If you indicated that experiencing the event influenced you, please specify the overall influence or impact the event had on your life.

Please indicate if the influence on you was:

○ Positive
○ Negative
○ Neutral
○ Do Not Know/Cannot Remember
79. Event # 11 - Violent Demonstrations/Protests

171. Violent Demonstrations/Protests

- Did not experience.
- Personally involved in/participated in this event/situation.
- Members of my nuclear family were involved in such an event/situation.
- Members of my extended family were involved in such an event/situation.
- An acquaintance that I regularly interacted with in my neighborhood, church/house of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.
- An acquaintance that I did not regularly interact with in my neighborhood, church/place of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.
- I was present when the event/situation occurred, but I was not acquainted with the participants.
- I observed event/situation on television, in a movie, heard about it on the radio or read it in a newspaper, magazine, book or the Internet, but I did not personally know the participants.
- Do not know/Cannot remember
80. Event 11 - Violent Demonstrations/Protests

You have indicated that you "experienced" violent demonstrations/protests. Below are three follow-up questions about your experience.

172. How old were you when you first experienced the event?

- Child (0-12)
- Adolescent (13-17)
- Young Adult (18-35)
- Middle aged adult (36-60)
- Later in life (over 60)

173. To what extent did the event or situation you "experienced" influence you personally?

- Strong Influence
- Some Influence
- Slight Influence
- No Influence
- Do Not Know/Cannot Remember

174. If you indicated that experiencing the event influenced you, please specify the overall influence or impact the event had on your life.

Please indicate if the influence on you was:

- Positive
- Negative
- Neutral
- Do Not Know/Cannot Remember
175. Civil unrest on mass scale (involving assault, murder, rape and/or human trafficking)

- Did not experience.
- Personally involved in/participated in this event/situation.
- Members of my nuclear family were involved in such an event/situation.
- Members of my extended family were involved in such an event/situation.
- An acquaintance that I regularly interacted with in my neighborhood, church/house of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.
- An acquaintance that I did not regularly interact with in my neighborhood, church/place of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.
- I was present when the event/situation occurred, but I was not acquainted with the participants.
- I observed event/situation on television, in a movie, heard about it on the radio or read it in a newspaper, magazine, book or the Internet, but I did not personally know the participants.
- Do not know/Cannot remember
82. Event 12 - Civil unrest on mass scale

You have indicated that you "experienced" civil unrest on a mass scale. Below are three follow-up questions about your experience.

176. How old were you when you first experienced the event?

- Child (0-12)
- Adolescent (13-17)
- Young Adult (18-35)
- Middle aged adult (36-60)
- Later in life (over 60)

177. To what extent did the event or situation you "experienced" influence you personally?

- Strong Influence
- Some Influence
- Slight Influence
- No Influence
- Do Not Know/Cannot Remember

178. If you indicated that experiencing the event influenced you, please specify the overall influence or impact the event had on your life.

Please indicate if the influence on you was:

- Positive
- Negative
- Neutral
- Do Not Know/Cannot Remember
83. Event # 13 - Acts of physical violence - Not during civil unrest

179. Violent acts occurring other than during civil unrest (including murder, rape, and/or assault)

- Did not experience.
- Personally involved in/participated in this event/situation.
- Members of my nuclear family were involved in such an event/situation.
- Members of my extended family were involved in such an event/situation.
- An acquaintance that I regularly interacted with in my neighborhood, church/house of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.
- An acquaintance that I did not regularly interact with in my neighborhood, church/place of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.
- I was present when the event/situation occurred, but I was not acquainted with the participants.
- I observed event/situation on television, in a movie, heard about it on the radio or read it in a newspaper, magazine, book or the Internet, but I did not personally know the participants.
- Do not know/Cannot remember
84. Event 13 - Acts of physical violence - Not during civil unrest

You have indicated that you "experienced" acts of physical violence occurring other than during civil unrest. Below are three follow-up questions about your experience.

180. How old were you when you first experienced the event?

- Child (0-12)
- Adolescent (13-17)
- Young Adult (18-35)
- Middle aged adult (36-60)
- Later in life (over 60)

181. To what extent did the event or situation you "experienced" influence you personally?

- Strong Influence
- Some Influence
- Slight Influence
- No Influence
- Do Not Know/Cannot Remember

182. If you indicated that experiencing the event influenced you, please specify the overall influence or impact the event had on your life.

Please indicate if the influence on you was:

- Positive
- Negative
- Neutral
- Do Not Know/Cannot Remember
85. Event # 14 - A complaint resolution process - not in the court system

183. A complaint resolution process other than through the court system

- Did not experience.
- Personally involved in/participated in this event/situation.
- Members of my nuclear family were involved in such an event/situation.
- Members of my extended family were involved in such an event/situation.
- An acquaintance that I regularly interacted with in my neighborhood, church/house of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.
- An acquaintance that I did not regularly interact with in my neighborhood, church/place of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.
- I was present when the event/situation occurred, but I was not acquainted with the participants.
- I observed event/situation on television, in a movie, heard about it on the radio or read it in a newspaper, magazine, book or the Internet, but I did not personally know the participants.
- Do not know/Cannot remember.
86. Event 14 - A complaint resolution process - not in the court system

You have indicated that you "experienced" a complaint resolution process other than through the court system. Below are three follow-up questions about your experience.

184. How old were you when you first experienced the event?

- Child (0-12)
- Adolescent (13-17)
- Young Adult (18-35)
- Middle aged adult (36-60)
- Late in life (over 60)

185. To what extent did the event or situation you "experienced" influence you personally?

- Strong Influence
- Some Influence
- Slight Influence
- No Influence
- Do Not Know/Cannot Remember

186. If you indicated that experiencing the event influenced you, please specify the overall influence or impact the event had on your life.

Please indicate if the influence on you was:

- Positive
- Negative
- Neutral
- Do Not Know/Cannot Remember
87. Event # 15 - Racially/ethnically diverse neighborhood

187. Racially/ethnically diverse neighborhood

○ Did not experience.

○ Personally involved in/participated in this event/situation.

○ Members of my nuclear family were involved in such an event/situation.

○ Members of my extended family were involved in such an event/situation.

○ An acquaintance that I regularly interacted with in my neighborhood, church/house of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.

○ An acquaintance that I did not regularly interact with in my neighborhood, church/place of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.

○ I was present when the event/situation occurred, but I was not acquainted with the participants.

○ I observed event/situation on television, in a movie, heard about it on the radio or read it in a newspaper, magazine, book or the Internet, but I did not personally know the participants.

○ Do not know/Cannot remember
88. Event 15 - Racially/ethnically diverse neighborhood

You have indicated that you "experienced" a racially/ethnically diverse neighborhood. Below are three follow-up questions about your experience.

188. How old were you when you first experienced the event?

- Child (0-12)
- Adolescent (13-17)
- Young Adult (18-35)
- Middle aged adult (36-60)
- Later in life (over 60)

189. To what extent did the event or situation you "experienced" influence you personally?

- Strong Influence
- Some Influence
- Slight Influence
- No Influence
- Do Not Know/Cannot Remember

190. If you indicated that experiencing the event influenced you, please specify the overall influence or impact the event had on your life.

Please indicate if the influence on you was:

- Positive
- Negative
- Neutral
- Do Not Know/Cannot Remember
89. Event # 16 - Racially/ethnically diverse neighborhood with tensions

191. Racially/ethnically diverse neighborhood with tensions due to differences

- Did not experience.
- Personally involved in/participated in this event/situation.
- Members of my nuclear family were involved in such an event/situation.
- Members of my extended family were involved in such an event/situation.
- An acquaintance that I regularly interacted with in my neighborhood, church/house of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.
- An acquaintance that I did not regularly interact with in my neighborhood, church/place of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.
- I was present when the event/situation occurred, but I was not acquainted with the participants.
- I observed event/situation on television, in a movie, heard about it on the radio or read it in a newspaper, magazine, book or the Internet, but I did not personally know the participants.
- Do not know/Cannot remember
90. Event 16 - Racially/ethnically diverse neighborhood with tensions

You have indicated that you "experienced" a racially/ethnically diverse neighborhood with tensions due to differences. Below are three follow-up questions about your experience.

192. How old were you when you first experienced the event?

- [ ] Child (0-12)
- [ ] Adolescent (13-17)
- [ ] Young Adult (18-35)
- [ ] Middle aged adult (36-60)
- [ ] Later in life (over 60)

193. To what extent did the event or situation you "experienced" influence you personally?

- [ ] Strong Influence
- [ ] Some Influence
- [ ] Slight Influence
- [ ] No Influence
- [ ] Do Not Know/Cannot Remember

194. If you indicated that experiencing the event influenced you, please specify the overall influence or impact the event had on your life.

Please indicate if the influence on you was:

- [ ] Positive
- [ ] Negative
- [ ] Neutral
- [ ] Do Not Know/Cannot Remember
### 91. Event # 17 - Overt prejudice due to race, gender, handicap or religious belief

#### 195. Overt prejudice due to race, gender, handicap or religious beliefs

- [ ] Did not experience.
- [ ] Personally involved in/participated in this event/situation.
- [ ] Members of my nuclear family were involved in such an event/situation.
- [ ] Members of my extended family were involved in such an event/situation.
- [ ] An acquaintance that I regularly interacted with in my neighborhood, church/house of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.
- [ ] An acquaintance that I did not regularly interact with in my neighborhood, church/place of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.
- [ ] I was present when the event/situation occurred, but I was not acquainted with the participants.
- [ ] I observed event/situation on television, in a movie, heard about it on the radio or read it in a newspaper, magazine, book or the Internet, but I did not personally know the participants.
- [ ] Do not know/Cannot remember
92. Event 17 - Overt prejudice due to race, gender, handicap or religious beliefs...

You have indicated that you "experienced" overt prejudice due to race, gender, handicap or religious beliefs.

Below are three follow-up questions about your experience.

196. How old were you when you first experienced the event?

☐ Child (0-12)
☐ Adolescent (13-17)
☐ Young Adult (18-35)
☐ Middle aged adult (36-60)
☐ Later in life (over 60)

197. To what extent did the event or situation you "experienced" influence you personally?

☐ Strong Influence
☐ Some Influence
☐ Slight Influence
☐ No Influence
☐ Do Not Know/Cannot Remember

198. If you indicated that experiencing the event influenced you, please specify the overall influence or impact the event had on your life.

Please indicate if the influence on you was:

☐ Positive
☐ Negative
☐ Neutral
☐ Do Not Know/Cannot Remember
93. Event # 18 - Covert/subtle prejudice

199. Covert/subtle prejudice due to race, gender, handicap or religious beliefs

- Did not experience.
- Personally involved in/participated in this event/situation.
- Members of my nuclear family were involved in such an event/situation.
- Members of my extended family were involved in such an event/situation.
- An acquaintance that I regularly interacted with in my neighborhood, church/house of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.
- An acquaintance that I did not regularly interact with in my neighborhood, church/place of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.
- I was present when the event/situation occurred, but I was not acquainted with the participants.
- I observed event/situation on television, in a movie, heard about it on the radio or read it in a newspaper, magazine, book or the Internet, but I did not personally know the participants.
- Do not know/Cannot remember
94. Event 18 - Covert/subtle prejudice

You have indicated that you "experienced" covert/subtle prejudice due to race, gender, handicap or religious beliefs.

Below are three follow-up questions about your experience.

200. How old were you when you first experienced the event?

- Child (0-12)
- Adolescent (12-17)
- Young Adult (18-35)
- Middle aged adult (36-60)
- Later in life (over 60)

201. To what extent did the event or situation you "experienced" influence you personally?

- Strong Influence
- Some Influence
- Slight Influence
- No Influence
- Do Not Know/Cannot Remember

202. If you indicated that experiencing the event influenced you, please specify the overall influence or impact the event had on your life.

Please indicate if the influence on you was:

- Positive
- Negative
- Neutral
- Do Not Know/Cannot Remember
95. Event # 19 - Parents divorce during childhood

203. Parents divorce during your childhood

- Did not experience.
- Personally involved in/participated in this event/situation.
- Members of my nuclear family were involved in such an event/situation.
- Members of my extended family were involved in such an event/situation.
- An acquaintance that I regularly interacted with in my neighborhood, church/house of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.
- An acquaintance that I did not regularly interact with in my neighborhood, church/house of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.
- I was present when the event/situation occurred, but I was not acquainted with the participants.
- I observed event/situation on television, in a movie, heard about it on the radio or read it in a newspaper, magazine, book or the Internet, but I did not personally know the participants.
- Do not know/Cannot remember
96. Event 19 - Parents divorce during childhood

You have indicated that you "experienced" parents divorce during your childhood. Below are three follow-up questions about your experience.

204. How old were you when you first experienced the event?

- Child (0-12)
- Adolescent (13-17)
- Young Adult (18-35)
- Middle aged adult (36-60)
- Later in life (over 60)

205. To what extent did the event or situation you "experienced" influence you personally?

- Strong Influence
- Some Influence
- Slight Influence
- No Influence
- Do Not Know/Cannot Remember

206. If you indicated that experiencing the event influenced you, please specify the overall influence or impact the event had on your life.

Please indicate if the influence on you was:

- Positive
- Negative
- Neutral
- Do Not Know/Cannot Remember
97. Event # 20 - Child sexual abuse/incest

207. Child sexual abuse/incest

- Did not experience.
- Personally involved in/participated in this event/situation.
- Members of my nuclear family were involved in such an event/situation.
- Members of my extended family were involved in such an event/situation.
- An acquaintance that I regularly interacted with in my neighborhood, church/house of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.
- An acquaintance that I did not regularly interact with in my neighborhood, church/place of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.
- I was present when the event/situation occurred, but I was not acquainted with the participants.
- I observed event/situation on television, in a movie, heard about it on the radio or read it in a newspaper, magazine, book or the Internet, but I did not personally know the participants.
- Do not know/Cannot remember
98. Event 20 - Child sexual abuse/incest

You have indicated that you "experienced" child sexual abuse/incest.

Below are three follow-up questions about your experience.

208. How old were you when you first experienced the event?

- Child (0-12)
- Adolescent (13-17)
- Young Adult (18-35)
- Middle aged adult (36-60)
- Later in life (over 60)

209. To what extent did the event or situation you "experienced" influence you personally?

- Strong Influence
- Some Influence
- Slight Influence
- No Influence
- Do Not Know/Cannot Remember

210. If you indicated that experiencing the event influenced you, please specify the overall influence or impact the event had on your life.

Please indicate if the influence on you was:

- Positive
- Negative
- Neutral
- Do Not Know/Cannot Remember
99. Event # 21 - Psychological abuse of children

211. Psychological abuse of children

- Did not experience.
- Personally involved in/participated in this event/situation.
- Members of my nuclear family were involved in such an event/situation.
- Members of my extended family were involved in such an event/situation.
- An acquaintance that I regularly interacted with in my neighborhood, church/house of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.
- An acquaintance that I did not regularly interact with in my neighborhood, church/place of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.
- I was present when the event/situation occurred, but I was not acquainted with the participants.
- I observed event/situation on television, in a movie, heard about it on the radio or read it in a newspaper, magazine, book or the Internet, but I did not personally know the participants.
- Do not know/Cannot remember
100. Event 21 - Psychological abuse of children

You have indicated that you "experienced" psychological abuse of children.

Below are three follow-up questions about your experience.

212. How old were you when you first experienced the event?

☐ Child (0-12)
☐ Adolescent (13-17)
☐ Young Adult (18-35)
☐ Middle aged adult (36-60)
☐ Later in life (over 60)

213. To what extent did the event or situation you "experienced" influence you personally?

☐ Strong Influence
☐ Some Influence
☐ Slight Influence
☐ No Influence
☐ Do Not Know/Cannot Remember

214. If you indicated that experiencing the event influenced you, please specify the overall influence or impact the event had on your life.

Please indicate if the influence on you was:

☐ Positive
☐ Negative
☐ Neutral
☐ Do Not Know/Cannot Remember
215. Alcohol abuse

- Did not experience.
- Personally involved in/participated in this event/situation.
- Members of my nuclear family were involved in such an event/situation.
- Members of my extended family were involved in such an event/situation.
- An acquaintance that I regularly interacted with in my neighborhood, church/house of worship, school or on the job was involved in such an event/situation.
- An acquaintance that I did not regularly interact with in my neighborhood, church/house of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.
- I was present when the event/situation occurred, but I was not acquainted with the participants.
- I observed event/situation on television, in a movie, heard about it on the radio or read it in a newspaper, magazine, book or the Internet, but I did not personally know the participants.
- Do not know/Cannot remember
102. Event 22 - Alcohol abuse

You have indicated that you "experienced" alcohol abuse.

Below are three follow-up questions about your experience.

216. How old were you when you first experienced the event?

- [ ] Child (0-12)
- [ ] Adolescent (13-17)
- [ ] Young Adult (18-35)
- [ ] Middle aged adult (36-60)
- [ ] Later in life (over 60)

217. To what extent did the event or situation you "experienced" influence you personally?

- [ ] Strong Influence
- [ ] Some Influence
- [ ] Slight Influence
- [ ] No Influence
- [ ] Do Not Know/Cannot Remember

218. If you indicated that experiencing the event influenced you, please specify the overall influence or impact the event had on your life.

Please indicate if the influence on you was:

- [ ] Positive
- [ ] Negative
- [ ] Neutral
- [ ] Do Not Know/Cannot Remember
### 103. Event # 23 - Drug use

#### 219. Drug use

- Did not experience.
- Personally involved in/participated in this event/situation.
- Members of my nuclear family were involved in such an event/situation.
- Members of my extended family were involved in such an event/situation.
- An acquaintance that I regularly interacted with in my neighborhood, church/house of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.
- An acquaintance that I did not regularly interact with in my neighborhood, church/place of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.
- I was present when the event/situation occurred, but I was not acquainted with the participants.
- I observed event/situation on television, in a movie, heard about it on the radio or read it in a newspaper, magazine, book or the Internet, but I did not personally know the participants.
- Do not know/Cannot remember
104. Event 23 - Drug use

You have indicated that you "experienced" drug use.

Below are three follow-up questions about your experience.

220. How old were you when you first experienced the event?

☐ Child (0-12)
☐ Adolescent (13-17)
☐ Young Adult (18-35)
☐ Middle aged adult (36-60)
☐ Later in life (over 60)

221. To what extent did the event or situation you "experienced" influence you personally?

☐ Strong Influence
☐ Some Influence
☐ Slight Influence
☐ No Influence
☐ Do Not Know/Cannot Remember

222. If you indicated that experiencing the event influenced you, please specify the overall influence or impact the event had on your life.

Please indicate if the influence on you was:

☐ Positive
☐ Negative
☐ Neutral
☐ Do Not Know/Cannot Remember
105. Event # 24 - Mental illness

223. Mental illness

- Did not experience.
- Personally involved in/participated in this event/situation.
- Members of my nuclear family were involved in such an event/situation.
- Members of my extended family were involved in such an event/situation.
- An acquaintance that I regularly interacted with in my neighborhood, church/house of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.
- An acquaintance that I did not regularly interact with in my neighborhood, church/place of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.
- I was present when the event/situation occurred, but I was not acquainted with the participants.
- I observed event/situation on television, in a movie, heard about it on the radio or read it in a newspaper, magazine, book or the Internet, but I did not personally know the participants.
- Do not know/Cannot remember
106. Event 24 - Mental illness

You have indicated that you "experienced" mental illness.

Below are three follow-up questions about your experience.

224. How old were you when you first experienced the event?

- Child (0-12)
- Adolescent (13-17)
- Young Adult (18-35)
- Middle aged adult (36-60)
- Later in life (over 60)

225. To what extent did the event or situation you "experienced" influence you personally?

- Strong Influence
- Some Influence
- Slight Influence
- No Influence
- Do Not Know/Cannot Remember

226. If you indicated that experiencing the event influenced you, please specify the overall influence or impact the event had on your life.

Please indicate if the influence on you was:

- Positive
- Negative
- Neutral
- Do Not Know/Cannot Remember
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>107. Event # 25 - Frequent physical relocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>227. Event 25 - Frequent physical relocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Did not experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Personally involved in/participated in this event/situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Members of my nuclear family were involved in such an event/situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Members of my extended family were involved in such an event/situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ An acquaintance that I regularly interacted with in my neighborhood, church/house of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ An acquaintance that I did not regularly interact with in my neighborhood, church/force of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ I was present when the event/situation occurred, but I was not acquainted with the participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ I observed event/situation on television, in a movie, heard about it on the radio or read it in a newspaper, magazine, book or the Internet, but I did not personally know the participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Do not know/Cannot remember.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
108. Event 25 - Frequent physical relocation

You have indicated that you "experienced" frequent physical relocation.
Below are three follow-up questions about your experience.

228. How old were you when you first experienced the event?

- Child (0-12)
- Adolescent (13-17)
- Young Adult (18-35)
- Middle aged adult (36-60)
- Later in life (over 60)

229. To what extent did the event or situation you "experienced" influence you personally?

- Strong Influence
- Some Influence
- Slight Influence
- No Influence
- Do Not Know/Cannot Remember

230. If you indicated that experiencing the event influenced you, please specify the overall influence or impact the event had on your life.

Please indicate if the influence on you was:

- Positive
- Negative
- Neutral
- Do Not Know/Cannot Remember
231. Separation from family
- Did not experience.
- Personally involved in/participated in this event/situation.
- Members of my nuclear family were involved in such an event/situation.
- Members of my extended family were involved in such an event/situation.
- An acquaintance that I regularly interacted with in my neighborhood, church/house of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.
- An acquaintance that I did not regularly interact with in my neighborhood, church/house of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.
- I was present when the event/situation occurred, but I was not acquainted with the participants.
- I observed event/situation on television, in a movie, heard about it on the radio or read it in a newspaper, magazine, book or the Internet, but I did not personally know the participants.
- Do not know/Cannot remember
110. Event 26 - Separation from family

You have indicated that you "experienced" separation from family.

Below are three follow-up questions about your experience.

232. How old were you when you first experienced the event?

- Child (0-12)
- Adolescent (13-17)
- Young Adult (18-35)
- Middle aged adult (36-60)
- Later in life (over 60)

233. To what extent did the event or situation you "experienced" influence you personally?

- Strong Influence
- Some Influence
- Slight Influence
- No Influence
- Do Not Know/Cannot Remember

234. If you indicated that experiencing the event influenced you, please specify the overall influence or impact the event had on your life.

Please indicate if the influence on you was:

- Positive
- Negative
- Neutral
- Do Not Know/Cannot Remember
### 111. Event # 27 - Parent’s remarriage

#### 235. A parent’s remarriage

- Did not experience.
- Personally involved in/participated in this event/situation.
- Members of my nuclear family were involved in such an event/situation.
- Members of my extended family were involved in such an event/situation.
- An acquaintance that I regularly interacted with in my neighborhood, church/house of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.
- An acquaintance that I did not regularly interact with in my neighborhood, church/place of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.
- I was present when the event/situation occurred, but I was not acquainted with the participants.
- I observed event/situation on television, in a movie, heard about it on the radio or read it in a newspaper, magazine, book or the Internet, but I did not personally know the participants.
- Do not know/Cannot remember
112. Event 27 - Parent’s remarriage

You have indicated that you "experienced" a parent's remarriage.

Below are three follow-up questions about your experience.

236. How old were you when you first experienced the event?

☐ Child (0-12)
☐ Adolescent (13-17)
☐ Young Adult (18-35)
☐ Middle aged adult (36-60)
☐ Later in life (over 60)

237. To what extent did the event or situation you "experienced" influence you personally?

☐ Strong Influence
☐ Some Influence
☐ Slight Influence
☐ No Influence
☐ Do Not Know/Cannot Remember

238. If you indicated that experiencing the event influenced you, please specify the overall influence or impact the event had on your life.

Please indicate if the influence on you was:

☐ Positive
☐ Negative
☐ Neutral
☐ Do Not Know/Cannot Remember
113. Event # 28 - Parent’s separation

239. Parent’s separation

- Did not experience.
- Personally involved in/participated in this event/situation.
- Members of my nuclear family were involved in such an event/situation.
- Members of my extended family were involved in such an event/situation.
- An acquaintance that I regularly interacted with in my neighborhood, church/house of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.
- An acquaintance that I did not regularly interact with in my neighborhood, church/place of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.
- I was present when the event/situation occurred, but I was not acquainted with the participants.
- I observed event/situation on television, in a movie, heard about it on the radio or read it in a newspaper, magazine, book or the Internet, but I did not personally know the participants.
- Do not know/Cannot remember
114. Event 28 - Parent’s separation

You have indicated that you "experienced" parent's separation.

Below are three follow-up questions about your experience.

240. How old were you when you first experienced the event?

☐ Child (0-12)
☐ Adolescent (13-17)
☐ Young Adult (18-35)
☐ Middle aged adult (36-60)
☐ Later in life (over 60)

241. To what extent did the event or situation you "experienced" influence you personally?

☐ Strong Influence
☐ Some Influence
☐ Slight Influence
☐ No Influence
☐ Do Not Know/Cannot Remember

242. If you indicated that experiencing the event influenced you, please specify the overall influence or impact the event had on your life.

Please indicate if the influence on you was:

☐ Positive
☐ Negative
☐ Neutral
☐ Do Not Know/Cannot Remember
115. Event # 29 - Custody battle for children

243. Custody battle for children

☐ Did not experience.

☐ Personally involved in/participated in this event/situation.

☐ Members of my nuclear family were involved in such an event/situation.

☐ Members of my extended family were involved in such an event/situation.

☐ An acquaintance that I regularly interacted with in my neighborhood, church/house of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.

☐ An acquaintance that I did not regularly interact with in my neighborhood, church/place of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.

☐ I was present when the event/situation occurred, but I was not acquainted with the participants.

☐ I observed event/situation on television, in a movie, heard about it on the radio or read it in a newspaper, magazine, book or the Internet, but I did not personally know the participants.

☐ Do not know/Cannot remember
116. Event 29 - Custody battle for children

You have indicated that you "experienced" custody battle for children.

Below are three follow-up questions about your experience.

244. How old were you when you first experienced the event?

- Child (0-12)
- Adolescent (13-17)
- Young Adult (18-35)
- Middle aged adult (36-60)
- Later in life (over 60)

245. To what extent did the event or situation you "experienced" influence you personally?

- Strong Influence
- Some Influence
- Slight Influence
- No Influence
- Do Not Know/Cannot Remember

246. If you indicated that experiencing the event influenced you, please specify the overall influence or impact the event had on your life.

Please indicate if the influence on you was:

- Positive
- Negative
- Neutral
- Do Not Know/Cannot Remember
117. Event # 30 - Enrollment in social science or social justice class/seminar

247. Enrollment in social science or social justice class/seminar

☐ Did not experience.

☐ Personally involved in/participated in this event/situation.

☐ Members of my nuclear family were involved in such an event/situation.

☐ Members of my extended family were involved in such an event/situation.

☐ An acquaintance that I regularly interacted with in my neighborhood, church/house of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.

☐ An acquaintance that I did not regularly interact with in my neighborhood, church/place of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.

☐ I was present when the event/situation occurred, but I was not acquainted with the participants.

☐ I observed event/situation on television, in a movie, heard about it on the radio or read it in a newspaper, magazine, book or the Internet, but I did not personally know the participants.

☐ Do not know/Cannot remember
118. Event 30 - Enrollment in social science or social justice class/seminar

You have indicated that you "experienced" Enrollment in social science or social justice class/seminar. Below are three follow-up questions about your experience.

248. How old were you when you first experienced the event?

☐ Child (0-12)
☐ Adolescent (13-17)
☐ Young Adult (18-35)
☐ Middle aged adult (36-60)
☐ Later in life (over 60)

249. To what extent did the event or situation you "experienced" influence you personally?

☐ Strong Influence
☐ Some Influence
☐ Slight Influence
☐ No Influence
☐ Do Not Know/Cannot Remember

250. If you indicated that experiencing the event influenced you, please specify the overall influence or impact the event had on your life.

Please indicate if the influence on you was:

☐ Positive
☐ Negative
☐ Neutral
☐ Do Not Know/Cannot Remember
119. Event # 31 - Religious beliefs or education

251. Religious beliefs or education

- Did not experience.
- Personally involved in/participated in this event/situation.
- Members of my nuclear family were involved in such an event/situation.
- Members of my extended family were involved in such an event/situation.
- An acquaintance that I regularly interacted with in my neighborhood, church/house of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.
- An acquaintance that I did not regularly interact with in my neighborhood, church/house of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.
- I was present when the event/situation occurred, but I was not acquainted with the participants.
- I observed event/situation on television, in a movie, heard about it on the radio, or read it in a newspaper, magazine, book or the Internet, but I did not personally know the participants.
- Do not know/Cannot remember
120. Event 31 - Religious beliefs or education

You have indicated that you "experienced" religious beliefs or education.

Below are three follow-up questions about your experience.

252. How old were you when you first experienced the event?

- Child (0-12)
- Adolescent (13-17)
- Young Adult (18-35)
- Middle aged adult (36-60)
- Later in life (over 60)

253. To what extent did the event or situation you "experienced" influence you personally?

- Strong Influence
- Some Influence
- Slight Influence
- No Influence
- Do Not Know/Cannot Remember

254. If you indicated that experiencing the event influenced you, please specify the overall influence or impact the event had on your life.

Please indicate if the influence on you was:

- Positive
- Negative
- Neutral
- Do Not Know/Cannot Remember
121. Event # 32 - Family history of advocacy or community involvement

255. Family history of advocacy or community involvement

- Did not experience.
- Personally involved in/participated in this event/situation.
- Members of my nuclear family were involved in such an event/situation.
- Members of my extended family were involved in such an event/situation.
- An acquaintance that I regularly interacted with in my neighborhood, church/house of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.
- An acquaintance that I did not regularly interact with in my neighborhood, church/place of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.
- I was present when the event/situation occurred, but I was not acquainted with the participants.
- I observed event/situation on television, in a movie, heard about it on the radio or read it in a newspaper, magazine, book or the Internet, but I did not personally know the participants.
- Do not know/Cannot remember
122. Event 32 - Family history of advocacy or community involvement

You have indicated that you "experienced" Family history of advocacy or community involvement. Below are three follow-up questions about your experience.

256. How old were you when you first experienced the event?

- Child (0-12)
- Adolescent (13-17)
- Young Adult (18-35)
- Middle aged adult (36-60)
- Later in life (over 60)

257. To what extent did the event or situation you "experienced" influence you personally?

- Strong Influence
- Some Influence
- Slight Influence
- No Influence
- Do Not Know/Cannot Remember

258. If you indicated that experiencing the event influenced you, please specify the overall influence or impact the event had on your life.

Please indicate if the influence on you was:

- Positive
- Negative
- Neutral
- Do Not Know/Cannot Remember
### 123. Event # 33 - Worked in a setting with prevalent conflict

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>259. Worked in a setting in which conflict was prevalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○ Did not experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Personally involved in/participated in this event/situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Members of my nuclear family were involved in such an event/situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Members of my extended family were involved in such an event/situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ An acquaintance that I regularly interacted with in my neighborhood, church/house of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ An acquaintance that I did not regularly interact with in my neighborhood, church/house of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ I was present when the event/situation occurred, but I was not acquainted with the participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ I observed event/situation on television, in a movie, heard about it on the radio or read it in a newspaper, magazine, book or the Internet, but I did not personally know the participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Do not know/Cannot remember.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
124. Event 33 - Worked in a setting with prevalent conflict

You have indicated that you "experienced" working in a setting in which conflict was prevalent

Below are three follow-up questions about your experience.

260. How old were you when you first experienced the event?

- Child (0-12)
- Adolescent (13-17)
- Young Adult (18-35)
- Middle aged adult (36-60)
- Later in life (over 60)

261. To what extent did the event or situation you "experienced" influence you personally?

- Strong Influence
- Some Influence
- Slight Influence
- No Influence
- Do Not Know/Cannot Remember

262. If you indicated that experiencing the event influenced you, please specify the overall influence or impact the event had on your life.

Please indicate if the influence on you was:

- Positive
- Negative
- Neutral
- Do Not Know/Cannot Remember
125. Event # 34 - Discussion of or awareness of social justice issues

263. Discussion of or awareness of social justice issues

- Did not experience.
- Personally involved in/participated in this event/situation.
- Members of my nuclear family were involved in such an event/situation.
- Members of my extended family were involved in such an event/situation.
- An acquaintance that I regularly interacted with in my neighborhood, church/house of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.
- An acquaintance that I did not regularly interact with in my neighborhood, church/place of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.
- I was present when the event/situation occurred, but I was not acquainted with the participants.
- I observed event/situation on television, in a movie, heard about it on the radio or read it in a newspaper, magazine, book or the Internet, but I did not personally know the participants.
- Do not know/Cannot remember.
126. Event 34 - Discussion of or awareness of social justice issues

You have indicated that you "experienced" discussion of or awareness of social justice issues.

Below are three follow-up questions about your experience.

264. How old were you when you first experienced the event?

- Child (0-12)
- Adolescent (13-17)
- Young Adult (18-35)
- Middle aged adult (36-60)
- Later in life (over 60)

265. To what extent did the event or situation you "experienced" influence you personally?

- Strong Influence
- Some Influence
- Slight Influence
- No Influence
- Do Not Know/Cannot Remember

266. If you indicated that experiencing the event influenced you, please specify the overall influence or impact the event had on your life.

Please indicate if the influence on you was:

- Positive
- Negative
- Neutral
- Do Not Know/Cannot Remember
127. Event # 35 - Work, travel or residency in other countries

267. Work, travel or residency in other countries

- Did not experience.
- Personally involved in/participated in this event/situation.
- Members of my nuclear family were involved in such an event/situation.
- Members of my extended family were involved in such an event/situation.
- An acquaintance that I regularly interacted with in my neighborhood, church/house of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.
- An acquaintance that I did not regularly interact with in my neighborhood, church/house of worship, school or job was involved in such an event/situation.
- I was present when the event/situation occurred, but I was not acquainted with the participants.
- I observed event/situation on television, in a movie, heard about it on the radio or read it in a newspaper, magazine, book or the Internet, but I did not personally know the participants.
- Do not know/Cannot remember
128. Event 35 - Work, travel or residency in other countries

You have indicated that you "experienced" work, travel, or residency in other countries.

Below are three follow-up questions about your experience.

268. How old were you when you first experienced the event?

- Child (0-12)
- Adolescent (13-17)
- Young Adult (18-35)
- Middle aged adult (36-60)
- Later in life (over 60)

269. To what extent did the event or situation you "experienced" influence you personally?

- Strong Influence
- Some Influence
- Slight Influence
- No Influence
- Do Not Know/Cannot Remember

270. If you indicated that experiencing the event influenced you, please specify the overall influence or impact the event had on your life.

Please indicate if the influence on you was:

- Positive
- Negative
- Neutral
- Do Not Know/Cannot Remember
129. Additional Events Experienced

The previous section presented life events/situations that could have influenced your decision to become a conflict intervener and/or mediator.

Since the list could not be exhaustive for all individuals, you may have experienced other significant life events/situations that you believe impacted on your decision to become a conflict intervener and/or mediator. Space is provided below to list up to five additional events that you believe impacted on your decision to become a conflict intervener and/or mediator.

After you specify the event(s)/situation(s), you will be given an opportunity to indicate: how you experienced the event; your age when you experienced the event or situation; what degree each event or situation may have influenced you; and the impact or influence the event had on your life.

271. List an additional event(s)/situation(s) you experienced that was not included on the list of events in Events Experienced Section.

1
2
3
4
5
1.30. How Additional Event Influenced

272. For each additional event(s)/situation(s) that you listed in the previous question, please indicate the following:
- how you experienced it,
- the age when you experienced it,
- the degree of influence, and
- the nature of the influence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Degree of Influence</th>
<th>Nature of Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Event 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
131. Factors that impacted your choice to become a intervener and/or mediator

Mediation experience would include interventions in which the third party who serves as a mediator or the third party utilizes mediatve skills or techniques to resolve/transform conflicts.

273. How did you first learn of the process of mediation? (Select only one)

- Friends/relatives/neighbor
- Radio/television/movies/newspaper
- Individual who had utilized mediation
- Co-worker
- School/University
- Mediator
- Court
- Other (please specify)

274. How did you become interested in being a mediator? (Select only one)

- Primary career choice
- Avocation
- Second career choice
- Work in the community
- Collateral duties to primary job tasks
- Other (please specify)
132. Ranking of factors that influenced decision to become conflict intervener/m...

275. Using the list shown on the right, list in rank order the letter that corresponds to the five events/situations that most impacted on your decision to become a mediator.

(1 = the event from the list that had the most impact on your choice to become a mediator; 5 = event from the list that had the least impact on your choice to become a mediator)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greatest impact (1st)</th>
<th>Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2nd greatest impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd greatest impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th greatest impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th greatest impact (least)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

276. List in rank order any other events, situations or factors that are not on the attached list that contributed to your decision to become a mediator.

(1 = the event not on the list that had the most impact on your choice to become a mediator; 5 = event not on the list that had the least impact on your choice to become a mediator)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greatest impact (1st)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2nd greatest impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd greatest impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th greatest impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th greatest impact (least)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

277. Do any of the events/situations that you identified as having a high impact on your decision to become an mediator, influence the types of mediation cases you are interested in handling as a mediator?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
278. If the events/situations you listed influence the types of mediation cases you are interested in handling as a mediator, please specify which ones impact the types of cases handled.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

279. Do any of the events you listed above contribute to your overall reason for being a conflict intervener/mediator?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

280. If you indicated that any of the events you listed above contribute to your overall reason for being a conflict resolver/mediator, please explain how.

[ ]
133. Mediation Cases Preference

281. Which of the following types of mediation cases would you prefer to handle? (Check all that apply)
   - □ Divorce
   - □ Custody
   - □ Property
   - □ Work place relationships
   - □ Organizational conflicts
   - □ Other (please specify)

282. Which types of mediation cases do you feel uniquely qualified to handle? (Check all that apply)
   - □ Divorce
   - □ Custody
   - □ Property
   - □ Work relationships
   - □ Organizational conflicts
   - □ Other (please specify)

283. Have you ever felt that a case was "too close" to you to mediate because of past events in your life?
   - □ No
   - □ Yes

284. If you have felt that a case was "too close" to you to mediate, what events have you experienced that made you feel that the case was "too close" to you?


134. Arenas in which intervene (Realms of work)

The following section will ask questions about the arenas in which you typically mediate. The arenas include interpersonal, community, national (within a country) and international (across countries).

285. In which of the following arenas do you typically mediate cases?
(Check all that apply.)

☐ International (between countries or nations)
☐ Intra-national (within a country or nation)
☐ Inter-Community (between communities)
☐ Intra-Community (within community)
☐ Inter-Organizational (between organizations)
☐ Intra-Organizational (within organizations)
☐ Interpersonal

286. In which of the following arenas do you prefer to mediate cases?
(Check all that apply.)

☐ International
☐ Intra-national/National (within a country)
☐ Inter-Community (between communities)
☐ Intra-Community (within community)
☐ Inter-Organizational (between organizations)
☐ Intra-Organizational (within organizations)
☐ Interpersonal
135. Thank You for Your Participation!

Congratulations, you have completed the survey.

I greatly appreciate your participation.

If there is any information you wish to share with the surveyor, please do so in the comment section below.

Betty Marshall, Doctoral Candidate
Institute of Conflict Analysis and Resolution
George Mason University

287. Comments:

288. At the beginning of this survey, it was explained that the researcher will also be conducting some oral interviews as a part of this research.

Do you wish to be considered for an oral interview or follow-up questions?

☐ Yes
☐ No
136. Do You Wish to Complete Survey?

You have indicated that you do not wish to participate. If you made this selection in error, and wish to complete the survey, please select return to survey below.

If you do not wish to participate in the survey, please select do not return to survey.

289. Do you wish to return to the survey?

- No
- Yes
137. Thank you.

Thank you for your time spent considering whether you wished to participate in the survey.

If there is any information you wish to share with the surveyor, please do so in the comment section below.

Betty Marshall, Doctoral Candidate
Institute of Conflict Analysis and Resolution
George Mason University

290. Comments.
138. Thank You for Your Time

Thank you for your time participating in the survey.

If there is any information you wish to share with the surveyor, please do so in the comment section below.

Betty Marshall, Doctoral Candidate
Institute of Conflict Analysis and Resolution
George Mason University

291. Comments:
139. Contact information

You have indicated that you wish to considered for an oral interview or follow-up questions.

If this is correct, please provide the information requested below.

You are not required to complete this section or to provide contact information.

**292. I wish to be considered for an oral interview or follow-up questions. I understand that this contact information will remain separate from the responses I have supplied to the survey.**

I also understand that the interview notes will be keep strictly confidential and will be available only to the researcher. Excerpts from the interviews may be shared with members of my dissertation committee and be used as part of the final dissertation, but under no circumstances will your name or any identifying characteristics be included in the dissertation.

You are not required to provide contact information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Email Address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
293. Please send me an abstract of the results of this research. My email address is:
141. Exit

You are exiting the survey.
Appendix B

Questionnaire Used in Interview of “High Profile” Mediators
I am working on a dissertation at the Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution at George Mason University located in Fairfax, Virginia. My research focuses on the backgrounds of mediators.

As a part of my research, I am conducting a survey of conflict interveners/mediators. I am also conducting oral interviews with “high-profile mediators”. You have been contacted for such an oral interview. The interview consists of questions about your experience as a conflict intervener in general and as a mediator in particular; demographic information; questions about how you became aware of the mediation field; and questions about the realms of your work. The interview consists of closed-choice questions, as well as opened-ended questions. It is anticipated that the interview will take approximately 60 minutes. I would like to emphasize that:

- your participation is entirely voluntary;
- you are free to refuse to answer any question; and
- you are free to withdraw at any time.

The interview will be audiotaped. All tapes will remain in my possession. I will personally transcribe the tapes and be the only person reviewing the tapes. After transcription and coding, the tapes will be destroyed. The results of the interviews will be kept strictly confidential and will be available only to members of my dissertation committee and myself. Excerpts from the interviews may be part of the final dissertation, but under no circumstances will your name or any identifying characteristics be included in the dissertation.

Section II – Experience as a Conflict Intervener

2.1 Do you consider yourself a conflict intervener?
   ☐ Yes ☐ No

2.2 If yes, why do you consider yourself a conflict intervener?

2.3 If no, did you ever consider yourself a conflict intervener?
   ☐ Yes ☐ No

2.4. If you no longer consider yourself a conflict intervener, what event/situations caused you to stop considering yourself a conflict intervener?
2.5 If you indicated you are not a conflict intervener at this time, are you currently enrolled in a conflict resolution training program or taking courses in conflict resolution?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

2.6. When you are serving as conflict intervener, what term(s) do you feel best describes the role(s) you are in or the work you are doing?

2.7. If you no longer consider yourself a conflict intervener, when you served as a conflict intervener, what term(s) do you feel best described the role(s) you performed?

2.8 What was the path you took to become a conflict intervener?

2.12 Do you engage in conflict resolution as a vocation/occupation, adjunct to a vocation/occupation or an avocation?

☐ vocation/occupation
☐ adjunct to vocation/occupation
☐ avocation

2.13 Did you select conflict intervention as a career?

2.14 Was the choice to become a conflict intervener your first career choice?

2.15 If becoming a conflict intervener was not your first career choice, what other careers did you hold prior to becoming a conflict intervener or studying conflict resolution? (Please briefly describe the series of career choices or decisions that lead you to becoming an intervener or to study conflict resolution.)

2.16 If you intervene in conflict as a profession, what types of cases do you routinely handle?
2.17 If you no longer intervene in conflict as a profession, what types of cases did you routinely handle when you practiced?

2.18 How many cases do you handle in a month?

2.19 If you no longer handle cases, how many cases did you handle in a month?

2.20 Are there any types of cases you prefer to handle?
   - Yes  - No

2.21 What types of cases do you prefer to handle?

2.22 Why do you prefer to handle these types of cases?

2.23 If you no longer handle cases, when you were practicing, were there types of cases you preferred to handle?
   - Yes  - No

2.24 If you no longer handle cases, when you were practicing, what types of cases did you prefer to handle?

2.25 If you no longer handle cases, when you were practicing, why did you prefer to handle these types of cases?

2.26 Are there any types of cases you prefer not to handle or choose not to handle?
   - Yes  - No

2.27 What types of cases do you prefer not to handle?

2.28 Why do you prefer not to handle these types of cases?
2.29 If you no longer handle cases, when you were practicing, were there types of cases you preferred not to handle?
☐ Yes  ☐ No

2.30 If you no longer handle cases, what types of cases did you prefer not to or choose not to handle?)

2.31 If you no longer handle cases, when you were practicing, why did you prefer not to handle these types of cases?

2.32 What types of cases have you been specifically trained to handle?

2.33 What types of cases are you most comfortable handling?

2.34 (If you no longer handle cases, what types of cases were you most comfortable handling?)

2.35 If you were to use a metaphor to describe your role as a conflict intervener, what would it be? Please describe your role in the metaphor.

**Section III – Mediation Experience**

Mediation experience would include interventions in which the third party who serves as a mediator or the third party utilizes mediative skills or techniques to resolve/transform conflicts.

3.1 If you indicated in the prior section that you consider (or once considered) yourself a conflict intervener, please indicate which, if any of the following terms, you feel, describe your work as a conflict resolver.

☐ facilitator  ☐ ombudsperson  ☐ arbitrator  ☐ mediator
☐ ____________________________
3.2 If you did not indicate that you consider yourself a mediator, did you previously consider yourself a mediator?
   ☐ Yes  ☐ No

3.3 You have indicated that you consider yourself a mediator. Do you use your mediative skills when you are not mediating?
   ☐ Yes  ☐ No

3.4 You indicated above that you do not consider yourself a mediator. Do you use mediative skills?
   ☐ Yes  ☐ No

   a. Briefly describe some of the mediative skills you incorporate into your work.

3.5 If you consider yourself a mediator, how long have you mediated?
   ☐ Less than 1 year  ☐ 5 years to less than 10 years
   ☐ 1 year to less than 3 years  ☐ 10 years to less than 20 years
   ☐ 3 years to less than 5 years  ☐ 20 years or more

3.6 If you previously considered yourself a mediator, how long did you mediate?
   ☐ Less than 1 year  ☐ 5 years to less than 10 years
   ☐ 1 year to less than 3 years  ☐ 10 years to less than 20 years
   ☐ 3 years to less than 5 years  ☐ 20 years or more

3.7 Have you received training as a mediator?
   ☐ Yes  ☐ No

3.8 Approximately how many hours of mediation training have you received?
   ☐ None
   ☐ Less than 60 hours
   ☐ More than 60 hours
3.9 Is a certification to mediate issued in the state in which you mediate?
☐ Yes ☐ No

3.10. Which state? ________________________ (Will provide selection list)

3.11. If yes, are you certified?
☐ Yes ☐ No

3.12. What does the certification permit you to do?
☐ mediate court referred cases
☐ other ___________

3.13. Approximately how many mediations have you conducted?
☐ Less than 5 ☐ More than 20, less than 30
☐ More than 5, less than 10 ☐ More than 30
☐ More than 10, less than 20

3.14. How long have you been mediating cases?
☐ Less than 1 year ☐ 5 years to less than 10 years
☐ 1 year to less than 3 years ☐ 10 years to less than 20 years
☐ 3 years to less than 5 years ☐ 20 years or more

3.15 If you no longer mediate, how long did you mediate cases?
☐ Less than 1 year ☐ 5 years to less than 10 years
☐ 1 year to less than 3 years ☐ 10 years to less than 20 years
☐ 3 years to less than 5 years ☐ 20 years or more

3.16 Do you currently mediate cases?
☐ Yes ☐ No

3.17. Approximately how many cases per month do you mediate?
☐ Less than 5 ☐ 5 More than 20, less than 30
☐ More than 5, less than 10 ☐ More than 30
☐ More than 10, less than 20 ☐ Other _________________
3.18 If you no longer mediate, how many cases did you mediate per month before you stopped mediating?
☐ Less than 5  ☐ More than 20, less than 30
☐ More than 5, less than 10 ☐ More than 30
☐ More than 10, less than 20 ☐ Other _________________

3.19. Approximately how many hours do you mediate per month?
☐ Less than 5  ☐ 5 More than 20, less than 30
☐ More than 5, less than 10 ☐ More than 30
☐ More than 10, less than 20 ☐ Other _________________

3.20 If you no longer mediate, how many hours did you previously mediate per month?
☐ Less than 5  ☐ More than 20, less than 30
☐ More than 5, less than 10 ☐ More than 30
☐ More than 10, less than 20

3.21 If you no longer mediate, when did you stop mediating or decided you did not wish to mediate?
☐ During mediation training
☐ After completing mediation training
☐ While completing required cases for certification
☐ After receiving certification
☐ After having mediated beyond required cases
☐ Other

Section IV – Demographic Information

4.1. What is your gender?
☐ male ☐ female

4.2. What is your age?
☐ less than 21 ☐ 41 to 50
☐ 21 to 30 ☐ 51 to 60
☐ 31 to 40 ☐ over 60
4.3 What is your racial background?
☐ African-American ☐ Native American or Alaskan Native
☐ Asian or Pacific Islander ☐ Multi-racial (Check all that apply from list)
☐ Hispanic ☐ White (Caucasian), Non-Hispanic
☐ Other ____________________________________________________________

4.4 What is the highest grade of school you completed?
☐ Less Than High School ☐ Bachelor’s Degree
☐ High School graduate/GED ☐ Master’s Degree
☐ Less than two years of college ☐ Ph. D
☐ Associate’s Degree ☐ Ed. D
☐ More than two years of college ☐ JD
☐ but less than 4 years ☐ MD
☐ Other ____________________________

4.5 Please list the careers/occupations of your parents or the individuals who served in the role of your parents when you were growing up?

4.6 Did the person(s) you identify as your parents or the individuals who served in the role of your parents when you were growing up, use conflict intervention skills in their career/occupation?
☐ Yes ☐ No

4.6 Please describe how your parents or the individuals who served in the role of your parents when you were growing up, used conflict intervention skills in their career/occupation?

4.7 Did your parents or the individuals who served in the role of your parents when you were growing up, use conflict intervention skills in their role in the community?
☐ Yes ☐ No
4.8 Please describe how your parents or the individuals who served in the role of your parents when you were growing up, use conflict intervention skills in their role in the community?

4.10 How many siblings do you have? (If none skip to section V)

4.11 If you have siblings, what is your birth order? (Example: Enter 1 of 3, If you are the first born of three children, enter 2 of 3, if you are the second born of three children.)

4.12 If you have siblings, please list their occupations.

4.13 Do your siblings use conflict intervention skills in their career/occupation? If yes, please describe.

4.14 Do your siblings use conflict intervention skills in their roles in the community or avocation? Please describe how the sibling(s) uses conflict intervention skills.

4.15 Please indicate the results of your Thomas Kilmann Conflict assessment in the order of the preference you may use them: (Competing, collaborating, compromising, avoiding, & accommodating)

First/strongest ______________
Second/second strongest ________________
Third/third strongest _____________________
Fourth/fourth strongest ___________________

4.16 If you have taken the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), please list your MBTI? __ __ __ __
Section VII: How did you become aware of mediation?

7.1 Using the list, list in rank order the letter that corresponds to the five events/situations that most impacted on your decision to become a mediator. (1 = the event from the list that had the most impact on your choice to become a mediator; 5 = event from the list that had the least impact on your choice to become a mediator)

1. ____________________
2. ____________________
3. ____________________
4. ____________________
5. ____________________

7.2 List in rank order any other events, situations or factors that are not on the attached list that contributed to your decision to become a mediator. (1 = the event not on the list that had the most impact on your choice to become a mediator; 5 = event not on the list that had the least impact on your choice to become a mediator)

1. ____________________
2. ____________________
3. ____________________
4. ____________________
5. ____________________

7.3 Do any of the events/situations you listed in the previous two questions influence the types of mediation cases you are interested in handling as a mediator?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

7.4 If the events/situations you listed influence the types of mediation cases you are interested in handling as a mediator, please specify which ones had the most impact on the types of cases handled.

1. ____________________
2. ____________________
3. ____________________
4. ____________________
5. ____________________
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7.5 Do any of the events you listed above contribute to your overall reason for being a conflict resolver/mediator?  
☐ Yes  ☐ No  
If yes, please explain how ________________________________

7.6 Which of the following types of mediation cases would you prefer to handle? (Check all that apply)  
☐ Divorce  ☐ Property  
☐ Custody  ☐ Workplace relationships  
☐ Organizational conflicts  ☐ Other ________________________________

7.7 Which types of mediation cases do you feel uniquely qualified to handle? (Check all that apply)  
☐ Divorce  ☐ Property  
☐ Custody  ☐ Work relationships  
☐ Organizational conflicts  ☐ Other ________________________________

Section VIII: Sphere of control of cases (Realms of work)

8.1 In which of the following arenas do you typically mediate cases? (Check all that apply.)  
☐ International  ☐ National (within a country)  
☐ Community (within community)  ☐ Interpersonal  

8.2 In which of the following arenas do you prefer to mediate cases? (Check all that apply.)  
☐ International  ☐ National (within a country)  
☐ Community (within community)  ☐ Interpersonal
Congratulations, you have completed the survey.

If you have any questions please call me at 703-369-6880 or email me at bmarsh1@gmu.edu. Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey!

Betty Marshall, Doctoral Candidate
Institute of Conflict Analysis and Resolution
George Mason University
Guide for Section VII
List of Events/Situations

1. Situation where others did not have an opportunity to present their side of a story
2. Unfair business practices
3. Altercation involving physical violence
4. Altercation involving personal verbal attack (raised voices, profanity, etc.)
5. Individual(s) suing an individual, business, group or organization or being sued by an individual, business, group or organization
6. Participant in a formal court proceeding
7. Attendance at a formal court proceeding (you were not a party in the proceeding)
8. Heard of others going to court
9. Visit to an attorney’s office
10. Non-violent Demonstrations/Protests
11. Violent Demonstrations/Protests
12. Murder
13. Rape
14. A complaint resolution process other than through the court system
15. Racially/ethnically diverse neighborhood
16. Racially/ethnically diverse neighborhood with tensions due to differences
17. Overt prejudice due to race, gender, handicap or religious beliefs
18. Covert/subtle prejudice due to race, gender, handicap or religious beliefs
19. Parents divorce during your childhood
20. Child sexual abuse/incest
21. Psychological abuse of children
22. Alcohol abuse
23. Drug use
24. Mental illness
25. Frequent physical relocation
26. Separation from family
27. A parent’s remarriage
28. Parent’s separation
29. Custody battle for children
30. Enrollment in social science or social justice class/seminar
31. Religious beliefs or education
32. Family history of advocacy or community involvement
33. While performing a profession in which conflict was prevalent, recognizing the need to use other approaches
Appendix C

Consent Form Used for Interviews of “High Profile” Mediators
**Title of the Research Study:**
The Making of a Mediator: What Life Circumstances or Events Do Mediators Identify as Being Influential in the Choice to Become a Mediator?

**INFORMED CONSENT FORM**

**RESEARCH PROCEDURES**
This research is being conducted to conduct research for dissertation at the Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution at George Mason University located in Fairfax, Virginia. My research focuses on the backgrounds of mediators.

As a part of my research, I am conducting a survey of conflict interveners/mediators. The survey contains eight sections. The survey contains closed-choice questions, as well as opened-ended questions about your background and your experience as a conflict intervener and/or mediator. If you agree to participate, you will be asked to complete the survey which takes approximately 30 minutes to complete.

In addition, the researcher will also be conducting some oral interviews as a part of this research. Two types of oral interviews will be conducted. Interviews will be conducted of “high profile” mediators and of mediators who completed the survey and indicated they will to participate in the follow-up oral interviews.

If you have a desire to be contacted for an oral interview following the completion of the written survey, you will be asked to complete the contact information at the end of Section 8 of the survey. You may complete the survey and opt not to participate in the oral interviews. It is anticipate the oral interviews will take appropriately 45 minutes. The oral interviews will ask respondents to discuss the sphere of control in their mediation practice as reflected in their survey responses, their style of conflict management, and their experience with cases that they perceive as “too close” to mediate based on events they have experienced.

In the oral interview of the “high profile” mediators, questions from Sections II, IV, VII and VIII of the on-line survey will be asked. These questions focus on identifying life circumstances or events that were instrumental in their decision to become mediators or resulted in becoming mediators. It is anticipated that the interview will take 60 minutes.
RISKS
There are no foreseeable risks for participating in this research. However if you experienced an unpleasant childhood and that is why you decided to become a mediator, taking this survey may bring up bad memories. If you decide to participate, I would like to emphasize that:

- your participation is entirely voluntary;
- you are free to refuse to answer any question; and
- you are free to withdraw at any time.

BENEFITS
There are no benefits to you as a participant other than to further research in the study of why individuals decide to become conflict interveners. In addition, the benefits to the field of conflict resolution and specifically the backgrounds of mediators may provide some criteria for those who assign mediators to cases, i.e. to assist in better matching mediators to disputants to maximize successful outcomes. Such research may also provide information that will assist mediator mentors and other coaches of mediators in providing feedback to junior mediators on how their backgrounds are impacting on their practices.

CONFIDENTIALITY
The data in this study will be confidential. The researcher will not be assigning a number or other identifier but the survey is being conducted via electronic survey software (Survey Monkey). Survey Monkey does assign a number which only the researcher will be able to access. If you elect to provide contact information in Section 8 indicating you wish to be considered for a follow-up oral interview, the researcher be will be able to link the number assigned by Survey Monkey to your identity. Only the researcher will have access to the identification key. While it is understood that no computer transmission can be perfectly secure, reasonable efforts will be made to protect the confidentiality of your transmission.

Confidentiality will be maintained at all times. Names will not be attached to responses when you respond electronically. The results of the survey will be keep strictly confidential and will be available only to members of my dissertation committee and myself. Excerpts from the surveys may be part of the final dissertation, but under no circumstances will your name or any identifying characteristics be included in the dissertation. The interview notes will be keep strictly confidential and will be available only to the researcher. Excerpts from the interviews may be shared with members of my dissertation committee and be used as part of the final dissertation, but under no circumstances will your name or any identifying characteristics be included in the dissertation.
PARTICIPATION
Your participation is voluntary, and you may withdraw from the study at any time and for any reason. If you decide not to participate or if you withdraw from the study, there is no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. There are no costs to you or any other.

CONTACT
This research is being conducted by Betty Marshall, Institute of Conflict Analysis and Resolution at George Mason University. She may be reached at 703-369-6880 for questions or to report a research-related problem. The Chair of the Dissertation Committee is Dr. Wallace Warfield and he may be reached at 703-993-3649. You may contact the George Mason University Office of Research Subject Protections at 703-993-4121 if you have questions or comments regarding your rights as a participant in the research.

This research has been reviewed according to George Mason University procedures governing your participation in this research.

CONSENT
I have read this form and agree to participate in this study.

The George Mason University Human Subjects Review Board has waived the requirement for a signature on this consent form. However, if you wish to sign a consent form, please email Betty Marshall @bmarsha1@gmu.edu.

If you have agreed to be interviewed, please complete this section:

I agree to be forwarded the interview questions in written format via email or mail and to return my responses electronically. __________

I do not agree to be forwarded the interview questions in written format via email or mail and to return my responses electronically.

_________

Version date:

__________________________________________________________
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