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"Conflict is present on every college and university campus in America. Whether between or among students, faculty, administrators, boards of trustees, or state and federal agencies, conflicts are an inevitable fact of academic life" (McCarthy, 1980, p. 1). To handle conflict, colleges and universities have institutionalized a variety of third party conflict resolution processes (interventions by individuals who are not involved in the conflict), which can be used by students who find themselves in conflict with other members of the campus community. For example, advice from para-professional staff members (Dodge, 1990), professional expertise from ombudspersons (McCarthy, 1980), administrative decision-making by full time staff members and judicial processes (Hayes & Balogh, 1990) traditionally have been available to students who required help in resolving conflicts. More recently, student and staff mediators have become available to members of the campus community who find themselves involved in a conflict (Waterz, 1990).
Statement of the Problem

This study will investigate whether or not students can be trained to view conflict in a way which supports the use of mediation, rather than arbitration (i.e., giving advice or administrative decision-making) or litigation (judicial process) to resolve disputes. Two groups of students will be exposed to three different kinds of mediation training. The ways in which these students view conflict after completing the training sessions will be compared to the ways in which students who have not participated in training view conflict.

If mediation is to be used effectively on college and university campuses, it must be viewed as a viable method for resolving disputes. When disputants view conflict as something which only can be resolved if a third party suggests, or imposes a resolution, they are unlikely to use mediation to resolve their conflict. However, if disputants view conflict as something which can be resolved through a process of negotiation, they are likely to consider mediation as a method of resolving their conflict (LaTour, Houlden, Walker, & Thibaut, 1978; Keuer & Panrod, 1986).

The purpose of this study will be to test the impact of mediation training on the perspectives, or frames,
which students use to view conflict. "Frame" describes an individual's understanding of a conflict. It is a way to interpret a conflict, a perspective, or a view which is used to make meaning out of the conflict which is present. Sheppard, Minton and Hyder (1990) define "frame" as an initial interpretation of the structure of a decision or interaction that has implication for the processes and choices that are considered by the perceiver. Thus, like a picture frame, cognitive frames focus our attention on some aspects of a situation, to the exclusion of others; and like a guardrail, they suggest certain directions for others (p. 6).

Background for the Study

Unlike many of the other third party intervention techniques which institutions of higher education make available to students, mediation requires that those involved in a conflict come up with their own solution to the conflict. Mediators do not decide how disputes will be resolved. Instead, they provide a structure which disputants use to discuss the issues which created the conflict in an effort to reach an agreement about how to resolve the conflict (Folberg, 1983). Many of the other
conflict resolution processes which are available to students involve a third party who ends up deciding for the parties how a conflict will be resolved (Fisher, 1983).

When students find themselves in a conflict with another party, they usually have to choose which conflict resolution process to use. Research shows that when disputants, as well as third parties have a choice, they prefer to use third party interventions where the third parties decide how the dispute will be resolved (Thibaut & Walker, 1975; Thibaut, 1978; LaTour, Houlden, Walker, & Thibaut, 1976; Sheppard, Blumenfeld-Jones, & Roth, 1989). This means that subjects prefer to use interventions where the disputants are not responsible for coming up with a solution. In other words, third party interventions other than mediation are used more often than mediation.

The dynamics surrounding the process of choosing a specific conflict resolution technique over other equally available techniques have not been thoroughly investigated. However, a number of researchers have suggested hypotheses which explain why subjects prefer intervention techniques which use third parties to suggest, or impose, a resolution to the dispute over techniques which require the disputants to develop their
own resolution (Hamnett, 1977; Ross, Green, & House, 1977; Davis, 1984; Bazerman, 1986; Peachy, 1989; Sheppard, Blumenfeld-Jones, and Roth, 1989). This paper will investigate an hypothesis advanced by Sheppard et al. (1989) which suggests that people view conflict with different perspectives which influence the kind of conflict resolution process which they choose.

Sheppard et al. (1989) found that third parties tended to use perspectives which motivated them to choose conflict resolution methods where they suggested, or imposed solutions to conflicts, rather than methods, like mediation, where they helped the disputants work out a solution to the problem. Sheppard et al. (1989) also found that their sample used perspectives which supported a third party suggesting, or imposing a solution three times as often as a perspective which supported a third party helping disputants to arrive at a solution.

When third parties intervene to help disputing parties resolve a conflict, they may play one of a variety of different roles. The roles which third parties play create the type of conflict resolution process which will be used to help the disputing parties to resolve their conflict. When third parties suggest, or impose a solution upon parties who are in a conflict, the conflict
resolution process is called "arbitration" (Fisher, 1983). Litigation is similar to arbitration except that the third party is a judge who is an employee of the legal system. In contrast, mediation is a dispute resolution process whereby impartial third parties help disputants reach mutually acceptable agreements which are designed to resolve conflicts (Folberg, 1983). In mediation, third parties rarely suggest, and never impose, the solution to a conflict. Instead, mediators help disputing parties negotiate a workable solution to their problem. Lewicki and Litterer (1985) define negotiation as a communication process where bargaining, or an "exchange of offers and counter offers" (p. 7), takes place as disputants attempt to resolve their differences. Mediators help parties involved in a dispute to discuss the issues which caused the conflict and to engage in a negotiation process which allows the parties, rather than the mediator, to find a solution to the problem.

For over a decade, Sheppard et al. (1989) have been investigating the roles which managers play when they intervene as third parties to help disputing employees to resolve their conflicts. In addition to supporting historical theories which portray third parties as "relatively unconstrained, rational decision makers
choosing the method that gives the best chance of achieving their objectives, given certain features of the dispute" (Sheppard et al., 1989, p. 180), Sheppard et al's. research suggested that a new theory of conflict frames might also explain third party decision making. Sheppard et al. (1989) hypothesized that third parties might use conflict frames, instead of or in addition to logic, to help them select an appropriate intervention process. Research conducted to test the existence of four conflict frames and the relationship between the frames and the conflict resolution process chosen by third parties supported Sheppard et al.'s. (1989) hypothesis.

Specifically, Sheppard et al. (1989) concluded that the subjects in their study, when given a choice, were predisposed to using perspectives which caused them to choose arbitration, rather than mediation, as a way of resolving conflicts. Assuming that Sheppard et al's. (1989) hypothesis stating that perspectives influence the kind of conflict resolution method which is chosen to resolve a dispute is correct and that Sheppard et al's. (1989) findings that people tend to use perspectives which favor an intervention of arbitration is accurate, it is unlikely that mediation will be used to resolve disputes to its full potential. Without a method of changing
people's perspectives, arbitration, as well as litigation will continue to dominate the field of conflict resolution. If, however, people can be taught or trained to use perspectives which motivate them to choose mediation as a way of resolving their conflict more often than is presently the case, then mediation will be able to play a more significant role in conflict resolution. This study investigated whether or not perspectives could be changed through education, training, or exposure to real mediation sessions.

Rationale for the Study

Since institutions of higher education have been expanding their formal use of mediation over the past decade (Waterz, 1991), it is important to understand when students will be motivated to choose mediation over the other options which are available to resolve their disputes. Although mediation has been used informally by members of the campus community during the history of higher education in the United States (Shubert & Folger, 1986), the establishment of mediation centers is a relatively new phenomenon (Waterz, 1991). Since 1981, when the first mediation center in higher education was established at The University of Massachusetts at Amherst,
there has been an increase in the number of colleges and universities which are making mediation formally available to campus community members who find themselves in conflict with another party. Specifically, in the last five years, the number of mediation centers on college campuses has more than doubled. Waterz (1991) found that of the twenty-seven institutions which responded to a survey about campus mediation services, only eight indicated that their mediation service had been in existence for more than five years, while sixteen indicated that their services had been established within the last three years.

As mediation centers continue to be established in higher education, it is important that administrators look outside the arena of higher education to find out if there are any important trends in the larger society which could negatively impact the use of mediation on campus. Unfortunately, there is evidence to suggest that mediation centers in community settings are not used as often as they could be. If this trend transfers to higher education, mediation will be unable to make the kinds of practical contributions to conflict resolution which administrators seek.
A summary of research compiled by Kressel and Pruitt (1989) investigated the use of mediation in a variety of settings outside of higher education. This research was conducted on a diverse group of people including men and women going through divorce, employees involved in labor/management disputes, citizens concerned about environmental issues, and neighborhood residents who found themselves in conflict. Statistics from community mediation centers indicated that mediation services were not utilized by community members who lived near them and that many of those who had used mediation services did not return when the opportunity presented itself. In other words, many people who are involved in conflicts and live in communities where mediation services are well known choose litigation to resolve their differences even when their conflicts would be more effectively resolved through mediation (Kressel & Pruitt, 1989).

Kressel and Pruitt (1989) found that when mediation was an appropriate method for resolving a conflict, it was used less often than other forms of conflict resolution when disputants or third parties were given a choice of conflict resolution processes. Kressel and Pruitt (1989) state that "in interpersonal disputes of all kinds, one-third to two-thirds of those given the option to use
mediation decline it" (p. 406). Because of the broad focus of Kressel and Pruitt's (1989) research, it is likely that the trends which they identified in the larger population hold true for smaller populations, like college and university students. Thus, it is probable that students in post secondary education, like members of the larger society, also use mediation less often than would be ideal.

The use of litigation instead of mediation is particularly confusing to researchers since satisfaction rates among disputants who have used mediation to resolve their conflicts are higher than satisfaction rates among people who have used litigation (Pearson & Thoennes, 1984; Vidmar, 1985; Changing Times, 1980). Even after disputants use mediation and find it to be a satisfactory experience, there is no evidence to suggest that they will choose mediation to resolve their next conflict. There appears to be some phenomenon at work which overrides the seemingly positive aspects of using mediation and motivates people to continue using other third party conflict resolution techniques. If this phenomenon is not minimized, mediation will remain underutilized in the larger society, as well as in higher education.
Mediation training and education may be able to solve the problem which currently exists. If people can be trained or educated to use mediation to resolve conflicts which can be mediated, but which are currently being resolved through litigation or arbitration, then mediation will begin to fulfill its potential as a conflict resolution process. Training and education have been used successfully to change a variety of human attitudes and behaviors, and it is hoped that views about conflict resolution can also be changed.

**Hypotheses of the Study**

The specific research hypotheses are stated below.

1. There will be no significant difference in the perspective used to view conflict between college students who show an interest in mediation by volunteering to be student mediators or by attending a course on "conflict resolution" and a random sample of college students.

2. College students who receive mediation training and act as mediators will be significantly more likely to view conflict with a perspective which would motivate them to choose mediation to resolve a conflict than students who receive mediation training only, attend a course on "conflict resolution", receive no mediation training and do not attend a course on "conflict resolution".

3. The level of confidence which college students who use a "negotiation" frame for Time 1 and Time 3 have in their solution being able to "solve" a conflict and "satisfy" those involved in the conflict will be significantly greater for students who receive mediation training and act as mediators for a period of five months than for students who receive mediation
training only, students who attend a course on "conflict resolution", students who do not attend a training session and students who do not attend a course on "conflict resolution".

Definition of Terms

The following terms were operationally defined for purposes of this study.

Academic Adviser

Although there are many different academic advisers at The Ohio State University, this paper refers to graduate students or full-time staff members who are employed by University College, a non-academic college for undergraduate students who are in the process of completing admissions criteria for admission into an academic college. Academic advisers provide undergraduate students with academic information, advice, and other services.

Accommodation

A conflict resolution technique where one party to a dispute seeks to meet the other party's needs before meeting its own needs (Lewicki & Litterer, 1985).

Administrative Decision-Making

A conflict resolution technique where a college or university administrator decides how a conflict will be resolved.
**Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR)**

A phrase used to identify a group of conflict resolution techniques which use mediation or negotiation techniques to resolve disputes that would otherwise be resolved through adjudication in the courts, administrative bodies, or other forums" (Brook & Cormick, 1990).

**Arbitration**

Similar to administrative decision-making, except that the third party does not have to be in an administrative position. Arbitration occurs when a third party intervenes to either suggest or impose a solution to a conflict. Lewicki and Litterer (1985) describe arbitration as being a "fairly clear cut" process with three main variations. The variations include "voluntary", "binding", and "final offer" arbitration. The difference between voluntary and binding arbitration is that in the former, the parties may choose not to abide by the arbitrator's decision, whereas in the later, the parties must abide by the decision. In final offer arbitration, the parties each submit a possible solution and the arbitrator is restricted to deciding which of the offers will become the settlement (Lewicki & Litterer, 1985).
Conciliation

A third party conflict resolution technique where communication about the issues which caused the conflict is emphasized. Although a resolution may occur as parties gain a better understanding of the other parties' position, resolving the conflict is not a stated goal.

Collaboration

A conflict resolution technique where disputing parties "work together to maximize their joint outcome" (Lewicki & Litterer, 1985).

Compromise

A conflict resolution technique where parties "split the difference" so that each party gets some of what they want, but not all of it (Lewicki & Litterer, 1985, p. 103).

Frame

A way to interpret a conflict, a perspective, or a view which is used to make meaning out of the conflict which is present.

An initial interpretation of the structure of a decision or interaction that has implication for the processes and choices that are considered by the perceiver. Thus, like a picture frame, cognitive frames focus our attention on some
aspects of a situation, to the exclusion of others; and like a guardrail, they suggest certain directions for others (Sheppard et al., 1990, p. 6).

For example, if two students disagree about what to watch on the television in the lounge, a hall director using a *negotiation* "frame" would look at the conflict as a difference of opinion which could be settled by having the students compromise so that one student selects the show at 8:00 and the other selects the show at 8:30. A hall director using a *right-wrong* "frame" would look at the conflict as one which originated from a misinterpretation of a rule. For example, the hall director may assume that the first student in the lounge has the right to pick the show. Using that rule, the hall director would resolve the conflict by finding out who arrived in the lounge first and having them pick the television show (Sheppard et al., 1989)

**Hall Director**

An employee of an institution of higher education who usually lives in the hall and is responsible for maintaining a safe environment, supervising resident advisers who live in the hall, providing students with information and advice, and enforcing university policies
as they relate to students living in residence halls.

**Hate-related Behaviors**

Behavior designed to inflict emotional, psychological, or physical harm upon a person, or group of persons, because they are of a different race, ethnic group, lifestyle, or religious belief than the perpetrator.

**Intact Academic Class**

Students who took a graduate level academic course entitled "Resolving Conflict" during the winter term of 1991. The course was offered by the Department of Management and Human Resources in The College of Business at The Ohio State University and was taught by Dr. Roy Lewicki.

**Intervention Theme**

The primary procedure which a party uses to resolve a conflict. "Procedure can be defined as a set of pre-established implicit or explicit rules or norms governing the way a dispute is resolved" (Sheppard, 1984). Sheppard et al. (1989) identify four procedures, or themes: 1) diagnosis and clarification, 2) fact finding, 3) solution identification, and 4) implementation. Diagnosis and clarification describes third parties who focus their questions on the nature of the dispute. Fact finding
describes third parties who focus their questions on how the dispute got started or what events caused the dispute. Solution identification describes third parties who focus on generating ways to resolve the problem. Implementation describes third parties who focus on putting the solution into action.

**Mediation**

"A process by which the participants, together with the assistance of a neutral person or persons, systematically isolate disputed issues in order to develop options, consider alternatives, and reach a consensual settlement that will accommodate their needs" (Folberg & Taylor, 1984).

**Negotiation**

A process by which two parties with conflicting interests or preferences make decisions through direct bargaining with the other party, without help from a third party (Bazerman & Lewicki, 1983). "A process of combining conflicting positions into a common position under a decision rule of unanimity" (Zartman, 1988, p. 32).

**Neighborhood Justice Centers**

Community organizations initially established by the Justice Department to offer an alternative to litigation. Generally, neighborhood justice centers train volunteers
from the local community to help disputants discuss their conflicts and work out ways to resolve them.

**Resident Adviser**

A student selected to live in the residence hall and to provide services to a certain number of students living in a designated area (i.e., a floor of a residence hall) near the resident adviser. Resident advisers offer students advice, provide information, organize social and educational activities, maintain safe living environments, and attempt to create a friendly atmosphere among the residents.

**Resident Hall**

A building controlled by a college or university and designed to provide students with lodging, and sometimes meals while they are enrolled in classes.

**Roommate Contracting**

A process which involves having a resident advisor guide roommates through a discussion of conflicts which could occur during the year. Once the conflicts are identified, the resident advisor helps the roommates decide how they will resolve the conflicts if they should arise. The agreements which are reached are written down in "contract" form for future reference. Roommate contracting can take place at any time during the school
year, but the initial process is initiated by the resident advisor during the first five weeks of school.

**Third Party**

A person who volunteers or is asked to help resolve a dispute between others. The third party can play a variety of roles from simply helping the parties communicate to actually deciding how the dispute will be resolved.

Chapter Two provides general information about mediation including the setting in which mediation is practiced in higher education, the process, and mediation’s effectiveness both inside and outside of the academic environment.
CHAPTER II

THE SETTING, PROCESS, AND EFFECTIVENESS OF MEDIATION

The Setting In Which Mediation Is Practiced In Higher Education

Institutionalized methods of resolving conflict in higher education. When mediation is offered to students who find themselves in conflict with other members of the campus community, it is usually offered as one option among many which can be used to resolve the conflict. Colleges and universities have institutionalized a variety of third party conflict resolution processes (see Figure 2.1) in an attempt to help students resolve conflicts, some of which have been discussed in Chapter One. Members of the academic community who traditionally have been used as third parties to help students resolve conflicts include residence life staff members, faculty members, and professionals, like ombudspersons, who are employed full time to resolve conflicts. These third parties use a variety of intervention techniques when trying to help students resolve conflicts. An overview of the conflict
resolution processes and the faculty or staff members most likely to use them will be presented.

Giving advice is a third party intervention technique which is used by most faculty and staff members at some point in their careers. Giving advice simply refers to a third party who makes a suggestion to one or both of the disputants about how to resolve a conflict. Resident advisors, academic advisers, and faculty and staff members often provide students with advice about how to resolve problems in a professional, as well as private, capacity. Nonetheless, resident and academic advisers probably use this method of conflict resolution more than other members of the academic community.

Conciliation is another third party conflict resolution process often used by resident hall staff, particularly resident advisers. Conciliation uses a third party to facilitate a discussion of the problem by the disputing parties. In other words, third parties act as guides, both encouraging and controlling the conversation which takes place between the parties in conflict. The third party does not focus on resolving the conflict, but rather, focuses on having both parties fully express their perspectives and feelings about the conflict.
Mediation also uses third parties as facilitators of conversation, but in mediation the third party eventually has the disputants focus on a way to resolve the conflict. Although the structure of mediation does not force disputants to agree upon a specific solution, it does give mediators an opportunity to pressure parties to try and work out a solution before terminating a mediation session. Mediation has been used informally in the past by different members of the academic community (Shubert & Folger, 1986). However, with the recent increase in the number of mediation centers on campus, students, as well as other members of the campus community, are being formally trained to use mediation to help resolve disputes (Waterz, 1991).

Ombudspersons, who are employed to resolve a variety of conflicts which can exist between members of the campus community have traditionally been associated with the use of "fact-finding". Because ombudspersons can cut through red tape, they can find out more information than students can about disputes which are created by a lack of information (i.e., a student keeps getting the run around from a university official) or power imbalances (i.e., a professor gives a student a "D" with no explanation). Once all of the facts are gathered, a resolution may
become obvious. If it does not, another method of dispute resolution may be employed by the ombudsperson.

Arbitration is a third party intervention which takes the decision making power out of the hands of the disputants. Individuals with some type of authority over student behavior, for example, hall directors, use arbitration to resolve student disputes. After hearing both sides of a dispute, third parties choose a solution to the problem and expect students to abide by it.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict Resolution Process</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Giving Advice</td>
<td>Third parties offer disputants suggestions about how to resolve their conflict.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conciliation</td>
<td>Third parties help disputing parties talk about the issues which caused the conflict.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediation</td>
<td>Third parties guide the disputants through a discussion of the issues which caused the conflict and a process of negotiation designed to resolve the conflict.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fact-finding</td>
<td>Third parties uncover new information which may have a bearing on how the conflict is resolved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbitration</td>
<td>Third parties listen to both sides of the conflict and then suggest, or impose, a resolution to the conflict.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Process</td>
<td>Only used when the conflict involves a violation of established institutional policies. Third parties act as judges and after hearing both sides of a conflict, impose a solution to the problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquisitorial</td>
<td>Third parties actively guide disputants through a discussion of the conflict and invent a solution which they impose upon the parties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litigation</td>
<td>The third party is a judge in the state or federal court system. After hearing both sides of the conflict, the judge imposes a solution which can be enforced by the police.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2.1.** Institutionalized Methods for Resolving Conflicts on College and University Campuses.
Most institutions of higher education have judicial processes which are modeled after the legal system. All of the conflict resolution techniques discussed prior to this one can be applied to any conflict. However, the judicial system only can intervene when the conflict violates an institutional rule or regulation or infringes on a widely accepted norm. The third party, who is a member of the academic community but takes on the role of a judge during the conflict resolution process, hears the conflict and imposes a decision. The third parties' decisions are based upon explicit rules and regulations which govern the behaviors of members of the academic community. The judicial process, although it follows written guidelines, is not as rigid or formal as the legal system which exists in the United States.

An inquisitorial intervention, which Lewicki & Sheppard (1985) believe to be the most common, is similar to arbitration except that the third party takes a more active role in the disputants' discussion of the conflict. Third parties, like residence hall directors, may take on the role of a lawyer and cross examine each party in order to answer their own questions about the conflict. In addition, disputant discussion may be cut short if the third party does not find it to be useful. Once third
parties have an understanding of the conflict, they will create solutions and impose them upon the disputants. Third parties will usually try to enforce the solutions once imposed (Lewicki & Sheppard, 1985).

The legal system, which is used to regulate the behavior of institutions, in addition to individuals, also impacts the academic environment. Members of the academic community, as well as the college or university, must adhere to federal, state, and local laws along with institutional policies. When laws are broken, parties have the right to sue, or litigate, the other party. Litigation moves the conflict resolution process outside of the academic environment. Lawyers are hired and the parties eventually must appear in a state or federal courtroom where they must abide by very rigid rules which are applied during the process of resolving the conflict.

Higher education has institutionalized an array of conflict resolution techniques ranging from advising to judicial interventions. Mediation has been institutionalized on only a small number of campuses, although the number of campuses offering formal mediation is growing. Mediation is particularly well suited to disputes where the participants have an on-going and otherwise satisfactory relationship (Roehl & Cook, 1988;
Raven, 1988; Kolb & Rubin, 1989). Rifkin, d'Errico and Katch (1980) argue that mediation is "useful in realms of human relations that can never be reached by the courts operating under the rule of law" (p. 49). In higher education, since judicial systems play the role that courts play in the larger society, mediation may be more effective than the judicial process for certain kinds of conflicts. Since many student conflicts involve relationship issues and need to be settled in ways that allow the students to continue living with or near each other, mediation is a particularly appropriate dispute resolution process in higher education (Miller & Zoradi, 1977; Roehl & Cook, 1987; Rifkin, d'Errico, & Katch (1980)).

The Process of Mediation

Mediation has been described as a science and an art (Kolb, 1983). However, Folberg (1983) describes mediation as "foremost a process" that "helps the participants to enhance communication, maximize exploration of alternatives, address the needs of all parties, and provide a model for future conflict resolution" (p. 71). Further, Folberg (1983) states that
although writers divide or categorize the stages differently, they appear to agree that there are some common components: introduction and orientation, fact-finding and disclosure, isolation and definition of issues, exploration and negotiation of alternatives, compromise and accommodation, tentative agreement, review and processing of the resulting settlement, and finalization and implementation (p. 8).

The stages of mediation. The components which Folberg (1983) identified can occur in several different orders depending on the characteristics of the conflict (Sheppard, 1984). In addition, the components can be grouped to create a model consisting of any number of distinct stages. For purposes of this study, mediation will be viewed as a seven stage process (see Figure 2.2).

Stage One is the "Introduction". This stage is used to calm the disputants and to focus their attention on the upcoming mediation session. Introductions are made and the mediation process is summarized so that disputants will know what to expect. Issues like confidentiality and appropriate behavior during the mediation session are also discussed. Usually, mediators will ask disputants to agree to certain ground rules at this time. Often,
disputants will be asked not to interrupt each other and to focus their attention on the mediator, rather than on the other party, during this stage (Folberg, 1983; Thoennes & Pearson, 1985; Davis & Salem, 1985; Karim & Pegnetter, 1983).

Stage One is followed by stage two, Problem Determination. This stage provides disputants with an opportunity to present their perspectives about what caused the conflict. Mediators may ask questions to make sure that they have a full understanding of the conflict, but interruptions by the other disputant are restricted. This stage may continue for some time with each disputant adding new information in response to the other disputant’s presentation. As long as disputants take turns and the information is new and relevant to the conflict, mediators should encourage this kind of information sharing (Folberg, 1983; Davis & Salem, 1985; Thoennes & Pearson, 1985; Karim & Pegnetter, 1983).

It should be noted that in the problem determination stage, mediators are not looking for actual "facts". Disputants may have very different perspectives, which cause the events leading up to the conflict to be presented differently. Mediators need to make sure that they understand each disputant’s perspective. They do not
need to have the disputants agree on the events that led up to the conflict to successfully complete this stage.

Stage Three is Summarizing. After each disputant's presentation, mediators summarize the information to make sure that nothing has been left out and to insure that both disputants have heard the same information. Mediators must ask the disputants if the summary is correct and complete after each summary is given. Disputants will be given a chance to clarify or add information if the summary is not accurate or if it is incomplete.

Stage Four is Issue Identification. After hearing both sides of the conflict, the mediator must identify the issues which need to be resolved if the conflict is to resolved. There may be one issue, or many, but each issue which has a bearing on resolving the conflict must be identified if mediation is to produce a lasting resolution. Even if the disputants presented different perspectives during the previous stage, the issues which caused the conflict are the same (Folberg, 1983; Thoennes & Pearson, 1985; Davis & Salem, 1985; Karim & Pegnetter, 1983).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Components of Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>Introduction: The mediator determines how the parties wish to be addressed. The philosophy of mediation is explained, and ground rules are discussed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>Problem Determination: The mediator listens to each party giving their version of the facts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Problem Summarization: After each party has completed their statement, the mediator concisely restates what the party has said. The parties are asked to verify the information after each summation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 4</td>
<td>Issue Identification: The mediator assists the parties in articulating the issue(s) in dispute.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 5</td>
<td>Generation of Alternatives: The mediator encourages the parties to suggest possible alternatives for mutual gain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 6</td>
<td>Selection of Appropriate Alternative: The parties select the appropriate solution. The mediator confirms agreement, insuring there is no misunderstanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 7</td>
<td>Closure: Depending upon the outcome, the mediator congratulates the parties and urges compliance with the agreement, or summarizes progress and, if appropriate, suggests subsequent steps to increase the likelihood of resolution.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(adapted from Dewhurst, 1991, pg. 5.)

Figure 2.2. The Seven Stage Model of the Mediation Process.
Stage Five is the Generation of Alternatives. This is a time for both of the disputants to identify mutually satisfactory ways to resolve the dispute. Disputants take turns offering suggestions and reacting to previous suggestions. Mediators should not make suggestions unless the disputants are unable to do so. The mediator should encourage serious consideration of all suggestions so that the disputants will have some flexibility in developing a workable solution. If disputants are unwilling to engage in this process in a serious manner, mediators may want to apply some pressure by having the disputants look at the alternatives to mediation and investigate whether or not mediation is the best way in which to resolve their conflict (Folberg, 1983; Davis & Salem, 1985; Pruitt, Karim & Pegnetter, 1983; Thoennes & Pearson, 1985; McGillicuddy, Walton & Fry, 1989; Fisher & Ury, 1981).

Stage Six is Selection of Appropriate Alternatives. Once a number of solutions have been presented, the disputants should begin narrowing the list of solutions to one. Negotiation, accommodation, compromise, and collaboration can all take place in this stage as a suggestion is modified into a potential resolution to the problem. Once a single resolution has been identified, the disputants should make a tentative agreement to abide
by that resolution (Folberg, 1983; Folberg & Taylor, 1984; Thoennes & Pearson, 1985; Karim & Pegnetter, 1985).

Mediators must review the tentative agreement to make sure that it is specific and workable. Disputants often will not foresee the problems that can arise when an agreement is not absolutely clear in its mandates. It is up to the mediator to make sure that dates, times, and amounts are spelled out so that there can be no misinterpretation. In addition, the agreement must be realistic, or workable. Disputants, under pressure, sometimes agree to terms which they can not uphold. The mediator must investigate the workability of each solution to make sure that disputants are capable, without undue duress, of carrying out the terms of the agreement (Folberg, 1983; Folger & Taylor, 1984; Davis & Salem, 1985; Thoennes & Pearson, 1985; Karim & Pegnetter, 1985).

The last stage is Closure. The mediator obtains a final agreement to abide by the resolution from the disputants. The agreement may be verbal or written. Closing comments congratulating the parties, expressing appreciation for using mediation, and explaining what to do if the agreement is broken are expressed before the session is ended (Folberg, 1983; Davis & Salem, 1985; Thoennes & Pearson, 1985; Karim & Pegnetter, 1983).
Mediation is a process which is easily broken down into a series of stages. Mediation consists of a sequence of events, or stages, which occur in a fairly standard order. Although the number of stages which researchers use to describe mediation varies, the general content of the mediation process is the same across disciplines (Kressel & Pruitt, 1989).

The goals and characteristics of mediation. Besides consisting of the stages outlined above, a number of important goals and characteristics describe the mediation process. Like other conflict resolution processes, mediation is described by a variety of characteristics and goals. However, the unique combination of goals and characteristics which defines mediation makes it different than other conflict resolution processes. McCarthy (1980) uses the words "voluntary", "impartial", "equal", "flexible", and "disputant control over outcomes" to describe the mediation process.

Unlike many of the conflict resolution techniques, i.e., the judicial system, which mandate disputants to participate, most mediation is voluntary. Ideally, disputants will agree to use mediation to resolve their conflict without excess pressure being applied. However, as long as the disputants are not required to accept a
specific resolution, the requirement for voluntariness can be maintained even if the disputants are forced to participate in the process (McEwen & Maiman, 1989). In reality, pressure is often applied to disputants to use mediation, but as long as the disputants know that they do not have to reach an agreement and can walk out of the mediation at any point, the voluntary nature of mediation remains valid.

Mediators, as well as the process of mediation, claim to be impartial, or neutral (Kressol & Pruitt, 1985; McCarthy, 1980). This claim has been under attack since, even with the best intentions, human nature may not be capable of acting in a truly neutral manner (Hamnett, 1977; Peachy, 1989; Rifkin, 1989). However, the process is designed to be impartial and encourages the disputants to resolve the dispute in a way that they, rather than the third party, deem to be fair. Mediators are trained to limit their impact on the problem-solving nature of this conflict resolution technique. Mediators act as disinterested third parties who do not reinforce their personal values during the mediator.

Mediators are also trained to help disputants appear as equals (Folberg & Taylor, 1984). This is called balancing power. For example, although one party may be a
faculty member and the other party a new freshman, the mediator will treat them with equal respect and address them in a manner that indicates equality (i.e., both would be addressed by first names or their last name preceded by Mister, Miss, Missus, or Ms., rather than Doctor). Similarly, if one disputant is less articulate than the other, mediators will spend more time asking questions of that disputant to make sure that the full story is presented.

Unlike many of the formal dispute resolution processes on campus, mediation has a built-in degree of flexibility (McCarthy, 1980; Folberg, 1983). The number of disputants who can engage in the mediation process at one time is unlimited, and the number of mediators can vary. If the dispute, for example, is a racial one, each party may want to select a mediator who can work as a member of a panel of mediators to help the parties resolve their conflict. Although mediators are not normally chosen by disputing parties, if the parties refuse to try mediation without selecting the mediators, mediation is flexible enough to allow this variation.

Besides the flexibility in the number of people involved in mediation, there is also no limit to the length of a mediation session or the number of times the
parties can return to the table to work on a particular problem (Becker, 1986; Roehl & Cook, 1989; McCarthy, 1980). In addition, although normal mediations are held with both parties in the same room, it is not uncommon to find the parties in different rooms with the mediator shuttling information back and forth between the rooms. To a large degree, mediation can be tailor made to meet the needs of the parties involved.

Another difference between mediation and the common conflict resolution techniques used on college campuses involves who has control over developing the solution to the problem (Thibaut & Walker, 1975; Sheppard, 1984). In the judicial process and in many staff interventions, the third party comes up with the solution and imposes it on the disputants, often against their wishes. In mediation, a stage is devoted to giving the disputants an opportunity to come up with their own solutions to the problem. Mediation allows disputants to make suggestions, negotiate, and even refuse to accept suggestions as viable solutions. Although mediators may make suggestions under some conditions, it is entirely up to the disputants to accept or reject their suggestions.

Mediation does not force disputants to agree to a solution. Thus, even if the disputants generate a number
of reasonable solutions, the mediator can not impose one of these solutions upon the disputants. The decision to abide by a particular resolution rests with the disputants. If either one of the disputants refuses to accept a specific resolution the mediation session is terminated, and the disputants are referred to other resources which may be able to help them resolve their conflict.

The fact that mediation is voluntary, impartial, flexible, and places responsibility for developing the solution and abiding by the agreement on the shoulders of the disputants makes it unique among conflict resolution techniques. This set of characteristics and goals makes mediation an effective alternative to conflict resolution processes like the judicial system which traditionally have been available (Kolb & Rubin, 1989; Serr & Taber, 1987; McCarthy, 1980; Rifkin, d'Errico & Katch, 1980).

The Effectiveness of Mediation

The results of research on mediation's effectiveness outside of higher education. Research on mediation suggests that it is an effective method for resolving certain kinds of disputes. Kressel and Pruitt (1989) have completed the most comprehensive summary of measures of
mediation's effectiveness research to date. The most common measures of effectiveness are user satisfaction rates, rates of compliance, and rates of settlement.

Kressel and Pruitt (1989) report that "user satisfaction with mediation is typically 75 percent or higher, even for those who fail to reach a mediated agreement" (pp. 395, 396). Rates of compliance are generally favorable, as well. Studies of disputants who reached an agreement during mediation indicated compliance rates of between 67 and 87 percent. Although it is difficult to compare compliance rates of litigated agreements to compliance rates of mediated agreements, several researchers have found that compliance is generally higher in mediation (Kressel & Pruitt, 1989).

The rates of settlement vary widely with "the median settlement rate at somewhere around 60%, with a range typically between 20 and 80 percent" (Kressel & Pruitt, 1989, p. 397). The fact that mediation is being used in a wide variety of settings may account for this variation. Mediation is being used to resolve a range of conflicts including those resulting from divorce, monetary disputes which qualify for small claims court, and neighborhood disputes.
In addition to the disputants' satisfaction with the mediation process, the disputants' perceptions of fairness have also been investigated. In the December issue of *Changing Times* the director of the American Bar Association's Special Committee on Alternative Means of Dispute Resolution stated that "some 80-85% of the people who go through mediation feel they get a fair shake" while "some 30% to 40% of the people who go through the courts...did not get a fair deal." These figures should be interpreted with the understanding that the legal system and mediation may be used to resolve different types of conflicts and that fairness may be related to the kind of conflict rather than the process used to resolve it. Nonetheless, Roehl and Cook (1983) argue that different settings and types of disputes ... including felony cases, divorce and child custody, and small claims - found that disputants perceived the outcomes of mediation hearings to be significantly fairer than those of court proceedings (p. 33.).

One area which mediation has, so far, failed to impact is the backlog of court cases. Kressel and Pruitt (1989) report that mediation appears to have had little impact on reducing court backlogs. In fact, there is some
evidence to suggest that mediation may have increased the
number of cases the legal system now deals with because
conflicts which would have been resolved outside the legal
system now enter the legal process before being directed
to mediation (Kressel & Pruitt, 1989).

One other statistic of interest is the cost of
litigation versus mediation. There is some evidence to
suggest that mediation is less costly than litigation
(Becker, 1985) although it is difficult to measure the
cost of the these two processes. However, mediated cases
may "reach settlement more quickly than comparable cases
that follow the traditional adversarial approach" (Kressel
& Pruitt, 1989, p. 398), but research is very limited.

Mediation is not appropriate for all disputes, but
Roehl and Cook (1989) argue that "mediation can address
the underlying issues and the history of a dispute in ways
that the courts cannot" (p. 34). Mediation, unlike the
judicial process and the legal system, focuses on the
future relationship between the parties who are in
conflict (Roehl & Cook, 1989). On college campuses,
students in conflict usually continue to live in near
proximity, making a future peaceful relationship as
important as the actual resolution to the conflict.
The results of research on mediation's effectiveness within higher education. Only a few studies which have investigated mediation and students in higher education have been conducted. Five studies reviewed here (Miller & Zoradi, 1977; Shubert & Folger, 1980; Miller, 1987; Rifkin, Lam & Will, 1987; Timmins, 1988), support the somewhat positive results which research on the use of mediation in the larger society has found. The studies will be summarized in chronological order.

One of the first studies to be reported (Miller & Zoradi, 1977) used a quasi-experimental design. Two residence halls housing between 400 and 600 students were chosen, and one was designated as the experimental hall while the other one served as a control hall. The resident advisers in the experimental hall were trained to use a conflict resolution process which closely resembled mediation and were periodically given the opportunity to ask questions and discuss the conflicts on their floor with professional mediators. The resident advisers in the other hall received no training and did not discuss their conflicts with the professionals. After half of an academic year, the residents in the experimental hall experienced forty-one conflicts, used the mediation process twenty-four times, and processed forty-eight
roommate changes. Residents in the control hall experienced eighteen conflicts, never used mediation, and processed ninety-seven roommate changes. Miller and Zoradi (1977) concluded that the program was a factor in the dramatic reduction of roommate changes. In addition, they believed that all of the roommates benefited to some degree from participating in the mediation session and that the reactions of the roommates to the conflict resolution process were generally positive.

Shubert and Folger (1980) discussed how a group of graduate students with academic concerns at the University of Michigan handled their grievances from 1976 to 1980. Conflicts concerning academic issues had to be brought to the attention of the department first. If students were not satisfied with what happened at the departmental level, they could take the issue to the Graduate School Referee who tried to mediate the grievance informally. The authors reported that the overwhelming majority of the grievances filed at the Graduate School had been successfully mediated by the Referee. Overall, mediation appeared to be an effective method for resolving the majority of graduate student disputes (Shubert & Folger, 1980).
Miller (1987) reported that 80% of the cases brought to mediation at State University of New York were successfully resolved. Miller (1987) considered a case to be successful if the parties did not seek the services of another organization, like judicial affairs, after reaching a mediated agreement. Of the cases settled, only 31% needed some type of follow-up, or "band-aiding". Band-aiding refers to the process of altering the original agreement, while maintaining its integrity, so that it becomes more acceptable to both parties (Miller, 1987).

Miller (1987) also reported that right after the mediation most parties were satisfied with the agreements which were reached, although a small number of respondents reported a high level of dissatisfaction. As time passed, however, respondents reported being "somewhat satisfied". In addition, immediately after mediation, respondents said that they "would recommend" mediation to others. But as time passed, they reported that they "probably would not recommend" mediation to others. Disputants also reported that mediation did not help them with other conflicts and that, over time, they felt that their relationship with the other party had deteriorated (Miller, 1987).

Miller (1987) included several characteristics about the mediation session in his article. The majority of
conflicts brought to the center involved roommate and suitemate conflicts. The participants, or disputants, were primarily white females and the mediators were primarily white males. Mediations lasted between 30 and 270 minutes, with an average of 150 minutes.

Rifkin, Lam, and Will (1987) found that resident advisors trained in mediation were more likely to intervene in conflicts between students on their halls than resident advisors who did not receive mediation training. In addition, the resident advisors who received mediation training "indicated that floor members sought them out to discuss troubles, and that mediation training offered them the skills to help the floor members sort out the problems themselves" (Rifkin, Lam, & Will, 1987, p. 21). Resident advisors not trained in mediation complained about not being prepared to "build community and foster cooperation" while trained resident advisors believed that mediation had "improved their communication skills, allowing them to build community and achieve their goals" (Rifkin, Lam & Will, 1987, p. 21).

Finally, Timmins (1988) reported that Brigham Young has a mediation and arbitration program which has proved successful in resolving disputes. The program hears up to 500 mediations a year. Timmins (1988) reported that
approximately 95% of the cases brought to the program were
resolved, but it was unclear as to how many of the cases
were mediated without arbitration and whether the
arbitration was voluntary or binding.

Summary. In summary, mediation can be described as a
series of stages which mediators guide disputants through
in an effort to resolve a conflict. Mediation combines a
unique set of characteristics, goals, and skills into a
process which helps parties who are in conflict to find a
resolution to their conflict. Research has shown that
mediation is effective in resolving certain kinds of
disputes which exist in higher education settings, as well
as in the larger society. Those who have used mediation
tend to comply with the agreements which they reached, and
they generally are positive about their experiences with
mediation, although their positive feelings erode over
time.

Research indicates that for a significant number of
conflicts, mediation appears to be at least as effective,
and sometimes even more effective, than other methods
which are available for resolving disputes. Since it
appears that mediation is an effective conflict resolution
process for certain kinds of conflicts, the fact that
parties tend not to choose mediation as a way of resolving
their conflicts remains a concern to those who are responsible for helping individuals resolve disputes. An understanding of why parties in conflict do not choose mediation more often would be useful to those who are involved in helping parties resolve conflicts. In addition, procedures which could be used to motivate individuals to choose mediation when it is appropriate would also be useful.

Chapter Three explores the development of the theory of "conflict frames" which provides one explanation of why parties tend to choose conflict resolution processes other than mediation to resolve disputes. It also provides a theoretical basis for understanding how to motivate parties to choose mediation more often than is happening at present.
CHAPTER III

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Development of the Nature of Frames

This chapter will trace the history of the theory of conflict frames. A conflict frame is an individual's understanding, perspective, or interpretation of a conflict. Sheppard et al. (1990) define "frame" as "an initial interpretation of the structure of a decision or interaction that has implication for the processes and choices that are considered by the perceiver" (p. 6). Conflict frames are important because they may influence which conflict resolution process an individual will choose when confronted with a conflict. Conflict frames may be the determining factor for third parties, as well as disputants, when they are confronted with a variety of possible conflict resolution processes and must choose one to resolve the dispute.

Chapter Three will begin with a presentation of seminal research by Thibaut and Walker (1975), add insights from several researchers whose results support
the concept of conflict frames, and culminate with the results of research conducted by Sheppard et al. (1989; 1990) and Pinkley (1990). The field of psychology provides the major theoretical support for the existence of conflict frames and its contributions will be presented in the latter half of the chapter. Perry's (1970) "Theory of Intellectual Development", which may impact how conflict frames change over time will conclude the chapter.

**Thibaut and Walker.** Thibaut and Walker (1975) investigated third party interventions in an effort to gain a better understanding of how certain conflict resolution processes are used. They identified five different conflict resolution techniques and defined them by the amount of control the third party had over both the dispute resolution process and the final decision about how the conflict would be resolved. Controlling the process involved such things as deciding which party would speak first, what issues the parties would address, and the timing of different phases of the resolution method. Controlling the decision involved deciding what the actual settlement, or resolution to the conflict, would be.

Table 3.1 defines each of the methods used in Thibaut and Walker's (1975) research by identifying whether or not
third parties have control in these two areas.

In autocratic and arbitration, the third party ultimately resolved the conflict for the disputants by suggesting, or imposing, a solution upon the disputants. In mediation and bargaining the terms of the solution were left in the hands of the disputants, while in moot, developing the terms of the solution was shared by the third party and the disputants. The significant difference between these two groups of conflict resolution methods is that the first group, autocratic and arbitration, requires that third parties make the final decision about what the settlement will be while the second group, mediation, moot and bargaining, requires that disputants take responsibility for selecting the resolution to the conflict.
Table 3.1

Characteristics of Different Conflict Resolution Techniques

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Procedure</th>
<th>Type of Third Party Control Exhibited in Procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>METHOD</td>
<td>PROCESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>autocratic</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arbitration</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mediation</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moot</td>
<td>shared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bargaining</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Sheppard, 1984, p. 151)

Thibaut and Walker (1975) found that when disputants could choose the kind of procedures which would be used to resolve a dispute, they preferred a procedure where third parties suggested, or imposed, a settlement, rather than one where the disputants made the final decision. In other words, disputants resisted the opportunity to use third parties to help them negotiate a settlement which they could then choose to accept or reject. Instead, disputants preferred to let third parties investigate the conflict and offer, or impose, resolutions which the disputants had little influence in developing or selecting. These results suggested that there was some phenomenon at work which motivated the subjects of the
study to favor non-mediated interventions over mediated ones. Although Thibaut & Walker did not investigate this phenomenon, their results encouraged other researchers to look more closely at third party conflict resolution in an effort to explain disputants' tendencies to use non-mediated conflict resolution processes.

Kolb. Following Thibaut & Walker's (1975) initial investigation of conflict resolution processes, Kolb (1983) conducted the first in-depth study of state and federal mediators. Although Kolb (1983) did not investigate conflict frames, she did look at the connection between the roles which mediators play and the strategies which they use to resolve conflicts. Kolb's (1983) research added insight into the decision-making processes which take place during mediation.

Based on the mediations which she observed, Kolb (1983) identified two roles, "dealmaking" and "orchestrating", which mediators commonly played. The role was meant to describe how the mediator pictured himself, as well as how he behaved during the mediation session. "Dealmakers" were mediators who believed that they had impacted the mediation process by helping each party shape resolutions which would be acceptable to the other party. "Orchestrators" believed that they were
instrumental in providing a forum for the parties so that they could come together in a controlled environment and work out a solution to their conflict.

After observing real mediations and speaking at length with the mediators, Kolb (1983) concluded that the "mediator's strategy seems inseparable from the perceptions he has of his own role and the role of others" (p. 111). Thus, when a mediator who believed that he was a dealmaker entered a mediation, he used different strategies or techniques in handling the disputants than did a mediator who believed that he was an orchestrator. For example, dealmakers were likely to be active in the negotiating process and apply pressure to both parties to accept the other parties' offers, while orchestrators were more likely to be passive and wait until both parties naturally arrived at a solution (Kolb, 1983).

Kolb's (1983) observations linked third party perceptions about themselves to the kind of intervention which they provided. Although not specifically related to conflict frames, the idea that preconceived perceptions of one's role in a conflict can impact the way in which a conflict is resolved is a building block in the development of the conflict frame hypothesis.
Kolb (1986; Sheppard et al., 1990) went on to study organizational ombudsmen and managers who found themselves serving as third parties in disputes between employees. Kolb concluded that managers frame disputes in ways that encourage them to explicitly propose solutions to conflicts, rather than to leave the decisions in the hands of their employees. In other words, when managers had an opportunity to intervene in a conflict between two employees, they usually intervened by telling the employees specifically how to resolve the dispute. Even though they had the option of sitting down with the employees and helping them negotiate a solution to their problem, they rarely chose this method of conflict resolution (Kolb, 1986; Sheppard et al., 1990).

Kolb explained a manager’s tendency to act as a decision-maker by relating it to the role which managers play in their organizations.

Managers frame organizational disputes in a manner that suggests decision control. Managers interpret conflicts as problems in which they are expected to act as decision makers, resolving differences of opinion over the best direction for the organization. They do so because managers are socialized to make
decisions, because managers frequently are a part of the problem being discussed (thus having their own agendas to serve), and because managers are uncomfortable with the concept of dispute as anything other than an optimization problem to be solved (Sheppard et al., 1990, p. 4).

Sheppard, Blumenfeld-Jones, and Roth. The most direct evidence for the existence of conflict frames comes from a program of research directed by Sheppard et al. (1989; 1990). Sheppard was interested in how informal third parties managed disputes. Informal third parties, in contrast to third parties who are brought in to perform a certain role, have a continuing relationship to their disputants, may be involved in the conflict, and have a wider range of options available since they are not paid to use a single conflict resolution technique (Sheppard et al., 1989). The concept of conflict frames emerged from a series of investigations into the dynamics which surround informal third party conflict resolution.

Sheppard et al. (1989) reported his first results in 1983. In that study, he asked sixty managers how they intervened in conflicts between their employees. Using Thibaut and Walker’s (1975) continuum of five conflict
resolution interventions, Sheppard et al. (1989) found that most managers fit into the autocratic or arbitration categories.

In an effort to gain more information, Sheppard et al. (1989) conducted a second study in which he gave one hundred managers a set of hypothetical conflict scenarios and asked them to describe how they would intervene. The results of this study indicated that managers preferred to intervene as mediators. Comparisons between the results of the first and second study indicated a discrepancy between what managers preferred to do and what they actually did. Although managers expressed a preference to intervene as a mediator, they rarely intervened without suggesting or imposing a solution.

A third study using both managers and police as respondents took the study of third party interventions in a new direction. In this study, third parties were asked to describe the factors they considered to be important when deciding what type of intervention to make. The results of this investigation suggested that fairness, effectiveness, efficiency, and disputant satisfaction and commitment to the solution were the most important (Sheppard et al., 1989).
The fourth study, based on research involving formal third party conflict intervention provided the first step by step view of conflict resolution. In other words, the elements or stages which occur during the process of conflict resolution were presented in a conceptual model (Sheppard et al., 1989).

The fifth study attempted to provide even more information about conflict resolution while testing the validity of the conceptual model. Three hundred informal third parties were asked to describe a recent attempt to intervene in a conflict. They were then asked a series of questions designed to identify the characteristics of the dispute, the third parties' goals in resolving the dispute, and the method(s) of intervention which were used. The goals of fairness, effectiveness, efficiency, and satisfaction and commitment to the solution were affirmed (Sheppard et al., 1989). From the responses about the method(s) which the third parties used to resolve the conflict patterns of behavior were identified to produce four intervention techniques, or themes. Each intervention theme described a "cluster of steps that third parties are likely to do together" (Sheppard et al., 1989. p. 174).
PANEL 1: Diagnosis and Clarification

Complex and important dispute → Disputant satisfaction and commitment → Diagnosis and Clarification (R = .37)

Disputant interdependence → Personality clash

Third-party authority

PANEL 2: Fact Finding

Complex and important dispute → Effectiveness → Fact Finding (R = .36)

Third-party authority → Disputant interdependence → Fairness

Personality clash

PANEL 3: Solution Identification

Complex and important dispute → Disputant satisfaction and commitment → Solution Identification

Disputant interdependence → Fairness

Third-party authority → Personality clash → Efficiency

(Sheppard, Blumenfeld-Jones and Roth, 1989, pg. 178)

Figure 3.1. A Rational Decision Model of Procedural Choice
The first theme, diagnosis and clarification, was used by third parties whose focus was on getting the parties to communicate better about their problem. The second theme, fact finding, was used by third parties who concentrated on gathering information about the dispute in order to present their opinion of how the conflict should be solved. The third theme, solution identification, was used by third parties whose focus was on generating potential solutions and then selecting one to resolve the issue. The fourth theme, implementation, was used by third parties who reached a resolution quickly and focused on having the resolution put into practice. Significant relationships between one or more of the goals and the themes were found for each theme except implementation (Sheppard et al., 1989).

The relationship between the third parties' goals and the intervention themes is presented in Figure 3.1. In Panel 1 of Figure 3.1, a goal of having the disputants feel satisfaction and commitment was positively related to the use of diagnosis and clarification. In Panel 2 of Figure 3.1, a goal of effectiveness and fairness was positively related to fact finding. In Panel 3, a goal of fairness and efficiency was positively related to solution identification while a goal of disputant satisfaction and
commitment was negatively related to solution identification (Sheppard et al., 1989). Thus, it appears that the goals which third parties have can be used to predict certain types of intervention.

Besides a third party's goals predicting a certain intervention, the data also seemed to suggest the concept of a conflict frame which could influence the kind of intervention which a third party chose to use. To test whether or not conflict frames existed, Sheppard et al. (1989) developed four basic frames (Figure 3.2) which third parties could use to interpret conflict: right-wrong, negotiation, underlying conflict, and stop. These frames were applied to the data supplied by the three hundred third parties in the fifth study. The results supported the hypothesis that conflict frames influence the type of intervention which third parties choose to resolve conflicts.

To understand the relationship between frames and specific intervention techniques better, Sheppard et al. (1989) conducted a univariate analyses of variance (ANOVAs) on each intervention theme when dispute frame was the independent variable. The results are presented in Figure 3.3. For each theme, the frame with the highest mean value was the frame most often used.
The problem requires identifying one party as right and one party as wrong, based on the rules or norms that apply to this particular dispute. In other words, a discrete choice is required.

Tradeoffs and compromises can be made so that a negotiated solution is possible.

This particular conflict is only symptomatic of a more important, ongoing problem between these two parties.

This dispute must be stopped. Resolving the issues is of secondary importance to making the conflict go away.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Frame</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Right-wrong</td>
<td>The problem requires identifying one party as right and one party as wrong, based on the rules or norms that apply to this particular dispute. In other words, a discrete choice is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation</td>
<td>Tradeoffs and compromises can be made so that a negotiated solution is possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underlying Conflict</td>
<td>This particular conflict is only symptomatic of a more important, ongoing problem between these two parties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>This dispute must be stopped. Resolving the issues is of secondary importance to making the conflict go away.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Shedd, Blumenfeld-Jones, and Roth, 1989, pg. 182)

Figure 3.2. Conflict Frames and Their Definitions

Sheppard et al. (1989) found that third parties who used a right-wrong frame were particularly likely to identify and select a solution to the disagreement, rather than to focus on clarifying the problem or to engage in fact-finding. This means that when third parties use right-wrong frames and are not told how to intervene, they tend to play the role of judge and jury, severely limiting the involvement of the disputants in the decision-making process. In addition, the researchers found that the
right-wrong and stop frames (the stop frame also resulted in third parties making decisions about how to resolve the conflict) were used to interpret disputes three times as often as the negotiation frame, which led them to suggest that "third parties may tend to make an initial interpretation of the dispute that is incompatible with a mediational intervention" (Sheppard et al., 1989).

To illustrate how conflict frames impact third party decision making, a detailed explanation of each frame will be followed by an example taken from student affairs. The example will show how four third parties, each using a different frame, can interpret the same event in a different manner. The event used for this purpose consists of two male roommates who are standing in a residence hall lounge arguing over what television show to watch.
The right-wrong frame was used by third parties who looked at disputes as disagreements over the interpretation of a rule or norm. These parties assumed that one of the disputants was correct in his or her interpretation of the rule and that the other party was incorrect. Once the conflict was resolved, the disputant with the correct interpretation would be considered a "winner", and the disputant with the incorrect interpretation would be considered a "loser". In this example, the third party might decide that the owner of the television has the right to decide what shows to watch and that the other student would be wrong in trying to force his desires on the owner. The third party would
intervene to reinforce the owner's right to choose the television shows.

The *negotiation* frame was used by third parties who assumed that disputes were created by many factors including a lack of communication. They believed that disputants needed to engage in a process of negotiation, or compromise, in an effort to reach a resolution. They did not look for a winner, or loser, but hoped that both disputants would be able to consider themselves "winners" once the conflict was resolved. A third party using a negotiation frame would intervene by asking that the roommates in the example sit down and work out a plan indicating on which days and during which hours each roommate had the right to pick the television shows.

The *underlying conflict* frame was used by third parties who interpreted the dispute as a symptom of a much deeper problem which would have to be settled before the current dispute could be resolved. A third party who believed that the disagreement over the television was really due to one roommate's jealousy over the other roommate stealing his girlfriend would be employing an underlying conflict frame. The third party might intervene by asking to speak privately to each student in an effort to find out what the root of the problem is.
Once the real cause is identified, the third party might try to counsel the two students about how to work out their emotions in a healthy manner.

The stop frame was used by third parties who believed that the dispute was so dangerous that it needed to be stopped before it could be resolved. A third party using a stop frame might assume that one roommate was about to punch the other roommate. A third party could intervene by immediately removing one roommate from the room before trying to resolve the conflict.

Sheppard, Minton and Hyder. Recent research by Sheppard, Minton and Hyder (1990) was designed to replicate Sheppard et al's. (1989) fifth investigation of three hundred managers who acted as third parties to a dispute. This team of researchers selected one hundred and eighty managers and interviewed them about a recent conflict in which they had acted as a third party. Although a few new questions based on the results of past research were asked in order to obtain more detailed information, the general format of this study was very similar to the original study. Of particular interest is the fact that the definitions of the frames were slightly different. The definitions evolved over time so that when the last research team began its investigation, Sheppard
was using new definitions (Sheppard et al., 1990). Fortunately, the new definitions correspond to the old definitions making it easy to compare results. The "right-wrong" frame was changed to a "choice" frame and was defined as "a problem involving the choice of a correct solution from a very few options" (Sheppard et al., 1990, p. 7). The "stop" frame was eliminated from this study, and the "negotiation" frame's definition was changed to "a multi-dimensional problem permitting trade-offs. Frequently involves petitioning of resources" (Sheppard et al., 1990, p. 7).

The results of this research (Sheppard et al., 1990) suggest that "managers do appear to assert control over the solution when intervening in others' disagreements ... and that control over the solution appears to be especially related to having adopted a choice frame" (p. 18). This means that the frame, in essence, dictates the intervention and that a "choice" (right-wrong) frame dictates an intervention other than mediation.

Pinkley. Pinkley (1990) focused on the results of the research which Sheppard et al. (1989) conducted on conflict frames. She viewed the identification of frames to be significant and felt that "a typology of conflict interpretations (i.e., dimensions of conflict frame) that
describe the various ways in which people perceive conflict" (p. 118) would be useful. Pinkley (1990) decided to measure both disputant and third party interpretation of conflict. Based on Sheppard et al's. (1989) definitions of frames and the "fundamental dimensions of interpersonal relationships postulated by Wish, Deutsch, and Kaplan (1976)" (Pinkley, 1990, p. 118), Pinkley (1990) predicted that there were four different dimensions on which conflict could be interpreted: win-lose vs compromise, relationship vs task, emotional vs intellectual, and stop vs. resolve.

In order to illustrate these dimensions, consider the following example: Sue borrows her roommate, Linda's, jacket and tears it. After Sue promises to pay the repair bill, Linda spends $50.00 to have the jacket repaired. Sue never gives Linda $50.00. The win-lose vs compromise dimension is very similar to Sheppard's et al's. (1989) "right-wrong" and "negotiation" frame. Using this example, an individual would either try to identify a right roommate and a wrong roommate or would assume there was no absolute right and wrong and have the roommates sit down and discuss the conflict. "Win-lose" would correspond to a third party finding Sue guilty for not paying Linda $50.00 after promising the money.
"Compromise" would correspond to a third party having Sue and Linda sit down and talk about all the factors which effect this conflict including the time Linda borrowed Sue's earrings and never gave them back.

The relationship vs task dimension is used to distinguish between third parties who frame disputes in terms of the disputants' relationship and third parties who focus on the events which caused the dispute and the tasks which must be undertaken to resolve the conflict. In this example, a third party could focus on Sue and Linda's friendship and act to preserve it, or, the third party could focus on the cost of repairing the jacket and the steps required to reimburse Linda.

The emotional vs intellectual dimension is used to distinguish between third parties who focus on how the disputants feel from those who focus on the facts of the conflict. For example, a third party could focus on Linda's feelings of anger, frustration, and personal injury as a result of Sue not paying for the jacket's repair, or on the fact that $50.00 of damage occurred to a jacket. Observers, or participants, to a conflict will use all three dimensions to interpret a single conflict.

Pinkley conducted two studies: the first included three phases designed to develop a comprehensive and
inductively derived typology of conflict frames, and the second was designed to replicate the first study. Thirty-one disputants and nine mediators were asked questions about the nature of a conflict in which they had been involved and their desired resolution in phase one. In phase two one hundred and sixty-one undergraduate students were asked to rank various attributes of conflict. In phase three the attributes were matched to the responses obtained in phase one.

The analysis of the data provided a number of interesting results. First, three dimensions were identified: relationship vs. task, compromise vs. win, and emotional vs. intellectual. Second, mediators and disputants generally focused on different sides of two of the three dimensions. "On the average, mediator descriptions were interpreted in terms of relationship problems and compromise solutions more readily than were disputant conflict descriptions" (Pinkley, 1990, p. 122). Since Pinkley's research is one of the few studies where groups of people have preferred to use a negotiation frame to a right-wrong frame, her findings raise some significant questions for this study. Why do the mediator's prefer a compromise frame? Did they choose to become mediators because they were predisposed toward
viewing conflicts in terms of compromises, or did the mediation training which they participated in change the way they viewed conflict?

Summary. In summary, it appears that conflict frames exist and that they direct participants' attention to particular aspects of the conflict which end up influencing the type of conflict resolution processes people choose to employ. Sheppard et al. (1989) suggest that third parties may "develop relatively simple interpretations, or frames, of a given dispute, which suggest the procedures they should use" (p. 180). Pinkley (1990) states that, once chosen, "conflict frames may then guide disputant behavior, strategy selection, outcome concerns, and evaluations of the other party" (p. 117). This means that the frame which a third party uses may influence which intervention techniques are chosen and what types of settlements are possible. If, as Sheppard et al. (1989) found to be true, right-wrong frames are used to interpret conflict more often than other frames, there will be a tendency to resolve conflicts using arbitration or litigation, rather than mediation. Thus, as long as right-wrong frames dominate, it will be very difficult to make mediation a viable alternative to conflict resolution methods currently being used.
Sheppard et al. (1989) define frames as "culturally based views of the world or schemata that individuals have evolved for interpreting and remembering past events" (p. 180). Similarly, Pinkley (1990) suggests that people interpret conflict based on "past experiences with conflict as well as present concerns and interests" (p. 117). The theory behind the concept of "frame" will be explored in the rest of this chapter.

**Theoretical Support for Conflict Frames**

Research by Thibaut and Walker (1975), Kolb (1983; 1986), Sheppard et al. (1989; 1990) and Pinkley (1990) provides evidence for the existence of conflict frames. However, the theories which support their claims come from a number of disciplines including philosophy, sociology and psychology. The fundamental assumption which these disciplines make is that "reality is socially constructed" (Berger & Luckmann, 1967, p. 1). This means that people see reality in their own way, based on a number of factors, like experience. Since people have different experiences, education, and upbringing, each person is different from every other person. Thus, socially constructed reality differs from person to person because people have a unique set of factors which influence their
reality. Bartlett (1932) writes that

the cautious and the rash; the student and the
man of affairs; the subject doubting and the
same subject confident never perceive alike,
though they may all be faced by exactly the same
situation, so far as external features go.

Identifying the processes which individuals use to
arrive at different interpretations of a single event has
demanded the attention of scholars throughout several
centuries. However, psychologists have been particularly
active in trying to explain how different interpretations
of a single event come into existence. The next section
of chapter three will explore a number of theories which
seek to explain how people interpret events. These
theories provide the foundation for a theory of conflict
frames.

Gestalt Psychology. Until the turn of the Twentieth
Century, psychologists operated under the assumption that
a whole entity was equal to the sum of its parts and that,
if the function of the individual parts could be
understood, then the whole could be understood as well
(Katz, 1950; Kohler, 1969). Katz (1950) provides an
example of this by looking at an organism.
The organism was represented as a combination of the smallest elements, namely cells; if one could achieve insight into the function of the single cell, comprehension of the work of the whole organism would come about automatically, to a certain extent, by summation (p.4).

This way of looking at an organism justified examination of each part, or cell, without equally examining the whole being. The term "atomistic" (Katz, 1950) which means to look at the simplest building blocks (Websters, 1971), or atoms, was assigned to this type of scientific inquiry.

In the natural sciences, looking at the smallest building blocks was useful, however "critical deliberation revealed that an atomistic approach to the nature of mental life could not, or at least could not by itself, do justice to the task" (Katz, 1950, p. 4) of investigating many human activities. Thus, social scientists began developing a new approach, which rejected many of the long held assumptions about scientific inquiry. This new approach evolved into a new school of thought which was called "Gestalt" psychology (Kohler, 1969).

Gestalt psychologists began to look at the whole organism and the interactions in which it participated. An examination of the individual cells which made up an
organism or the minute physical actions and reactions of which the organism's behavior consisted were not as important to Gestalt psychologists as was understanding what was visible to the naked eye. In other words, pre-Gestalt psychologists "sought an atomistic explanation" (Katz, 1950) while Gestalt psychologists focused on a "holistic" (Katz, 1950) approach. This was a radical change from the way in which science had been practiced up to the point, and it allowed the study of perception, which is a forerunner to the concept of conflict frames, as well as other fields, to take on new meaning.

Research on Remembering. Gestalt psychology was still fairly young when Bartlett (1932) conducted a series of experiments designed to find out how people remember. His research has implications for explaining how individuals make meaning of their present reality. Bartlett (1932) suggested that individual reactions to new situations are the easiest, or the least disagreeable, or the quickest and least obstructed that is at the time possible. When we try to discover how this is done we find that always it is by an effort to connect what is given to something else. Thus, the immediately present "stands for" something not immediately present (p. 44).
Bartlett (1932) adds that an individual fills up the gaps of his perception by the aid of what he has experienced before in similar situations, or ...by describing what he takes to be "fit"; or suitable, to such a situation. He may do this without being in the least aware that he is either supplementing or falsifying the data or perception. Yet...he is certainly doing the first, and in many instances he is demonstrably doing the second (p. 14).

In other words, people encountering a new situation will search through their memory for a past experience that bears resemblance to the new experience. Then, the past experience will be used to help them understand the present event, even if the past event is not as similar as to the present event as it might appear on the surface. From his experiments, Bartlett (1932) concluded that prior experience had an important influence on an individual's understanding of a present event.

Social Cognition Theory. Further research eventually led to the development of an area called "social cognition" in the field of psychology. Social cognition research is responsible for investigating how people construct reality, and it is from theories in this area
that an hypothesis of framing can be derived.

Fiske and Taylor (1984) argue that each of us, in our experiences with cause-effect relations in the world, develops certain abstract conceptions about how causes work together to yield effects; we can use these when we wish to explain effects for which causal information is ambiguous or unclear (p. 34).

Fiske and Taylor (1984) call these abstract conceptions "schema". Schema is defined as a cognitive structure that represents one's general knowledge about a given concept or stimulus domain...and enables us to function in the world (Fiske & Taylor, 1984, p. 13).

Schemata (plural of schema), then, are human understandings of the world at a given point in time. Understanding is gained through personal experience and communication with others. Understanding changes in people as they gain new experiences, and likewise, schema change. However, for a given time period, the schema which is in the mind of an individual will be applied to the events of that time period to enable the person to more fully understand the events and react to them with confidence.
Since schema is an understanding of the way things work, it can be viewed as having two parts. Schema consists of attributes, or characteristics, and relationships. The main focus of an experience, for example a roommate conflict, has a set of characteristics. In this example, the characteristics might include female, freshman, and same race. The relationship would be described by the fact that they are roommates sharing a small living environment for the first time. "Schema contains both the attributes of the concept and the relationships among the attributes" (Fiske & Taylor, 1984, p. 13).

Schemata are used to better define, or understand, situations or events. They allow people to infer certain characteristics which exist in other situations to present situations. Fiske and Taylor (1984) identify several specific ways in which schemata can be used to make inferences about a situation.

First, causal schemata help people to make causal inferences when information is incomplete, sketchy, or derived from only one incident or observation. Second, they represent general conceptions about patterns of cause-effect relationships that may apply across a wide range of specific content areas.
Causal schemata, in essence, give the social perceiver a causal shorthand for accomplishing complex inferential tasks quickly and easily. Based on our knowledge of causal schemata, we are able to use information about presence, absence, or strength of causes to infer effects when information is less than complete (Fiske & Taylor, 1984, p. 35).

To summarize, schemata are knowledge aggregates which have been stored from the past and are used to interpret or better understand an event in the present. Schemata enable a person to take details from a past experience which is similar to a present situation and add to the present reality. In a sense, the present reality, plus information from the past which is stored as schemata, are put together to create a new reality. Because individuals have more insight into the newly constructed reality than into the actual reality, they can act with greater confidence and are motivated to continue this type of reality construction.

Attribution Theory. "Attribution theory" is a branch of social cognition theory which has been concerned with "how people understand the causes of behaviors" (Hewstone, 1983, p. 1). Fiske and Taylor (1984) state that attribution theory "examines how people combine and use
information to reach causal judgments" (p. 44). Attribution theory consists of a number of models which explain how people gather information and put it together to enable them to make decisions.

Lalljee and Abelson (1983) write that "it is of vital importance for people to explain what has occurred because the explanation gives meaning to the event, thus assisting one's orientation towards the world" (p. 65). "Causal attributions are our most basic or fundamental cognitions, the ones formed from raw information and the ones on which other inferences are subsequently based" (Fiske & Taylor, 1984, p. 96). Research in this area suggests that instead of a naive scientist entering the environment in search of truth, we find the rather unflattering picture of a charlatan trying to make the data come out in a manner most advantageous to his or her own already held theories (Fiske & Taylor, 1984, p. 88).

A simplistic look at attribution theory suggests that it is involved with "only if...then" propositions (Kruglanski, Baldwin & Towson, 1983, p. 82). People experience an event and in their desire to explain the cause of the event they deduce that only if such and such happened first, would the particular event they were involved in have resulted. Kruglanski, Baldwin and Towson
(1983), in summarizing some of the major attributional models, point out that "(1) the external entity, (2) the person's unique properties, (3) the interaction modality or (4) the "time" at which the interaction occurred" (p. 86) must be taken into account when assigning a cause to a particular event. In addition, attribution models have attributed the cause of events to "some correspondent personality attribute", and in "the problem of attributing one's success or failure", models have looked at "ability, effort, task difficulty or luck" (Kruglanski, Baldwin & Towson, 1983, p. 86).

Fiske and Taylor (1984) interpret attribution theory to say that people can use schemata, which may be made up of any of the entities listed above (i.e., external entity, time, etc.), to explain the cause of particular events in their lives. Once people have schemata of a particular content in mind, it is very difficult to change how they will apply that schemata to future events. This means that when a present situation resembles a past situation, schemata from the past will be applied to the present causing the person to interpret the present situation in a way that is similar to the past interpretation. Even when the new situation warrants a fresh interpretation, attribution theory suggests that the old interpretation
It appears that the individual has a "willingness to form stable attributions, especially about others, and an unwillingness to amend or change one's beliefs, in the face of discrepant evidence" (Fiske & Taylor, 1984, p. 88). This means that new information coming into a person's mind is "shaped by organized prior knowledge" (Fiske & Taylor, 1984, p. 142) and transformed into a new reality which supports the person's present belief system. This model of how people perceive reality "openly contradicts common sense" (Fiske & Taylor, 1984, p. 141), but seems to explain the process which people go through as they react to present events and incorporate new information into their memory.

One of the models which has emerged from attribution theory predicts how people assign responsibility for credit or blame to others. An example of this model which predicts what kind of help one person will likely give another when the other is perceived as needing aid is presented in Figure 3.4. Fiske and Taylor (1984) explain the model presented in Figure 3.4 in detail.

The Moral Model represents a person who sees others who are in need as responsible for both the cause of their problem and the solution to the problem. This person is
very unlikely to provide aid and may prefer to simply urge the needy person to help him or herself more actively. The Compensatory Model represents a person who sees others who are in need as responsible for the solution to their problem, but not responsible for their problem. Again, this person is more likely to offer words of encouragement than actual assistance. The Enlightenment Model represents a person who blames others who are in need for their problem, but does not place the responsibility for the solution on their shoulders. This person would offer assistance. The Medical Model absolves others who are in need of the responsibility for the problem, as well as the solution. This person would offer assistance and probably be most willing to do so since others are seen as victims of outside forces.

These models bear a strong resemblance to the model which Sheppard et al. (1990) proposed to predict what kind of conflict resolution technique managers will choose if asked to intervene in a problem between employees. Figure 3.5 presents a model which predicts what kind of response different kinds of conflict frames will elicit from third parties who intervene in disputes between their employees.

Both of these models predict the behavior of third parties based on what kind of perception the third parties
have of the people they see. Fiske and Taylor (1984) predict behavior based on the perceptions a third party has about a person in need of help while Sheppard et al. (1990) predict behavior based on the perceptions a third party has about what caused a conflict between two people.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSIBLE FOR SOLUTION</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You are responsible for your plight</td>
<td>You are responsible for your plight (drinking), but you can not cure yourself</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(bad grades) and your cure (study)</td>
<td>without help (Alcoholics Anonymous)</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harder.</td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Model</td>
<td>Enlightenment Model</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are not responsible for your plight</td>
<td>You are not responsible for your plight (cancer) or your cure (chemotherapy).</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(poor), but you are responsible for the cure (hard work).</td>
<td>Medical Model</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compensatory Model</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Fiske and Taylor, 1984, p. 105)

**Figure 3.4.** Frames Which Predict the Kind of Help One Individual Will Give Another Individual Who is Perceived To Be In Need
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frame</th>
<th>Type of Intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>choice</td>
<td>A rule has been broken. Identify the person(s) who broke the rule and have them make amends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negotiation</td>
<td>There are a number of different factors contributing to this conflict. Have parties sit down and negotiate a resolution to the conflict.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>underlying</td>
<td>This conflict is a symptom of a deeper conflict. Sit down with disputants and try to find out what the underlying problem is and then try to resolve it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>problem</td>
<td>This conflict is causing an extremely dangerous situation. Stop the conflict first, then work on resolving the conflict.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(adapted from Sheppard et al., 1989, pp. 181 and 182)

**Figure 3.5.** Frames Which Predict the Kind of Intervention One Person Will Make When Two Parties are Perceived To Be In Conflict.

Attribution theory provides strong support for the existence of conflict frames. In addition, attribution theory suggests that people tend to behave consistently in reaction to like situations. Thus, it is conceivable that a particular frame will dominate individuals' interpretations of conflicts and subsequently guide them into a single method of conflict resolution time after time.
Perry's Theory of Intellectual Development Impacts the Theory of Conflict Frames. It is possible that the type of conflict frame which individual's predominantly use can be related to their level of intellectual development. This may be particularly evident for traditionally aged college students, 18-22 years old, because the educational process intentionally seeks to move students from one level of intellectual development to another. Perry (1970) proposed a model of intellectual development for college students which has been accepted for over two decades. Perry's model identifies six stages (see Figure 3.6) through which students pass as they grow intellectually.

Stage one is a hypothetical end point from which students begin their intellectual development. In stage one, students view the world in terms of absolute rights and wrongs. Teachers, or people in positions of authority, are expected to know the right answers to all of the questions and are expected to share them with students. People who do not know the answers, or who choose not to share the answers, are considered incompetent (Perry, 1970).

In stage two, students begin to see multiple viewpoints. However, rather than accepting them as valid,
students believe that when two people hold different opinions one of the people is confused, ignorant, or simply trying to make the students figure out the truth by playing devil's advocate. In stage two, students still believe that there is an absolute right and wrong, but they are aware that multiple opinions exist (Perry, 1970).

In stage three, students begin to admit that rather than being incompetent, authority figures may have differing opinions or not know some of the answers because science has not yet discovered all of the answers. Students in stage three still believe in an absolute right and wrong, but differing opinions can be explained by the fact that science has not had time to identify a single truth by proving that the differing opinions are wrong (Perry, 1970).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages</th>
<th>Definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage One: Basic Duality</td>
<td>Students see the world in terms of absolute rights and wrongs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage Two: Multiplicity Pre-legitimate</td>
<td>Students are aware of multiple view-points, but regard them as confused or uninformed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage Three: Multiplicity Subordinate</td>
<td>Students are aware of multiple view-points, but explain them by saying that science has not discovered the truth yet, but when science does discover the truth, then there will only be one viewpoint.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage Four: Multiplicity: Correlate</td>
<td>Students believe that there are no absolute rights and wrongs. Everyone's opinion is equally valid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage Five: Relativism</td>
<td>Students begin to understand that different viewpoints are a result of applying different contexts or rationales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage Six: Commitment Foreseen</td>
<td>Students commit themselves to one context or rationale and apply it consistently.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(adapted from Perry, 1970, pp. 57-153)

Figure 3.6. Perry's (1970) Six Stage Model of Intellectual Development.
Stage four is a radical change from the first three stages. In stage four, students come to believe that there is no absolute right or wrong. Rather, there is a multiplicity of truths where everyone's opinion is equally uncertain and equally valid. In this stage, students begin to enjoy talking over material with their peers since authority figures no longer have a corner on truth (Perry, 1970).

Stage five occurs when students begin to see truth in context. The idea that everyone's opinion is equally valid is replaced by the idea that every opinion must be supported by a logical rationale in order to be accepted as truth. Students begin to analyze and synthesize information in this stage in order to support their viewpoints. This stage is known as relativism (Perry, 1970). Many different truths can exist at the same time because each person uses a different context and can legitimately view the same situation from a different perspective.

Stage six, like stage one, may also be hypothetical. It involves commitment to one's perspective, or truth. As students consistently employ the same rules, or context, when they interpret information, they prepare to move into stage six. Perry's (1970) model contains three more
stages beyond stage six which involve deeper levels of commitment. Since these stages depend upon commitment being shown over a significant amount of time and are therefore, intended for older adults, they will not be included in this paper.

**Summary.** Perry's (1970) model suggests that students progress through a series of stages as they grow intellectually. From an initial stage of dualism, they may progress through multiplicity and relativism to eventually arrive at commitment. Since the "choice" frame is very similar to the stage of dualism and the "negotiation" frame is similar to the stage of relativism (Figure 3.7), there should be some interaction between a person's intellectual development and their use of different frames to resolve conflicts. This study seeks to teach or train students to use a negotiation frame, rather than a choice frame in much the same way that Perry suggests students can be taught to move from dualism to relativism.
Stages                             Frames

Dualism: absolute rights and wrongs. Choice: a rule is broken. Identify the right party and the wrong party.

Relativism: different views are a result of applying different contexts or rationales. Negotiation: there are a number of different factors contributing to the conflict. Each party has its own unique interests in the outcome of this conflict.

Figure 3.7. Perry’s (1970) Model Matched to Conflict Frames.

The impact of Perry’s (1970) Model on teaching students to use different frames. Research on college students has revealed that most undergraduates spend their college years in stages two and three (Perry, 1970). Assuming that this is true, there is a likelihood that undergraduates would tend to use a "choice," or "right-wrong" conflict frame because it would correspond with their level of intellectual development. If students view the world in terms of right and wrong, they will also view conflicts in terms of right and wrong.
Perry argues that students move from one stage to the next as their present stage is challenged. In other words, students in dualism move to multiplicity when they are continually presented with multiple viewpoints. Forcing students to experience the next higher stage in a consistent manner eventually motivates them to accept that stage as reality. Since Perry (1970) believes that students progress through stages as the validity of their present stage is challenged, it is reasonable to assume that students would change their conflict frames from "choice" to "negotiation" if they were challenged to do so. The mediation training session which suggests using negotiation to settle many common disputes, plus the actual practice of mediation, which will show students that multiple viewpoints exist, will challenge currently held dualistic, or right-wrong perspectives while favoring the use of multiple, or negotiated perspectives.

There is a significant body of knowledge in the field of psychology to support the existence of conflict frames. These frames may influence the type of conflict resolution process which individuals will choose to help them resolve a dispute. Perry's (1970) theory of Intellectual Development may impact what kinds of conflict frames people use, as well as how people can be taught to use
different frames.

This study will investigate whether or not students can be taught, over time, to use a "negotiation" frame, rather than a "right-wrong" or "choice" frame, when viewing a hypothetical conflict. Students will be challenged to use a "negotiation" frame in several different ways. One group of students will participate in a mediation training session and mediate real disputes among students living in the residence halls. Another group of students will attend a class on conflict resolution which will include lectures on mediation and provide the students with opportunities to practice their negotiating skills.

Chapter Four explains the research procedures which were used for this study.
CHAPTER IV

METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the research procedures which were used in the study. The study investigated the conflict frames which students use when interpreting hypothetical disputes. An assessment instrument, in this case a questionnaire, was designed to collect the conflict frame information. After describing the setting in which the research was conducted, the procedures used to develop the Dispute Resolution Questionnaire (DRQ) are explained. The remainder of the chapter presents the research design, subject selection, data collection, scoring, and data analysis.

This study tested students in four groups: an experimental group, a control group, an intact academic class of graduate students, and a purposive sample. Each student completed one or more questionnaires which were coded to identify the kind of conflict frame ("choice" or "negotiation") they used to resolve a series of hypothetical conflict scenarios. The experimental group and the intact class received education and/or training.
designed to motivate their members to change from using predominantly "choice" frames to predominantly "negotiation" frames between the first and last administration of the questionnaire. A series of analyses was performed on the data in order to ascertain the impact of the education and training on the type of conflict frame chosen to resolve the series of conflicts.

Setting

The study was conducted at The Ohio State University, a major comprehensive university enrolling approximately 54,000 students on a single campus. Just under 9,000 students reside in the residence halls. There are twenty-three residence halls of varying sizes which house undergraduate students and three which house graduate students. Married students are housed in apartments separated from the main campus.

In the spring of 1990, the director of Residence Life at The Ohio State University decided to implement a Student Mediation Center to address conflicts between undergraduate students who lived in the residence halls. The kinds of conflicts the Center was designed to address included, but were not limited to, roommate disputes, conflicts between former girlfriends and boyfriends, and disputes involving hate-related behaviors which were not
directed toward a specific individual (i.e., writing "fag" on a mirror in a public bathroom). The Coordinator of Judicial Affairs determined that any conflicts where the disputants desired to use mediation and where the conflict did not violate The Ohio State University's The Code of Student Conduct could be mediated by the Center. Examples of violations of The Student Code of Conduct, which could not be mediated, include theft, rape, assault, drug use, felonies, and certain kinds of hate-related behavior which were directed toward a specific individual (i.e., writing "fag" across a student's name tag which is attached to the student's door in a residence hall).

A doctoral student with experience in mediation was hired to design and direct the Student Mediation Center during the 1990-1991 academic year. Student mediators were recruited during the month of September, 1990. Interviews were held during the first two weeks of October and students were notified whether or not they had been selected by October 15th. The twelve hour training session for those chosen to become student mediators was held on October 18 and October 20, 1990. The first mediation was held on October 31.
Instrument Development

The development of the Dispute Resolution Questionnaire was based on the research of several scholars. During one of Sheppard et al.’s. (1983) studies, managers were presented with a series of hypothetical dispute scenarios and asked to describe how they would resolve each conflict. The hypothetical dispute scenarios were adapted from the real conflicts which subjects of Sheppard et al.’s. (1983) early research had described.

Pinkley (1990) conducted a telephone survey and those who admitted to being involved in a conflict were asked the following questions: "1) Briefly tell me what you think this conflict is probably about, 2) What do you think is at the heart of this conflict?, and 3) What do you want to come out of this conflict?" (Pinkley, 1990). These two methods of collecting information about how people respond to conflicts -- questionnaires containing hypothetical conflict scenarios and open-ended questions about how respondents handled conflict, were combined to produce the Dispute Resolution Questionnaire (DRQ).

Since the purpose of this research was to investigate how conflict frames change over time, it was important to have respondents describe the same conflict during each administration of the Dispute Resolution Questionnaire.
(hereafter called DRQ). Hypothetical conflicts, rather than real conflicts which the respondents were involved in, were used to enable respondents to react to the same series of conflicts at different points in time. Sheppard et al. (1989) used hypothetical dispute scenarios to measure specific differences in how managers resolved conflicts; a similar methodology was used for this study. The DRQ presented respondents with a series of examples of conflicts and asked variations of two of the three questions Pinkley used in her research: 1) "What is causing this conflict?" and 2) "How would you like to see the conflict resolved?". From the answers to these two questions, the respondents' frames were identified.

In addition to asking the respondents to describe the issues involved in the conflict and how they would like to see the conflict resolved, the respondents' confidence in each response was also measured. To investigate the respondents' confidence in their proposed resolutions to the conflicts presented in this study, confidence levels on four goals: effectiveness, efficiency, fairness, and the satisfaction and commitment of the disputants, were measured. If third parties could experience a high level of achievement in all four of these goals with a particular intervention theme, it was assumed that they
would be very confident of that intervention process. Therefore, respondents were asked to rate on a 1 - 7 Likert Scale how confident they were that their proposed solution would 1) solve the problem (effectiveness), 2) cost less time, money, and hassle than other solutions (efficiency), 3) be fair (fairness), and 4) satisfy everyone involved in the conflict (satisfaction and commitment).

Development of conflict scenarios included in the final draft of the DRQ, much like the hypothetical dispute scenarios used by Sheppard et al. (1989), were chosen from a much larger initial pool. Five residence life staff members who had worked with the researcher at Ohio State submitted examples of commonly occurring conflicts in the residence halls. Three of the staff members were hall directors who managed resident halls housing from 200 to 500 students. Two were employed by Ohio State and one was on staff at Capital University, a medium sized liberal arts institution in Columbus, Ohio. The fourth staff member was an area coordinator at Ohio State responsible for three residence halls containing a total of 1800 students. The final staff member was a resident advisor at Ohio State living on a hall of approximately thirty students. Each staff member submitted five examples.
Conflict interpretations could be represented on an abstract continuum with "right/wrong" frames at one extreme, "negotiation" frames at the opposite extreme, and a combination of both frames in between, in much the same way that Thibaut and Walker (1975) represented conflict resolution processes on a continuum ranging from "third party has high control over the outcome" to "third party has low or no control over the outcome". For example, conflict scenarios could be written so that respondents would use a "choice" frame when answering the questions. Similarly, examples of conflicts could be written so that respondents would use a "negotiation" frame when answering. In addition, it appeared that examples could be written so that respondents would use "choice" frames if they were in Perry's (1970) stage of dualism, but would use "negotiation" frames if they were in Perry's (1970) stages of multiplicity or relativism. They would also use a "negotiation" frame if they had been taught to use a "negotiation" frame for that particular example.

In order to document the development of the final DRQ which was used in the study, the DRQ's which were used in pilot studies will be numbered in chronological order in this section of chapter four. The language and format used in DRQ #1 were developed by a group consisting of one
undergraduate student, two graduate students, and the researcher (hereafter called Panel 1). Panel 1 tried to insure that each example was equal in terms of the kinds of language used and the content of the conflicts. From the pool of twenty-five examples of typical residence hall conflicts, Panel 1 chose ten examples. These examples were designed to represent conflicts which were assumed to evoke different conflict frame responses from respondents.

Each type of conflict frame was defined, and the purpose of the research was explained to each member of the Panel prior to their selecting the examples. The examples were selected after discussion among the members of the Panel identified these examples as best being able to produce the kinds of frame responses which the researcher desired. Panel 1 chose three examples which they assumed would evoke "choice" frame responses. Three more examples which they assumed would evoke "negotiation" frame responses, and four examples which they assumed would evoke "negotiation" frame responses, but which might also produce "choice" frame responses based on the level of intellectual development of the respondents, were selected. This last group of examples will be labeled "either" frames since a respondent may be likely to use
either a "choice" or a "negotiation" frame when viewing these examples. "Either" is the response the researcher desires, but "choice" and "negotiation" are the two frames which the respondent can use.

DRQ #1, which contained ten examples of conflicts (see Appendix B), was piloted on a sample of twelve undergraduate students who were waiting in the lobby of their academic advisors' offices one morning during the summer term of 1990. The ordering of conflicts was randomized to insure that the instrument was internally valid. To obtain different orderings of conflicts, examples were paired to create six pairs of two conflicts and placed in the order presented in Appendix C. It was important that questions placed early on the questionnaire did not influence the answers to questions which appeared later and bias the results. Students were asked to not only answer DRQ #1, but to indicate which statements were unclear, as well.

The twelve questionnaires were analyzed by the researcher and a panel of two graduate students (heretofore called Panel 2) in an effort to make the questionnaire less ambiguous and to reduce the number of examples of conflicts. For purposes of internal validity, the final DRQ needed to contain as few examples as
possible, and yet enough examples to gain the information which would make the study worthwhile. The researcher decided that six examples was the least number which would provide adequate information. Panel 2 was assembled to replace one graduate student from Panel 1 who moved and because the researcher did not want the undergraduate student to continue on the panel due to his lack of experience. One graduate student from Panel 1 became part of Panel 2. Frames were decided by consensus.

A chart (Appendix D), Types of Conflict Frames Used By Respondents To Interpret Ten Hypothetical Disputes, indicated that the ordering of the conflicts had little effect on the respondents’ answers. Two of the conflicts which were designed to elicit a "choice" frame consistently did so, regardless of which position they held, and four conflicts designed to elicit "either" responses successfully produced the desired results. The other four examples received mixed responses although one was designed to produce a "choice" frame on each administration and three were designed to produce a "negotiation" frame during each administration.

After reading the results from DRQ #1, one member of Panel #2 suggested writing the examples in the first person instead of in the third person. Panel #2 discussed
this idea and then asked two of the respondents to DRQ #1, who were easily available to the researcher, for their feedback. Both respondents thought that examples written in the first person would be more engaging to the reader. Panel #2 decided to use the first person for the rest of the DRQs.

After analyzing the results from DRQ #1, Panel #2 reduced the number of examples of conflicts to eight. This was done by eliminating the examples which produced responses which were least like the responses the researcher desired. For example, the conflict which failed to reliably elicit a "choice" response (Question 3 in Appendix B) was eliminated. In addition, the three examples designed to consistently elicit "negotiation" responses (Questions 8, 9, and 10 in Appendix B) were eliminated because they only produced that response 50% of the time. Panel 2 also created a new example designed to elicit a predominantly "negotiation" response (Question 7 in Appendix E).

The resulting DRQ #2 included eight examples of conflicts: two designed to elicit "choice" responses, two designed to elicit a "negotiation" response and four designed to elicit a "choice" response during the first administration of the DRQ and a "negotiation" response
during the later administrations of the DRQ. The examples
designed to elicit only a "choice" response or a
"negotiation" response were included to make sure that the
respondents were reading the examples carefully. The
other examples, designed to elicit "choice" responses
during early administrations of the DRQ and "negotiation"
responses during later administrations of the DRQ were
included to test the impact of mediation education and
training. DRQ #2 was reviewed (but not completed) by a
sample of three undergraduate students who were visiting
their academic adviser one morning in the summer to make
sure that the examples were unambiguous and could be read
easily.

The process of refining the pilot DRQs until they
became the final DRQ consisted of administering the pilot
DRQs to various samples of students, analyzing the
results, and making changes in the pilot DRQs. Since the
procedures used in this process were similar to what has
already been described, the remainder of the process is
described in Appendix F. The final DRQ consisted of six
hypothetical scenarios designed to evoke one "choice"
response, one "negotiation" response, and four "either"
responses.
Research Design

This study was conducted using a quasi-experimental design. A full experimental design was not possible because neither random sampling, nor random assignment of subjects to groups could be done. Only students who indicated an interest in being involved in the Student Mediation Center and who could attend the training session were considered for the experimental and control groups. In addition, due to the time constraints of some of the subjects, complete random assignment of the students to the control and experimental groups did not occur. Finally, one of the groups involved in the study was created from the members of an intact academic class who were taking a graduate course in "Conflict Resolution" taught by a faculty member in The College of Business.

Group #1 and #2. Group #1, the control group, consisted of twenty-eight students who qualified to attend the mediation session, but were either randomly selected or predetermined not to attend training. Group #2, the experimental group, consisted of twenty-seven students who were either randomly selected or predetermined to participate in mediation training and serve as student mediators. The selection of Groups #1 and #2 will be described in more detail shortly.
Group #3. Group #3, the intact academic class, consisted of 23 students who attended an academic course entitled "Resolving Social Conflict". The course is offered to graduate students once a year and is taught by a faculty member in the Department of Management and Human Resources of The College of Business. The course exposes students to different conflict resolution processes through lectures and opportunities to role play negotiation scenarios.

Group #4. Group #4 consisted of a purposive sample of thirty students. The goal was to have a sample which did not volunteer to learn mediation, but which was similar to the control and experimental groups. Students were approached at the Student Union one afternoon and asked to complete the DRQ. The Union was chosen because of the diverse group of students which frequent the Union. The gender of each student was noted before asking them what year they were in school. The researcher's goal was to obtain a sample of students who matched the experimental group's age and gender characteristics. If the student who was approached matched a member of the experimental group in terms of gender and year in school, that student was asked to complete the DRQ. The researcher continued to note the students' gender and ask
their year in school until thirty students who matched the experimental group as closely as possible had been found. Every effort was made to have the first thirty students who met the goals of the researcher complete the DRQ; five students refused to fill out the questionnaire.

SubGroups A and B. When the final data were collected, the researcher noted that only about half of the students in Group 2 had an opportunity to conduct a real mediation. In addition, the experiences of the students who had conducted mediations varied widely. Some students had been involved in four mediations while others had only assisted with one. Students had been involved in different types of mediations lasting from fifteen minutes to two and a half hours.

In order to more accurately test the impact of conducting real mediations on the use of frames, Group 2 was subdivided into SubGroups A and B during the data analysis. SubGroup A consisted of eleven members of Group 2 who had participated in a real mediation. SubGroup B contained the remaining sixteen students in Group 2. SubGroup A was not intentionally different than SubGroup B because students were chosen on the basis of their availability and not on the basis of a particular characteristic. Each student in Group 2 had been given a
chance to mediate a real conflict by the time of the last data collection, and it was availability which determined who mediated the real conflicts.

Table 4.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Time 0</th>
<th>Time 30 Days</th>
<th>Time 60 Days</th>
<th>Time 150 Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group #1 = control group  
Group #2 = experimental group  
Group #3 = intact class  
Group #4 = purposive sample  
X = the DRQ was administered

The timing of questionnaire administration is represented in Table 4.1. The instrument was initially administered to each member of all four groups. One month later, immediately after Group #2 had completed the mediation training session, the instrument was again administered to Groups #1 and #2. Five months after the initial administration, Groups #1 and #2 were again asked to complete the instrument. Group #3 received the instrument approximately two months after the initial administration.
Selection of Subjects for the Experimental and Control Groups

Personal letters were sent to all seven hundred and sixty-nine students who had volunteered to help residence hall students move in when classes started in the fall. This is an important job at Ohio State and students are recruited during the summer and receive special training during the week before school starts. Once move-in is over, these students responsibilities are also over. All of these students lived in residence halls and were either freshmen or sophomores.

Letters were also mailed to resident advisors and academic advisors asking for the names of students who they felt would make good student mediators and would like to become involved in the Student Mediation Center. Posters and pamphlets were placed in the residence halls and in several other college buildings.

One hundred and nineteen students responded. Approximately 60% of the respondents were volunteers for move-in. Approximately 20% had been encouraged to apply by their resident advisor or academic advisor and the other 20% had seen the posters or pamphlets.

Ninety-three students signed up for screening interviews; eighty-eight students completed the
interviews. The interviews were used to evaluate students' communication skills, maturity, analytical skills and poise. An sample of the questions asked during the interview is presented in Appendix J. After the interviews, eighty students were chosen to participate in the research.

Selection of subjects for groups #1 and #2. Students were matched based on age and gender to create forty pairs of students; half were randomly placed in the control group and half in the experimental group. Age was selected because it was assumed from Perry's (1970) research on intellectual development that the older students would be more prone to use negotiation frames than younger ones. Gender was selected because Carnevale, Lim, and McLaughlin (1989) found that gender, as well as age, was associated with the use of different tactics when resolving disputes.

There were nine exceptions to this procedure. Eight students informed the researcher during the interview that due to previous commitments, they would be unable to participate in the training. One student informed the researcher after being selected to attend training that she would be unable to participate. These nine students were automatically placed in the control group while their
partners were placed in the experimental group.

The forty students who were placed in the control group were notified that they would receive mediation training during spring term. The forty students in the experimental group were notified that they could attend mediation training in October, during the fall term. Thirty-six students accepted the offer and four declined. Of the thirty-six, five did not show up and one quit after the first session. Thus, thirty students in the experimental group received the full mediation training; the control group was thus reduced to thirty by eliminating the matched partners of the untrained experimental group members.

During the training, the researcher was made aware that two of the students in the experimental group had received mediation training in other settings. These students were deleted from the experimental group, and their partners were deleted from the control group. In addition, one student in the experimental group did not return the second DRQ. Follow-up revealed that she had transferred to another institution. This student was deleted from the experimental group, but her partner in the control group remained because she had already submitted a second DRQ. Figure 4.2 describes the characteristics of the students in each group.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>CONTROL GROUP</th>
<th>EXPERIMENTAL GROUP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.2. Characteristics of the Members of the Control and Experimental Groups.

Data Collection

Groups #1 and #2. Once the students indicated an interest in becoming a student mediator, an interview was scheduled and a Dispute Resolution Questionnaire (DRQ) was mailed to them. Students were told over the phone that since the Student Mediation Center was a new program the DRQ was being used to evaluate the Center and that the responses to the DRQ would have no bearing on the selection process. The researcher stressed that the DRQ was simply an anonymous evaluation tool which would be administered at intervals throughout the Student Mediation Centers' existence. Students brought the completed
questionnaire with them to the interview. DRQ's were numbered in order to enable comparisons, but students' names were not written on the form.

The experimental group participated in a two day mediation training program. This program consisted of six hours of lecture and demonstrations on mediation and six hours of role plays and was comparable to training offered by the Community Mediation Services of Central Ohio and the Night Prosecutor's Program of Columbus. At the conclusion of the training, the DRQ was handed out with instructions to return it within two weeks to give students adequate time to catch up on studies before completing the DRQ. DRQs were also mailed to students in the control group, with similar instructions.

During the next four months, eleven members of the experimental group mediated real conflicts between students living in the residence halls. All members of the experimental group gave mediation presentations to student groups, participated in a training session for new mediators, discussed the real mediations and informally advised friends who were in conflict. Periodic newsletters also went out to the experimental group members to keep them abreast of The Student Mediation Center's activities. The control group received no
communication from the researcher and did not participate in any mediation activities. The follow-up DRQ was sent out to all members of the experimental and control groups five months after the initial mediation training. Students were again asked to return it within two weeks.

Group #3. Three months after the initial training, students beginning an academic course on conflict resolution were asked to complete the DRQ prior to the end of the first week of class. These students were also asked to complete the DRQ during the ninth week of the ten week course. These students were given more information about conflict resolution techniques than the experimental group, but they did not participate in mediation role plays or mediate any actual conflicts.

Group #4. The purposive sample of students was given the DRQ as the members were approached in the Student Union. The students were asked to complete the DRQ within thirty minutes. If they did not have time, they were given a self-addressed, stamped envelope and asked to mail the completed DRQ to the researcher within a week.

Data Analysis

The questionnaires were coded by the researcher using the guidelines listed in Appendix A. As a reliability
check, a graduate student who helped train the student mediators independently coded a random sample of nine questionnaires (fifty-four questions). The graduate was taught how to code the questions by the researcher. All of the questions were coded and the percentage agreement of classifications was 84 percent.

In this section, a description of the data analysis is presented. Each research hypothesis presented in Chapter One was rewritten to reflect the characteristics of the study and, when necessary, was broken down into simpler statements. The original research hypothesis presented in Chapter One will be followed by the new research hypothesis and an explanation of the data analysis used.

**Key**

Group 1  = Control Group (received no training).
Group 2  = Experimental Group (received mediation training and acted as mediators for five months).
Group 3  = Course (attended a ten week course in conflict resolution).
Group 4  = Purposive Sample
Subgroup A = Those students in Group 2 who mediated real conflicts between college students living in the residence halls.
Subgroup B = Those students in Group 2 who did not have an opportunity to mediate real conflicts between college students living in the residence halls.
Original Research Hypothesis #1. There will be no significant difference in the perspective used to view conflict between college students who show an interest in mediation by volunteering to be student mediators or by attending a course on "conflict resolution" and a random sample of college students.

New Hypothesis #1. For Time 1, there will be no significant difference in the number of "negotiation" responses for Groups 1, 2, 3 and 4.

Analysis. Chi Square Test of Homogeneity.

Original Research Hypothesis #2. College students who receive mediation training and act as mediators will be significantly more likely to view conflict with a perspective which would predispose them to choose mediation to resolve a conflict than students who receive mediation training only, attend a course on "conflict resolution", receive no mediation training and do not attend a course on "conflict resolution".

New Hypothesis #2. For Group 1, there will be no significant difference in the number of "negotiation" responses across all times.

Analysis. Chi Square Test of Homogeneity.

New Hypothesis #3. There will be no significant difference in the change in the proportion of "negotiation" responses from Time 1 to Time 2 for Groups 2 and 3, however there will be a significant difference in the change in the proportion of "negotiation" responses from Time 1 to Time 3 for Group 2, but not for Group 1.

Analysis. Descriptive data was used because of the small sample sizes.

Analysis. Simultaneous 95% confidence intervals.

New Hypothesis #4. There will be no significant difference in the proportion of "negotiation" responses at Time 1 for Subgroups A and B.

Analysis. Descriptive data.

Analysis. A 2-tailed Fisher's Exact Test.
New Hypothesis #5. The change in the proportion of "negotiation" responses from Time 1 to Time 3 will be significantly larger for Subgroup A than Subgroup B.

Analysis. Descriptive data.

Analysis. Simultaneous 95% Confidence Intervals.

Original Research Hypothesis #3. The degree of confidence which college students who use a "negotiation" frame for Time 1 and Time 3 have that their solution will "solve" a conflict and "satisfy" those involved is significantly greater for students who receive mediation training and act as mediators for a period of five months than for students who receive mediation training only, students who attend a course on "conflict resolution", students who do not attend a training session, and students who do not attend a course on "conflict resolution".

New Hypothesis #6. For all Groups at Time 1, the level of confidence for respondents using "choice" responses will be significantly larger than the level of confidence for respondents using "negotiation" responses.

Analysis. Simultaneous 95% confidence intervals.

New Hypothesis #7. The level of confidence displayed by members of Group 1 who used "negotiation" responses for Times 1 and 3 in the categories "solve" and "satisfy" is constant over time.

Analysis. Descriptive data.

New Hypothesis #8. The level of confidence displayed by members of Group 2 who used a "negotiation" response for Times 1 and 3 in categories "solve" and "satisfy" will significantly increase over time.

Analysis. Descriptive data.

Chapter five contains a restatement of the research hypotheses, a brief rationale for each hypothesis, the
methods of data analysis, and the results.
CHAPTER V

RESULTS

This study was designed to answer the question: can students be trained to view conflict in a way which will motivate them to choose mediation, rather than other third party conflict resolution processes, as the way to resolve a given dispute. A series of research hypotheses, amended from the research hypotheses presented in Chapter One and presented at the end of Chapter Four, were formulated in order to test this question. This chapter is organized so that each research hypothesis is followed by 1) a description of the method used for data analysis; 2) a presentation of the results and 3) an explanation of the results.
The six questions contained in the DRQ are presented with the anticipated frame in parenthesis.

("Either" frame)

1. You bought the refrigerator which is in your suite. You have been letting your three suitemates use the refrigerator, but for the past two weeks your coke and food have been disappearing. You think your roommate is taking your Coke and food because last night when you came home your roommate was drinking a Coke, and this morning when you looked in the refrigerator, one of your Cokes was missing. You are angry about this.
2. Your hall has voted to have "quiet hours" from 10:00 p.m. until 8:00 a.m. all year long. During the winter term, you enjoyed being able to study in your room for a couple of hours after 10 p.m. before you went to bed because it was so quiet. Now it is spring, and when you and your neighbor's windows are open on hot nights, you can hear your neighbor's stereo, making it very difficult for you to study.

3. You and your roommate share a bathroom. It becomes obvious after a short time that your standards for cleanliness are different. When you get up after your roommate, you find toothpaste in the sink, hair clogging the shower drain, water everywhere, and sometimes clothes or a towel are left where you have to move them. You are becoming angry about this.

4. Your roommate came back to the room late one night after drinking too much and managed to break the window in your room while horsing around. You paid $100.00 to the hall director to fix the window since your roommate was short on cash and promised to pay you back the next pay day. It has been two months and your roommate has been paid four times since the window was broken. You need the money now to pay for the ticket to the beach for spring vacation.

5. You work best late at night and like to sleep late in the morning. You were fortunate to get afternoon classes this term so that you could sleep in and not worry about missing classes. However, your roommate is an early riser and has an 8:00 a.m. class every day of the week. Your roommate gets up at 7:00 a.m. every day and wakes you up and you can not get back to sleep. After several weeks of this, you find yourself falling asleep during the day so that you have missed a couple of classes and have not gotten your homework done.

6. Your roommate has lots of friends, is very popular, and plans to pledge a Greek social organization next year. Your roommate's friends are always in your room talking, and when you come in they ignore you and do not even get off your bed to let you sit down. You have begun to avoid your room until late at night, but you are getting tired.
of feeling like you do not have any place to call "home"
on campus.

**Hypothesis 1.** For Time 1, there will be no
significant difference in the number of "negotiation"
responses for Groups 1, 2, 3 and 4.

**Analysis.** A Chi Square Test of Homogeneity was used
to compare the number of "negotiation" responses among all
Groups. The results are presented in Table 5.1.

Table 5.1

A Chi-Square Test Comparing the Number of "Negotiation"
Responses For All Groups at Time 1. \( \alpha = .01 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.</th>
<th>Gr. 1</th>
<th>Gr. 2</th>
<th>Gr. 3</th>
<th>Gr. 4</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=28</td>
<td>n=27</td>
<td>n=23</td>
<td>n=30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10 (36%)</td>
<td>8 (30%)</td>
<td>4 (17%)</td>
<td>6 (27%)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.152</td>
<td>.541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6 (21%)</td>
<td>5 (18%)</td>
<td>4 (17%)</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.391</td>
<td>.708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11 (41%)</td>
<td>10 (36%)</td>
<td>8 (35%)</td>
<td>5 (23%)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.835</td>
<td>.607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.059</td>
<td>.377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 (22%)</td>
<td>11 (39%)</td>
<td>5 (22%)</td>
<td>8 (36%)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.901</td>
<td>.179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>13 (48%)</td>
<td>14 (52%)</td>
<td>10 (45%)</td>
<td>5 (23%)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.901</td>
<td>.179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q. = question  Gr. = Group
"N" = negotiation response  n = sample size

**Results.** The N/As in the first four columns for
Question #4 indicate that none of the respondents used a
"negotiation" frame at Time 1. Since the Chi-Square Test
compared the number of "negotiation" frames which were used by each group, it could not be applied to Question #4. Question #4 was written so that respondents would use a "choice" frame. At Time 1, none of the respondents in any of the Groups used a "negotiation" response.

The P values (last column) are all greater than .01, indicating that there were no significant differences in the number of "negotiation" responses for Groups 1, 2, 3 and 4. These results support the hypothesis. These results were expected for a number of reasons. First, the researcher assumed that only students who had been trained in mediation and had acted as mediators would have a greater tendency than normal to provide "negotiation" responses. Since mediation training is new and only scarcely available, it is highly unlikely that any of the students were trained mediators.

Second, the main difference between Group 4 and the other three Groups was that Group 4 was a purposive sample of students who had not expressed an interest in mediation to the researcher. Groups 1, 2 and 3 "volunteered" either to be mediators or to take a course on "conflict resolution". The characteristic of "volunteering" was not viewed as a variable which would impact the kind of frame which students use to resolve conflicts.
Third, the main difference between Group 3 and the rest of the Groups was that Group 3 consisted of graduate students who were, on average, older than the students in Groups 1, 2 and 3. If age is related to the use of "negotiation" frames, Group 3 might have provided more "negotiation" responses than the other three Groups. However, the researcher felt that the sample of graduate students in Group 3 was not significantly enough older than the members of the other samples to result in their providing more "negotiation" responses than the members of the other samples.

Hypothesis 2. For Group 1, there will be no significant difference in the number of "negotiation" responses across Times 1, 2 and 3.

Analysis. A Chi-Square Test of Homogeneity was used to compare the number of "negotiation" responses at Times 1, 2 and 3. The results are presented in Table 5.2.
Table 5.2

A Chi-Square Comparison of the Number of "Negotiation" Responses at Times 1, 2 and 3 for Group 1, α = .01

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.</th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 2</th>
<th>Time 3</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=28</td>
<td>n=27</td>
<td>n=23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10 (35%)</td>
<td>5 (29%)</td>
<td>7 (39%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.359</td>
<td>.835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6 (21%)</td>
<td>4 (24%)</td>
<td>4 (22%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11 (41%)</td>
<td>6 (35%)</td>
<td>12 (67%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.156</td>
<td>.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 (22%)</td>
<td>6 (35%)</td>
<td>8 (44%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.539</td>
<td>.281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>13 (48%)</td>
<td>5 (29%)</td>
<td>12 (67%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.660</td>
<td>.086</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q. = Question "N" = negotiation response n = sample size

Results. The N/As in the first three columns of Question #4 indicate that none of the respondents in Group 1 used a "negotiation" response at Times 1, 2 or 3. Question #4 was written so that respondents would use a "choice" response. Across all Times, all the members of Group 1 used a "choice" response.

The P values (last column) are all greater than .01 indicating that there were no significant differences in the number of "negotiation" responses for Group 1 across all times. These results support the hypothesis. This
result was expected because Group 1 was not exposed to any training designed to teach them to use "negotiation" responses.

Hypothesis 3. There will be no significant difference in the change in the proportion of "negotiation" responses from Time 1 to Time 2 for Groups 2 and 3, however there will be a significant difference in the change in the proportion of "negotiation" responses from Time 1 to Time 3 for Group 2, but not for Group 1.

Analysis: Descriptive data was used to compare the percentage of respondents in Groups 1, 2 and 3 who answered "choice" in Time 1 and changed to "negotiation" in Time 2 or Time 3. These results are presented in Table 5.3.
Table 5.3

The Percentage of Respondents in Groups 1, 2 and 3 Who Used a "Choice" Response in Time 1 and Changed to a "Negotiation" Response in Time 2 and/or in Time 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gr.</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Q.</th>
<th># and % of &quot;Choice&quot;</th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th># and % Change to &quot;N&quot;</th>
<th>Time 2</th>
<th># and % Change to &quot;N&quot;</th>
<th>Time 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17 (61%)</td>
<td>3 (18%)</td>
<td>4 (22%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19 (68%)</td>
<td>9 (47%)*</td>
<td>10 (53%)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19 (83%)</td>
<td>5 (26%)</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22 (79%)</td>
<td>3 (14%)</td>
<td>3 (14%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23 (82%)</td>
<td>7 (30%)*</td>
<td>5 (22%)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19 (83%)</td>
<td>2 (11%)</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17 (61%)</td>
<td>1 (6%)</td>
<td>5 (33%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18 (64%)</td>
<td>7 (39%)</td>
<td>9 (50%)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15 (64%)</td>
<td>8 (53%)*</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N/A</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22 (79%)</td>
<td>5 (23%)</td>
<td>5 (23%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17 (61%)</td>
<td>11 (65%)*</td>
<td>8 (47%)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18 (78%)</td>
<td>6 (33%)</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15 (53%)</td>
<td>2 (13%)</td>
<td>3 (20%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13 (46%)</td>
<td>5 (38%)</td>
<td>12 (92%)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12 (52%)</td>
<td>5 (42%)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = the group with the largest percent response to each question at Time 2 and also at Time 3

Gr. = group
n = sample size
"N" = negotiation response
Q. = question
Results. The N/As for Question #4 indicate that none of the respondents in the three groups changed from a "choice" frame to a "negotiation" frame. The results of the Chi-Square Test (page 126) indicated that none of the respondents in Group 1 used a "negotiation" response for Question #4. The results in Table 5.3 indicate that none of the respondents in Groups 2 and 3 used a "negotiation" response for Question #4. These results were expected since Question #4 was written so that respondents would use a "choice" response.

The Chi Square Test of Homogeneity indicated that there was no significant difference among the groups in the proportion of "negotiation" responses used at Time 1. The results in Table 5.3 indicate that Groups 2 and 3 responded differently than Group 1 at Times 2 and 3. At Times 2 and 3, the asterisk indicates, by question, the group with the largest number and percent of respondents who started with a "choice" response and changed to a "negotiation" response.

Group 1 never experienced a larger change than Group 2 or 3. At Time 2, Group 2 experienced the largest change for Questions #1, #2 and #5, while Group 3 experienced the largest change for Questions #3 and #6. At Time 2, it is not clear that Group 2 or 3 experienced a greater change.
However, for Time 3, Group 2 consistently experienced a larger change than Group #1.

The results at Time 3 were expected because Group 2 was the only group which participated in real mediations. The results at Time 2 were expected since the training which Group 2 received at Time 2 was thought to be similar to the course which Group 3 participated in, resulting in no significant differences between Groups 2 and 3.

**Analysis.** To investigate hypothesis 3 further, simultaneous 95% confidence intervals were used to test the changes in the proportion of "negotiation" responses from Time 1 to Time 2 for Groups 2 and 3 and from Time 1 to Time 3 for Group 2. A 95% simultaneous confidence interval indicates that one can be 95% sure that the change in the proportion of "negotiation" responses lies within the given interval. If an interval does not contain a "0", one can conclude that a significant difference among the groups exists. A positive interval indicates that the proportion of "negotiation" responses at the later time period is larger than the proportion of "negotiation" responses at the earlier time period. A negative interval indicates that the proportion of "negotiation" responses at the earlier time period is larger than the later time period.
Since the Chi Square Test of Homogeneity established no significant difference in the change in the proportion of "negotiation" responses for Group 1 across all times, Group 1 was not tested further. The results for Groups 2 and 3 are presented in Table 5.4.
Table 5.4

Simultaneous 95% Confidence Intervals Comparing the Change
In the Proportion of "Negotiation" Responses From Time 1
To Time 2 and From Time 1 to Time 3, for Groups 2 and 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Time 2-Time 1</th>
<th>Pt. Es.</th>
<th>Time 3-Time 1</th>
<th>Pt. Es.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(-0.00297, .6271)</td>
<td>.3124</td>
<td>(-0.06551, .5498)</td>
<td>.2422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(-.1184 , .4569)</td>
<td>.1683</td>
<td>(-.2049 , .3093)</td>
<td>.0522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(-.2019 , .4442)</td>
<td>.1211</td>
<td>(-.04963, .5661)</td>
<td>.2582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(0,0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0,0)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(-.00880, .6144)</td>
<td>.3028</td>
<td>(-.208 , .4223)</td>
<td>.1071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(-.2375, .4179)</td>
<td>.0902</td>
<td>(.1484, .6607)*</td>
<td>.4046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(-.1442, .463 )</td>
<td>.1594</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(-.2883, .2262)</td>
<td>-.03106</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(-.0687, .6111)</td>
<td>.2712</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(0,0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(-.06614, .5837)</td>
<td>.2588</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(-.1866, .5156)</td>
<td>.1645</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G = Group  Q = Question  Pt. Es. = Point Estimate
* = Comparisons are significant at the .05 level
^ = none of the respondents used a "negotiation" response for this question
Results. The asterisk identifies the only positive interval in Table 5.4. The results presented in Table 5.4 indicate that there is a significant difference in the change in the proportion of "negotiation" responses from Time 1 to Time 3 for Group 2 for Question #6. In addition, the results indicate that Group 2 increased its use of "negotiation" responses from Time 1 to Time 3. All other results are not significant. The results support hypothesis 3 only for Group 2's responses to Question #6 at Times 1 and 3.

That hypothesis 3 was confirmed at all is important because of the small sample sizes in this study. The results suggest that with larger sample sizes the hypothesis might be supported for more questions.

Hypothesis 4. There will be no significant difference in the proportion of "negotiation" responses at Time 1 for Subgroups A and B.

Analysis. A frequency table was used to compare the number and percent of "negotiation" responses at Time 1 for Subgroups A and B. The results are presented in Table 5.5.
Table 5.5

The Number and Percent of Respondents in SubGroups A and B Who Used a "Negotiation" Response at Times 1, 2 and 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gr.</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Q.</th>
<th># &amp; % Time 1</th>
<th># &amp; % Time 2</th>
<th># &amp; % Time 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 (38%)</td>
<td>5 (63%)</td>
<td>5 (56%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5 (26%)</td>
<td>9 (60%)</td>
<td>9 (53%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 (22%)</td>
<td>3 (38%)</td>
<td>2 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 (16%)</td>
<td>5 (33%)</td>
<td>4 (24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4 (44%)</td>
<td>5 (63%)</td>
<td>5 (56%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6 (32%)</td>
<td>6 (40%)</td>
<td>11 (65%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5 (56%)</td>
<td>6 (75%)</td>
<td>4 (44%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 (32%)</td>
<td>10 (67%)</td>
<td>9 (53%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5 (56%)</td>
<td>5 (63%)</td>
<td>9 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9 (50%)</td>
<td>9 (60%)</td>
<td>15 (88%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gr. = Group    Q. = Question    n = sample size
* = none of the respondents used a "negotiation" response for this question

Results. Table 5.5 compares the number and percent of respondents who used "negotiation" responses at Times 1, 2 and 3. At Time 1, for each question, a higher percent of SubGroup A's respondents used "negotiation" responses than SubGroup B's (i.e., for Question #1, Time 1, SubGroup A had 3 respondents or 38% of its group use a "negotiation" response while SubGroup B had 5 respondents
The results indicate that SubGroup A used a higher percent of "negotiation" responses at Time 1 than SubGroup B. This result prompted further investigation to find out if there was a statistically significant difference between the proportion of "negotiation" responses for SubGroups A and B at Time 1.

Analysis. Because of the small sample size, a 2-tailed Fisher's Exact Test was used to compare the proportion of "negotiation" responses at Time 1 for SubGroups A and B. The results are presented in Table 5.6.
Table 5.6

Fisher's Exact Test Used to Compare the Proportion of "Negotiation" Responses for SubGroups A and B at Time 1, $\alpha = .05$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = none of the respondents used a "negotiation" response for this question

Results. The P values are all greater than .05, indicating that there is no significant difference in the proportion of "negotiation" responses at Time 1 for SubGroups A and B. These results support the hypothesis. This result was expected since Subgroups A and B were drawn from the same population and had not been exposed to mediation training at Time 1.
Hypothesis 5. The change in the proportion of "negotiation" responses from Time 1 to Time 3 will be significantly larger for Subgroup A than Subgroup B.

Analysis. Descriptive data was used to compare the number and percent of "negotiation" responses for Subgroups A and B at Times 1, 2 and 3. The results are presented in Table 5.5.

Results. The results indicate that Subgroups A and B behave in a similar pattern across Times 1, 2 and 3, except for question #3. For Question #3, respondents in Subgroup B increased the number and percent of "negotiation" responses from Time 2 to Time 3, while Subgroup A decreased. For Questions #1, #2 and #5, both Subgroups decreased the number and percent of "negotiation" responses from Time 1 to Time 3. For Question #6, both Subgroups increased the number and percent of "negotiation" responses from Time 1 to Time 3.

The most interesting piece of data is Subgroup A's response at Time 3 to question #6. All of the members of Subgroup A who responded used a "negotiation" response at Time 3 to this question. This is the only Subgroup, or Group, where 100% of those responding used a "negotiation" response. This was expected since at Time 3, Subgroup A was the only group to have participated in real mediations.
and to have seen mediation successfully resolve disputes. This result prompted further analysis.

Analysis. Simultaneous 95% confidence intervals were used to compare the change in the proportion of "negotiation" responses for SubGroups A and B from Time 1 to Time 3. Due to the complexity of the model which was used to produce these confidence intervals, only two questions were tested. Question #6 was chosen because it appeared to be able to detect differences in how the different groups of people viewed conflict. Question #1 was randomly chosen. The results are presented in Table S.7.

Table S.7
Simultaneous 95% Confidence Intervals Comparing the Change In the Proportion of "Negotiation" Responses for SubGroups A and B from Time 1 to Time 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>SubGroup</th>
<th>Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>(-0.340, 0.640)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>(-0.100, 0.555)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>(0.090, 0.755)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>(-0.075, 0.530)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - Comparisons significant at the .05 level
Results. The only positive interval, indicated by an asterisk, which does not contain a zero occurs for SubGroup A, Question #6. This result indicates that there is a significant difference in the change in the proportion of "negotiation" responses for Question #6 for SubGroup A, thus supporting the hypothesis. These results also indicate that SubGroup A used more "negotiation" responses at Time 3 than SubGroup B. The change in SubGroup A's responses was expected to be significantly larger because the students in SubGroup A had the opportunity to mediate real conflicts. Since about 70% of the mediations conducted by these students successfully resolved disputes, it is understandable that these students would have a favorable attitude toward mediation and seek to use it more often at the end of the study than at the beginning.

Hypothesis 6. For all Groups at Time 1, the level of confidence for respondents using "choice" responses will be significantly larger than the level of confidence for respondents using "negotiation" responses.

Analysis. Simultaneous 95% confidence intervals comparing the mean level of confidence across Groups for Time 1 was used. In order to minimize the risk of error,
only two categories (solve and satisfy) were tested. These categories were chosen because the researcher believed that mediation training would have the greatest impact on them. The results are presented in Table 5.8.
### Table 5.8.

**Simultaneous 95% Confidence Intervals Comparing the Mean Level of Confidence Across Groups for Time 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Confidence Interval</th>
<th>Pt. Est.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>For the Category &quot;Solve&quot;</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(-0.34965, 0.53615)</td>
<td>0.09325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(-0.62146, 0.62986)</td>
<td>0.00420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(0.14900, 1.3946)</td>
<td>0.7718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(-0.3309, 0.8928)</td>
<td>0.2810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(-0.57108, 0.66632)</td>
<td>0.04762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>For the Category &quot;Satisfy&quot;</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(0.1152, 1.0753)</td>
<td>0.5952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(-0.3092, 1.1860)</td>
<td>0.4384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(0.1120, 1.2677)</td>
<td>0.6898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(-0.68649, 0.69602)</td>
<td>0.0047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(0.0042, 1.3053)</td>
<td>0.6548</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - Comparisons are significant at the .05 level
* - none of the respondents used "negotiation" responses for this question
**Results.** An interval, not containing a "0", indicates that a significant difference among the groups exists. A relationship between frame and level of confidence was expected since it was assumed that students' tendency to use a "choice" response indicated a higher level of confidence in that response than other responses. The researcher believed that respondents using "choice" frames would mark higher confidence levels on the Likert scale than respondents using "negotiation" frames. The results do not indicate a clear relationship between the frames which students use and the level of confidence which they have in their solution being able to "solve" the conflict or "satisfy" those involved in the conflict.

For question #3 for the "solve" category and questions #1, #3 and #6 for the "satisfy" category a significant relationship was identified. However, due to the large number of hypotheses being tested and the small sample size, the chance for error is fairly large. Therefore, it is unwise to make any predictions based on the results of these confidence intervals. However, the results suggest that with a larger sample size a statistically significant relationship might be established.
Hypothesis 7. The level of confidence displayed by members of Group 1 who used "negotiation" responses for Times 1 and 3 in the categories "solve" and "satisfy" is constant over time.

Analysis. Descriptive statistics will be used to compare the means of the confidence levels of the members of Group 1 who used "negotiation" responses for Times 1 and 3. The results are reported in Tables 5.8 and 5.9.
Table 5.9

The Means of the Level of Confidence for Groups 1 and 2 at Times 1 and 3 for the Category "Solve"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.</th>
<th>Gr.</th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 3</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.333</td>
<td>6.333</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.500</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>-0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>-2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.285</td>
<td>5.285</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.857</td>
<td>5.428</td>
<td>-0.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4^</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4^</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.500</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>+0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.333</td>
<td>4.166</td>
<td>-1.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.875</td>
<td>4.750</td>
<td>-0.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.538</td>
<td>5.769</td>
<td>+0.231</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All 1 Total Change = +3.875
All 2 Total Change = -3.854

Q. = question  
Gr. = Group  
^ = none of the respondents used a "negotiation" response for this question  
Total Change = the summation of the changes for each question, by Group
Table 5.10

The Means of the Level of Confidence for Groups 1 and 2 at Times 1 and 3 for the Category "Satisfy"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.</th>
<th>Gr.</th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 3</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td>5.666</td>
<td>-.344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.250</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>-.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>-2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.857</td>
<td>5.143</td>
<td>+.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td>5.571</td>
<td>-.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.500</td>
<td>5.500</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>5.600</td>
<td>+.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.375</td>
<td>5.250</td>
<td>-.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.308</td>
<td>5.308</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All 1 Total Change = -.183
All 2 Total Change = -2.079

Q = question Gr. = group
* = none of the respondents used a "negotiation" response for this question
Total changes = the summation of the changes for each question, by group
Results. For each question, the direction and size of the change in the means from Time 1 to Time 3 is calculated under the last column. The results indicate that Group 1 may have remained more constant from Time 1 to Time 3 than Group 2, thus providing some support for the hypothesis. Group 1 did not change from Time 1 to Time 3 for two of the questions in each category. In addition, for the category "satisfy", Group 1 had a total change of only -.183 compared to Group 2's larger total change of -2.079. Interestingly, the size of the changes for both Groups in category "solve" were similar, but Group 1 increased its total confidence while Group 2 decreased its total confidence by almost the same amount.

Hypothesis 8. The level of confidence displayed by members of Group 2 who used a "negotiation" response for Times 1 and 3 in categories "solve" and satisfy" will significantly increase over time.

Analysis. Descriptive statistics were used to compare the means of the confidence levels of the members in Group 2 who used "negotiation" responses for Times 1 and 3. The results are reported in Tables 5.8 and 5.9. The results do not support the hypothesis. For both categories, the total means for Group 2 decreased from
Time 1 to Time 3. In addition, only two out of twelve means increased and the increases were by .6 or less. It appears that receiving mediation training and acting as mediators may have decreased the students' confidence that their solution would "solve" the problem or "satisfy" those involved when they used a "negotiation" response. This was the opposite of what was predicted since it was assumed that mediation training and practice would increase students' level of confidence in mediation being able to "solve" a conflict and "satisfy" those involved.

Chapter Six provides a summary of the results, a discussion of the implications of this study and suggestions for future research.
CHAPTER VI
DISCUSSION

This study was designed to identify the kinds of training which could motivate students to change their view of conflict (or frame) from one which suggests the use of arbitration or litigation to one which suggests the use of mediation. Three different kinds of training (a mediation training session, a course on "resolving conflict", and an opportunity to act as a mediator) were made available to different groups of subjects in this study. The impact of each kind of training on the type of conflict frame was tested. As a corollary, the levels of confidence which subjects had in their suggested solutions to different conflicts were also measured. This chapter provides a summary of the results, a discussion of the implications of the study and suggestions for future research.
Summary of the Results

There is no relationship between the characteristic of "voluntariness" and the type of frame used by students. Since the members of the control and experimental groups had all volunteered to become student mediators, it was important to find out whether or not these students were more likely to use a "negotiation" response than other students. An argument can be made that the students who volunteered for mediation training did so because they viewed conflict differently than the average population. In other words, it is possible that the students who were interested in mediation had a greater tendency to use "negotiation" frames than the students not interested in mediation.

In contrast, the researcher believes that frames can only be changed when students observe real mediations successfully resolving conflicts over a period of time. Therefore, no significant differences in the number of "negotiation" responses used by the random sample of students and the groups which contained "volunteers" was expected.

The results (Table 5.1) supported the researcher's hypothesis. There were no significant differences among the groups in regard to the number of "negotiation"
responses used prior to training. Thus, even though three of the groups contained volunteers, the results indicate that the members of all four groups were drawn from the same population and that "volunteering" and "frame" are not interrelated.

Students who did not receive any of the three forms of mediation training did not change their frames over a period of five months. See Table 5.2. In order to control for threats to internal validity (history, maturation, testing, instrumentation, and regression), a control and experimental group were used. There was concern that over a six month period students would be exposed to significant amounts of information which could impact the type of "frame" they used to view a dispute. Since conflict is prevalent in residence halls, where most of the respondents lived, students' exposure to conflict resolution processes could not be controlled. It was important to find out whether or not a group of students who did not participate in mediation training, but who did live in the residence halls for six months, changed their use of frames.

The researcher did not believe that students would change their frames due to exposure to the kinds of
conflict resolution processes used in the residence halls. The majority of conflict resolution at Ohio State is accomplished through advising, arbitration and the judicial process, creating minimal opportunities for growth in the area of mediation. Therefore, assuming that few opportunities to observe successful mediations existed, the researcher expected there to be no significant change in how students viewed conflict during the six month period. The results supported the hypothesis.

Students who acted as real mediations increased their use of "negotiation" frames. The researcher's main hypothesis was that only after mediating real conflicts would respondents be motivated to use an increasing number of "negotiation" responses. The descriptive data (Table 5.3) suggested that the students used more "negotiation" responses after they participated in mediation training and attended a course on conflict resolution, as well as after they mediated real conflicts. Since the responses of the students who did not receive mediation training remained fairly constant over time, it appears that mediation training, course work and mediating real conflicts increases the number of "negotiation" frames.
used by students.

The results of the simultaneous 95% confidence intervals (Table 5.4) diluted the conclusions drawn from the descriptive data. There were no significant differences in the changes in the proportion of "negotiation" responses used by students who received the different forms of mediation training, except for Question #6. The change in the proportion of "negotiation" responses for students who acted as mediators was significant for Question #6. This may be due to the context of the question.

Question #5 was designed to produce a "choice" response initially and a "negotiation" response after students had mediated real conflicts. From a review of the written responses to Question #6, it appears that students initially focused on their rights being violated by the unwelcome presence of guests in the room. Particularly strong reactions were written to the suggestion that the guests were sitting on the respondent's bed. General responses on the initial DRQ included "get him off my bed", "kick them out", and "it's my room too and they can't take advantage of me". Responses after acting as mediators included "set up a schedule" and "we both have a right to the room".
It may be that the general content area of "personal" rights is one of the first areas where students begin to understand how compromise can work. It appears that students initially responded by focusing on their own rights and changed, after acting as mediators, to focusing on the rights of all the parties.

Students may have interpreted Question #6 as a question which focused on a conflict over individual rights while providing the least amount of evidence for other types of violations. For example, in Question #1, students focused on the "stolen" Coke and food. For Question #2, students focused on the breaking of the quiet hour "rule". Question #3 is difficult to explain because the intent was to focus on a conflict over standards of cleanliness. Cleanliness may be viewed as a right which is less subject to compromise than having guests in the room. Question #4 was written to produce "choice" responses, and it succeeded. Students responded with answers which were very close to "stop" frames for Question #5. In other words, many students responded "I have a right to my sleep and he has a right to his and one of us should move out". This was interpreted as a "choice" frame, but indicated that although students did not find anyone in violation of a rule or a right, they
could not foresee this type of conflict being resolved. Thus, with the somewhat limited focus of question #6, students may have been able to more easily apply what they learned from acting as mediators.

Of the students who acted as mediators, only those who mediated real conflicts increased their use of "negotiation" frames. At the time of the final data collection, only about half of the students who were trained as mediators had mediated a real conflict. The five months during which students acted as mediators contained a variety of opportunities to be involved in mediation, in addition to actually conducting a real mediation. Students did presentations, informally advised friends in conflict, discussed the real mediations and encouraged students to use the Student Mediation Center’s services. Therefore, even without conducting real mediations the students who acted as mediators gained valuable mediation experiences beyond training. Nonetheless, in order to gain better insight, the students who acted as mediators, but did not conduct real mediations were compared to the students who mediated real conflicts (Tables 5.5 and 5.7).
The results provide further support for the researcher's initial hypothesis. To decrease the chance for error, only the responses to Questions #1 and #6 were tested. The results for Question #6 were significant and indicated that students who mediated real conflicts increased their use of "negotiation" frames, whereas the students who acted as mediators, but did not mediate real disputes did not significantly increase their use of "negotiation" frames. The results suggest that for Question #6, the significant increase in the use of "negotiation" frames by Group 2 (the students who "acted as mediators") may have come primarily from the students who mediated real conflicts. If students had only acted as mediators, and had not conducted real mediations, it is conceivable that there would be no significant difference in this group's use of "negotiation" frames.

There is no evidence of a relationship between the type of frame students use and the level of confidence students have in their solution being able to "solve" the conflict or "satisfy" those involved. This result (Table 5.8) was not expected since it was assumed that students would have the greatest confidence in the frame which they used the majority of the time. The "choice" frame was
used 72% of the time and was clearly the favorite selection. There was a fairly large chance for error for this test because of the number of questions and the fact that two of the four categories were tested. Therefore, the results of this test should be interpreted as inconclusive due to the small sample sizes and the large chance for error.

For the first five months following mediation training, the mediators' level of confidence in a negotiation process being able to "solve" a conflict or "satisfy" those involved decreased. These results (Table 5.9) were not expected since it was assumed that once students were trained in mediation and had the opportunity to observe successful mediations they would increase their confidence in mediation. These results are particularly interesting because it appears that students who acted as mediators used "negotiation" frames more often than other students. The opportunity to act as a mediator increased students' use of "negotiation" frames while, at the same time, decreased their confidence in mediation.

These results may be explained by the complexity of the mediation process. Students who acted as mediators in this study were extremely positive about increasing the
use of mediation on campus. However, they usually preferred to assist, rather than to lead, a mediation session. It appeared that the students wanted several opportunities to assist with a mediation before leading one. They appeared to feel confident about the mediation process, but not confident about their skills as a mediator. Since all of the mediators were new and had limited training (twelve hours) in comparison to mediators in community mediation centers (minimum of twenty hours), the low levels of confidence may have reflected the students' lack of confidence in their abilities, rather than in mediation.

In addition, the low confidence levels may reflect the students' very limited exposure to mediation. It is often the case that when people learn something new the realization that there is a significant amount of unknown information decreases their level of confidence in that content area. After only five months and limited training, students may not have felt like they were competent mediators.

**Implications of the Study**

The small sample sizes used in this study limited the use of statistical testing and the opportunity to make
accurate inferences to a larger population. However, the results suggest that a similar study with larger sample sizes might yield statistically significant, as well as useful results. For example, in Table 5.4, the confidence intervals for Questions #1 and #5 for Group 2 at Time 2-Time 1 are extremely close to being positive intervals which do not contain a zero. With larger sample sizes, the chance for error is reduced and the intervals are usually narrower. Narrower intervals might eliminate the negative end of seven of the intervals in Table 5.4 creating statistically significant results for nearly half of the Questions, rather than only for Question #5.

Second, the data support Sheppard et al’s. (1989) research which indicates that the population uses predominantly “choice” frames. In addition, an interest in mediation appears to have no bearing on the type of frame used to view a conflict. This suggests that, for the university setting, the majority of students will not choose mediation to resolve a conflict unless they are trained to do so.

Third, the data suggested that the largest increase in the use of “negotiation” frames occurred after students had conducted real mediations. There is less evidence to suggest that increases in the use of “negotiation” frames
occurred after students participated in mediation training or completed a course on "conflict resolution.

If these results hold true for the larger university population, it will be very difficult to introduce mediation to a campus and have it become a popular form of conflict resolution because it appears that education alone does not motivate people to use mediation. Publicity about mediation and educational programs are the most popular forms of encouraging people to use mediation. This study suggests that unless people actually conduct mediations, they are unlikely to view conflict with a frame which would suggest a mediated resolution. Therefore, if mediation is to become a popular method for resolving conflicts, a new type of educational process for the general population is needed.

Fourth, if students are to have confidence that mediation will "solve" a conflict and "satisfy" those involved, they must receive an adequate amount of training and experience conducting real mediations. The results of this research indicated that students trained in mediation were supportive of mediation, while having increasingly less confidence that mediation could "solve" the conflict or "satisfy" those involved. These results appear to contradict each other and may best be explained by the
researcher's observation that the mediators rated the confidence which they had in their own mediation skills, rather than the confidence which they had in mediation as an effective conflict resolution process.

Mediation training is time consuming for both trainers and trainees. Because of the time commitment involved, many organizations often choose to train their employees in other forms of conflict resolution. This study suggests that mediators desire more opportunities to assist with real mediations before leading them, which would make training periods even more labor and time intensive than is currently the case. However, since the mediators in this study received less than the twenty hours which is typical of community mediation training sessions, perhaps the results of this study simply indicate that twelve hours is too short a period of time for mediators to develop confidence in their skills.

The results do suggest that mediation training sessions of twelve hours or less may result in mediators having lowered confidence levels, which may impact their ability to perform. In addition, low confidence levels may have a negative impact on conversations between mediators and others about the mediation process. It appears that the length of mediation training sessions has
an impact on the confidence which mediators have in their ability to conduct mediations which will solve the conflict and satisfy those involved. It appears that cutting training short to save time and money may have negative consequences on the confidence which mediators have in their ability to help others resolve a conflict. Therefore, because the length of a mediation training program may impact the confidence levels of the mediators, it may be difficult to successfully introduce mediation into a setting which has limited time, labor and financial resources.

Suggestions for Future Research

The main limitation of this study was the small sample sizes. Larger sample sizes could yield statistically significant results and provide greater understanding of the relationship between frames and training. Since it appears that a non-volunteer sample of students and mediation "volunteers" do not differ in their initial use of frames, future research might use the members of student groups as a control group. This would provide a large group of students who have a connection to the researcher.
A larger experimental group is also needed. Future research could include mediators from more than one institution or, if possible, include mediators from other mediation agencies. For example, the Night Prosecutor's Program in Columbus hires about twenty people who are either college students or recent college graduates. These individuals would match the characteristics of the respondents used in this study.

A larger intact class could be obtained in several ways. Students taking other courses which explore conflict resolution could be included in the study, as well as students taking courses on conflict resolution at other institutions. Resident advisors or other staff members who receive some type of mediation training could also be included, in addition to students who attend workshops which present basic conflict resolution techniques.

The second limitation involved the opportunities provided for the experimental group during the five months after they had been trained. The intent of the study was to have every member of the experimental group mediate real conflicts. However, in reality, only nine conflicts were mediated during the study. When mediation is introduced to a campus, even one as large as Ohio State,
there is a reluctance to use it. The small number of opportunities to mediate real conflicts had not been anticipated. The study could have been strengthened in a couple of ways.

First, student mediators could have been encouraged to become involved in community mediation agencies. This would have increased the students’ opportunities to both observe and conduct mediations. Second, where appropriate, community mediators could have been included in the study. Although many of the community mediators are not students, some are fairly recent graduates and probably would not bias the study. Third, student mediators from several educational institutions who mediated real conflicts could have participated in the study.

Further research is needed to find out at what point students begin to change to a "negotiation" frame. The results from this study are not conclusive in regard to the impact that an academic course or training, alone, has on frames. Other types of interventions from, for example, informational mediation presentations held during university orientations to short mediation workshops scheduled before real mediation sessions, should be included in future research. In addition, research
conducted on students who have varying opportunities to observe, assist with, or participate in several real mediation sessions would shed more light on what motivates students to change frames.

Besides finding out when frames change, research measuring whether or not the change is temporary or permanent is also needed. Research suggests that disputants' feelings of "satisfaction" with a mediation session erodes over time. It may also be true that changing from a "choice" frame to a "negotiation" frame is only a temporary phenomenon. For mediation to continue to be a viable option, people who change from using "choice" frames to "negotiation" frames must continue to use "negotiation" frames throughout their lives.

A longer study which could assess the confidence levels of mediators after they had conducted five or six mediations or had been exposed to mediation for at least a year would be helpful. In addition, a better way of testing the relationship between frames, kinds of training and levels of confidence would be useful. This study did not use a very effective test for the relationship between frames and confidence levels.

It would also be useful to track the frames used by each individual respondent. It is not clear from this
study whether the same individuals used "negotiation" responses throughout the study. Having the same students continue to use "negotiation" responses is a different result than having one set of students use "negotiation" responses at Time 2 and another set use "negotiation" responses at Time 3.

It is also not clear why students change frames. Is there a particular component(s) of mediation training, education, or conducting mediations which motivates students to change frames, or is it the cumulative effect of being exposed to different aspects of mediation over a period of time which causes students to prefer mediation? It is possible that students change frames due to a sudden recognition that other people's opinions are of equal value to their own. This was the reasoning used to explain the large number of students who, at Time 3, changed to a "negotiation" frame on Question #6. If there is a key "lesson", rather than an extended training period which can motivate students to use a "negotiation" frame, it would make the process of teaching people to use mediation easier.

The results of this study suggest that the frames which college students use to view conflict do not change significantly in response to education and training.
The following suggestions, which link mediation in higher education to other processes, might increase the speed with which campus populations move from a predominantly non-mediation orientation to one which considers mediation as a viable option.

First, it might be possible to link the mediation which is occurring in higher education to the mediation which is occurring in primary and secondary education. Mediation training is currently taking place in a number of elementary, junior high and high schools throughout the country (Davis, 1985; Davis & Porter, 1985). The results of research on the impact of mediation training on young mediators, the impact of being exposed to mediation at a young age and the impact that grade school mediation training has on students who attend institutions of higher education where formal mediation is practiced would be useful. Research in this area could shed more light on the factors that influence how an individual views conflict. It may be that attitudes about conflict resolution, like most deep rooted beliefs, can best be changed by introducing mediation in elementary school and reinforcing its legitimacy throughout the educational
process.

Second, the mediation which is being practiced in higher education may be able to build upon processes which are currently operating on college campuses. Mediation works when parties respect the rights of others. This quality of mediation reinforces the efforts which colleges and universities are making to promote diversity. A variety of activities which promote diversity, including presentations and workshops, are in place in most institutions of higher education. Unfortunately, many of the methods used to promote diversity focus on lectures or workshops which are not part of the "real life" of students. If mediation as a process for resolving disputes could be linked to the efforts which are currently being made to help students recognize and respect human differences, students might find that mediation is a method of confronting real life diversity issues in a healthy manner. However, research is needed to find out if linking mediation to diversity initiatives could make both processes more effective.
APPENDIX A

Scoring the Dispute Resolution Questionnaire
In order to provide uniformity during the coding process, several rules were established. They are explained below:

1) Coders will look for the expression of norms, rules and rights. If they exist, the conflict will be coded as a right/wrong frame. Examples of norms, rules and rights are "right to privacy", "right to study", "not being considerate", "not taking my feelings into consideration", and "too messy". The first two examples involve fairly standard rights which are recognized by most people in higher education. The last three examples are less obvious, but are norms which were used by students to indicate that one person's behavior was inappropriate and should change to make the other person feel better. Key words like "too" in "too messy" indicate that the respondent has some criteria in mind (a rule) which can be used to determine when people should change their standard of cleanliness to meet the standards of the other person. Another way to look at right/wrong frames is to ask whether blame is being assigned to one of the parties. If one is the parties is "too messy", for example, the respondent is blaming that party for the conflict.
2) In contrast to rights, norms, and rules, negotiation frames are often indicated by a complete lack of a standard. The issues and solutions in a negotiation frame will tend to be written as broad categories, rather than specific behaviors. For example, a negotiation frame would be assigned to a respondent who wrote that "the issue is cleanliness". Cleanliness is a category and it is not possible to determine if one party is too clean or too messy. Without modifiers, no blame is being assigned to one of the parties in this response. In contrast, a right/wrong frame would be assigned if a respondent wrote "the issue is that one roommate is too messy". Messy is not as broad, is seen as negative, and the modifier, "too", places the blame on one of the parties.

3) The last, chronological solution suggested by the respondent will be the solution used to identify the frame. For example, a respondent could begin by saying "I will talk to the other person and work out a compromise". However, if the final sentence is "if that doesn't work, I will get a room change because my right to quiet time is being violated", the final sentence will cause this conflict to be coded as a right-wrong frame. Although this student indicates a willingness to begin by talking over the conflict, in the final analysis, if students
responding in this manner do not get what they identify as appropriate, they will take other action to protect their rights. The identification of a right or norm which is seen as violated is necessary for a right/wrong frame to be assigned.

4) In general, asking for a room change will be interpreted as a right/wrong frame, rather than a stop frame. If students use room changes to protect themselves from harm, the room change could be viewed as a stop frame. However, these conflicts do not have dangerous overtones and room changes appear to be used to either avoid confrontation or to protect a right which will continue to be violated without a room change. If the room change protects a right, it is an obvious right/wrong frame. If the room change is used to avoid confrontation (and it is unclear when this is the case), it is not so obvious that it is a right/wrong frame, but it definitely is not a negotiation frame. Since this study is being used to investigate whether or not students move toward negotiation frames after mediation training, it was considered appropriate to identify an avoid response as a right/wrong response in an effort to find out if change occurs.
5) Involving another person who is viewed as an authority will be interpreted as a right/wrong frame unless it is clear that the person is to help facilitate a discussion. For example, "if talking to the neighbor does not work, tell the resident adviser" implies that the resident adviser is being told so that he or she can make the neighbor conform. "Have the resident adviser sit down and discuss the problem with both of us" indicates a negotiation frame since the resident adviser is not being asked to solve the problem in a certain way.

6) There appears to be a fine line between telling the other party how to resolve the conflict and suggesting a solution which could ultimately lead to a negotiation process. Responses that include "telling" the other party to the conflict what to do will be interpreted as a right/wrong frame. For example, "tell him to clean up better" or "I'd tell him to stay off my bed" is a right/wrong frame while "I'd let her know how I feel and ask her if she could dress in the bathroom in the morning" is a negotiation frame. Suggestions which include drawing up schedules will usually be interpreted as a negotiation frame, although if the schedule appears to entirely favor one party, it may become a right/wrong frame. For example, "suggest that she have her friends over two
nights a week and two nights a week she goes to her friends' rooms" is a negotiation frame. "No friends in the room after 9:00pm and no one sits on my bed" is probably a right/wrong frame if there are no other clues in the answer.
APPENDIX B

DRQ #1
Key: the "frame" in parenthesis is provided so that the reader will know how the researcher intended the respondents to reply to the examples. These frames were not printed on DRQ #1.

PLEASE READ EACH OF THE FOLLOWING SCENARIOS AND 1) TELL ME WHAT YOU THINK THIS CONFLICT IS ABOUT AND 2) HOW YOU WOULD LIKE TO SEE THIS CONFLICT SETTLED.

("Either" frame)
1. Sally bought the refrigerator which is in her room, but is happy to let her three suitemates use it. However, for the past two weeks someone has been drinking half her pop and eating some of her food. She is pretty sure it is Karen, her roommate.

("Choice" frame)
2. At 2:00 a.m. the fire alarm is pulled and John has to get up and go outside. The next day, John's roommate tells him in confidence that George pulled the alarm. That night, John's RA holds a hall meeting and threatens to punish the entire hall if the guilty party is not identified.

("Choice" frame)
3. Kathy got a job over the lunch period and volunteered to give her I.D. to her roommate's best friend, Kim, who lives off campus, so that the two of them could eat together in the dining hall. After a month, the dining hall director caught Kim using Kathy's I.D.

("Either" frame)
4. Margie's roommate, Sue, always signs up for 8:00 a.m. classes. Margie is a night person and likes to sleep in until her 11:00 a.m. class. Margie is tired of having Sue awaken her a 7:00 a.m. when she gets ready for class.

("Either" frame)
5. Rob likes to study in his room at night because the hall voted to have quiet hours after 8:00 p.m. For the past week, Rob has been able to hear his neighbor's stereo when he's been studying between 8:00 p.m. and midnight.
6. John is pretty straight laced and goes to bed early, gets up fairly early, and spends a lot of time in the library. His roommate, Larry, has begun to sneak in the room with his girlfriend on Friday and Saturday nights after John has gone to bed. Often John gets up in the morning before Larry and Chris have gotten out of bed.

7. Melodie is very popular and will join a sorority next year. Her friends are always dropping by the room and coming in to talk. Angie, her roommate, always feels like an intruder when Melodie and her friends are in the room talking, so she ends up studying a lot in the library or in the lounge.

8. Angie is used to being able to study in the lounge, but lately there always seems to be one of the woman on the hall and her boyfriend in the lounge making out.

9. Bob is a transfer student who just moved into Jerry’s room. Bob has lots of friends from town and is rarely around. However, Jerry has noticed that lately Bob seems to be storing things like t-shirts, books, and sweat shirts in the room, and after a couple of days he gives them to friends. Jerry is beginning to think that Bob is stealing from local stores.

10. Jane and Lynn were roommates last year and chose to be roommates this year, along with two students who lived on their floor last year. Lately, Jane has been spreading rumors about Lynn which are based on truth, but have been exaggerated beyond the facts. Lynn has just heard about some of these rumors from her two suitemates who have accused her of using their belongings without asking and taking laundry soap, toothpaste, etc. without replacing it.
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The Order of Questions Given to Respondents Who Completed DRQ #1
The Order of Questions Given to Respondents Who Completed DRQ #1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>respondent</th>
<th>order of questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 1,2</td>
<td>3,4 5,6 7,8 9,10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 11,12</td>
<td>9,10 7,8 5,6 3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 1,2</td>
<td>5,6 9,10 3,4 7,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 11,12</td>
<td>7,8 3,4 9,10 5,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 3,4</td>
<td>7,8 11,12 1,2 5,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 9,10</td>
<td>5,6 1,2 11,12 7,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 2,1</td>
<td>4,3 6,5 8,7 10,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 12,11</td>
<td>10,9 8,7 6,5 4,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 2,1</td>
<td>6,5 10,9 4,3 8,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J 12,11</td>
<td>8,7 4,3 10,9 6,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 4,3</td>
<td>8,7 12,11 2,1 6,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 10,9</td>
<td>6,5 2,1 12,11 8,7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

Type of Conflict Frame Used By Respondents To Interpret

Ten Hypothetical Disputes From DRQ #1
Type of Conflict Frame Used By Respondents To Interpret Ten Hypothetical Disputes From DRQ #1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>TYPE OF CONFLICT FRAME USED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>R/w R/w R/w N N R/w R/w N N R/w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>R/w R/w R/w R/w N R/w N N N N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>R/w R/w R/w R/w R/w R/w R/w R/w N R/w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>R/w R/w N R/w N N R/w R/w R/w R/w N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>R/w R/w N R/w R/w R/w R/w R/w R/w R/w R/w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>R/w R/w R/w R/w R/w R/w R/w R/w R/w R/w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>R/w R/w N N N N N N N N N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>R/w R/w N R/w N R/w R/w N R/w N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>R/w R/w R/w R/w R/w N R/w R/w R/w R/w R/w R/w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>R/w R/w R/w R/w R/w N R/w R/w R/w R/w R/w R/w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>R/w R/w R/w R/w R/w N R/w R/w R/w N N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>R/w R/w R/w N R/w R/w N N R/w N N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TYPE OF FRAME DESIRED
R/w R/w R/w E E E E E N N N N

R/w = right/wrong or choice frame.
N = negotiation frame.
E = "N" (negotiation frame) is desired during the early administrations of the DRQ and a "R/w" (right/wrong frame) is desired during later administrations of the DRQ.
APPENDIX E

DRQ #2
PLEASE ANSWER THE QUESTIONS BELOW FOR EACH OF THE CONFLICTS DESCRIBED.

1. WHAT IS CAUSING THIS CONFLICT?

2. HOW WOULD YOU SOLVE THIS CONFLICT? (PLEASE ANSWER IN ENOUGH DETAIL THAT IF I WERE YOU IN THE EXAMPLE, I COULD CARRY OUT YOUR SUGGESTION WITHOUT HAVING TO ASK YOU WHAT YOU MEAN. ALSO, IF THE SOLUTION YOU SUGGEST IS NOT LIKELY TO SOLVE THE CONFLICT, PLEASE TELL ME THE NEXT STEP YOU WOULD TAKE SO THAT THE CONFLICT COULD BE SOLVED.)

("Either" frame)

1. You bought the refrigerator which is in your suite. You have been letting your three suitemates use the refrigerator, but for the past two weeks your coke and food have been disappearing. You think your roommate is taking your Coke and food because last night when you came home your roommate was drinking a Coke, and this morning when you looked in the refrigerator, one of your Cokes was missing. You are angry about this.

("Choice" frame)

2. The fire alarm in our building was pulled at 2:00 a.m. in the morning and the whole residence hall had to get up and go outside. By 3:00 a.m. you are back in bed asleep, but when you get up about 8:00 a.m. to go to class you begin complaining to your roommate about the disturbance last night. Your roommate tells you in confidence that a friend pulled the alarm last night on a dare and that only four people know about it and all have promised not to tell. That night the RA holds a hall meeting and tells you that the whole hall will be punished if the guilty party is not found.

("Either" frame)

3. You work best late at night and like to sleep late in the morning. You were fortunate to get afternoon classes this term so that you could sleep in and not worry about missing classes. However, your roommate is an early riser and has an 8:00 a.m. class every day of the week. Your roommate gets up at 7:00 a.m. every day and wakes you up.
and you can not get back to sleep. After several weeks of this, you find yourself falling asleep during the day so that you have missed a couple of classes and have not gotten your homework done.

( "Either" frame )

4. Your hall has voted to have "quiet hours" from 10:00 p.m. until 8:00 a.m. all year long. During the winter term, you enjoyed being able to study in your room for a couple of hours after 10 p.m. before you went to bed because it was so quiet. Now it is spring, and when you and your neighbor's windows are open on hot nights, you can hear your neighbor's stereo, making it very difficult for you to study.

( "Either" frame )

5. For the past three Friday and Saturday nights, your roommate and his or her date have been coming back to your room and making out. You stayed away the first weekend, but after the second weekend, you told your roommate that you planned to go to bed early the next weekend. When you got home Friday night, the two of them were in the room and when you told then that you were going to bed they said, "Fine we'll be quiet and won't bother you. We're going to bed, too." Although they were quiet, you realized that you did not want them both in your room while you were sleeping. Saturday night the same thing happened, but when they said they were "going to bed too", you left the room and slept next door on the floor in a friend's room.

( "Choice" frame )

6. Your roommate is a transfer student who you do not know very well. Your roommate rarely hangs around with you and seems to have some friends in town who always come over in the evening, but never stay if you are in the room. Recently you have noticed that your roommate comes home with all kinds of things each day and appears to give them the friends each evening. You have noticed things like t-shirts, sweat shirts, books, flashlights, and stuffed animals, and all of them look like new. You are beginning to feel like your roommate is shoplifting items from the local stores and using your room to store the items until the friends pick them up. You are beginning to feel very uncomfortable about this.
7. You and your roommate are in the habit of borrowing each other's jackets or sweaters when you have to get dressed up for a date. Your roommate borrowed your $100 sweater last weekend and brought it home with a large stain on it. You tried to wash it and took it to the cleaners, but the stain is still obvious. You have asked your roommate to buy you a new sweater, but whenever you bring up the topic, your roommate leaves the room.

8. Your roommate has lots of friends, is very popular, and plans to pledge a Greek social organization next year. Your roommate's friends are always in your room talking, and when you come in they ignore you and do not even get off your bed to let you sit down. You have begun to avoid your room until late at night, but you are getting tired of feeling like you do not have any place to call "home" on campus.
APPENDIX F

Developing the Final DRQ
Developing the Final DRQ

With minor changes in wording, DRQ #2 was administered to a sample of seven students. Since the ordering of conflicts had not appeared to affect the responses, the order of incidents in DRQ #2 was not randomized. All of the students had some familiarity with mediation, either having worked as a mediator or taken a course in mediation. Three of the students were law students interested in mediation and four were undergraduate students who worked as mediators for the Columbus City Prosecutor's Office. A chart (Appendix G) of the Types of Conflict Frames Used By Respondents To Interpret Eight Hypothetical Disputes was compiled in an effort to identify two more examples which could be eliminated so that the final DRQ would contain the more manageable number of six examples.

After reviewing the responses to DRQ #2, Panel 2 (the researcher and two graduate students) decided to eliminate three examples and create one new example for the following reasons:

a) one example designed to elicit an "either" frame (see Question 5 in Appendix E) was based on a conflict over one roommate allowing a significant other to sleep over on weekends. It was eliminated because some respondents
viewed this conflict as a religious or moral issue. The conflict was seen as secondary to the respondents' views on premarital sex. Since the purpose of this research is to find out whether or not conflict frames change in response to mediation training, examples which elicit responses based on strongly held religious or moral values which are viewed as non-negotiable by a significant percentage of society, were deemed to be inappropriate and were eliminated since the purpose of mediation training is not to change these kinds of values.

b) a second eliminated example (Question 2 in Appendix E) involved a student who had been told, in confidence, the name of another student who had pulled a fire alarm. This example was also designed to produce an "either" frame response. Respondents were asked what they would do if the resident advisor for the hall threatened to punish the entire hall if the student who pulled the alarm did not come forward. In every case, although the responses ranged from sending an anonymous note to telling the resident advisor in front of the student who pulled the alarm, the students indicated that they would turn the offender in. The respondents did not focus on the conflict between the people in this example, but focused on whether or not they should honor the confidential
nature of the information which they had. Similar to the
collision above, the respondents focused on the ethical
dilemma which they faced rather than on the conflict
between the people involved in the scenario.
c) the third eliminated example (Question 6 in Appendix E)
involved a student who lived with a roommate who appeared
to be shoplifting and using the room to store stolen
goods. When students were asked how they would resolve
the conflict, they all wanted to be removed from the
situation to avoid any possibility of trouble. This
response is similar to responses which Sheppard et al.
(1989) categorized as a "stop frame". Respondents were
much more interested in stopping the conflict than in
resolving it. Since the frame used by the respondents was
not a "choice" or "negotiation" frame, this conflict was
eliminated from the questionnaire.
d) the one collision which was added was designed to
produce a negotiation response the majority of the time
(Question 6 in Appendix H). This conflict was given to a
sample of five undergraduate students working in the
office of one of the residence halls and produced a
negotiation frame response from four of the five students.
With the elimination of three conflicts and the addition of the last conflict, the final questionnaire, DRQ #3 (Appendix H), contained one example of a conflict which had consistently produced a "right-wrong" frame, one which produced a "negotiation" frame about 80% of the time, and four designed to produce a "right-wrong" frame on the initial administration and a "negotiation" frame in later administrations.

DRQ #3, the final DRQ (Appendix H), containing six examples of conflicts, was piloted on a sample of twelve first year masters degree students in the College of Education at the Ohio State University. The students were in the middle of their first two weeks of training as assistant residence hall directors. All had recently completed their undergraduate degrees. Other than hearing that a mediation center would be piloted during the upcoming year, the students had not been sensitized to mediation by the researcher or the Residence Life staff at The Ohio State University. Although slightly older than the population who would be responding to DRQ #3 during the research, in many other ways this group resembled the experimental group. The pilot group, like the experimental group, is a diverse group in terms of gender, race, undergraduate majors and extra-curricular
activities. The group is people oriented and interested in helping others, both traits which the control and experimental groups will possess.

Responses from the pilot group were coded by the researcher. Panel two randomly selected three DRQs (eighteen questions) and coded them. The rate of agreement was thirteen out of eighteen, or 77%. The results are tabulated in Appendix I. The example designed to produce "choice" frames did so 92% of the time while the example designed to produce a "negotiation" frame did so 56% of the time. The other four examples, designed to produce a "negotiation" frame on later administrations of the DRQ produced "negotiation" frames 40%, 8%, 80%, and 16%, respectively.

As discussed earlier, it was assumed that the conflicts designed to elicit "either" responses would not elicit "negotiation" responses until after the respondents had been exposed to mediation training. Therefore, the low "negotiation" response rates were seen as being able to distinguish between changes in framing. The fact that the respondents in the pilot study were older and somewhat experienced in the negotiation process through their involvement in roommate contracting should result in higher negotiation responses for the pilot group than for
the students involved in the study. Therefore, the 40% and 80% response rates were not interpreted to be problematic for the research.

Roommate contracting is a structured time period where roommates sit down with a staff member and discuss potential conflicts. Once the conflicts have been identified, roommates engage in a negotiation session, guided by the staff member if necessary, to resolve the conflicts before they happen. This means that DRQ #3 should be more sensitive to change when administered to the students involved in the actual research.
APPENDIX G

Type of Conflict Frames Used By Respondents to Interpret

Hypothetical Disputes From DRQ #2
### Hypothetical Disputes From DRQ #2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Type of Conflict Frame Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>R/W R/W R/W R/W N R/W R/W N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>N R/W N N N R/W N N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>R/W R/W R/W R/W N R/W R/W R/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>R/W R/W R/W N N R/W N N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>N N R/W N N N R/W N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>R/W N N N N N R/W N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>N N R/W N N N N N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TYPE OF FRAME DESIRED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>R/W</th>
<th>R/W</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

R/W = "right/wrong" or 'choice' frame.
N = "negotiation" frame.
E = a "right/wrong" frame is desired in the early administration of the DRQ and a "negotiation" frame is desired in later administrations.
APPENDIX H

The Final DRQ
The Final DRO

Key: the "frames" in parenthesis are provided so that the reader will know how the researcher intended for the respondents to respond to the examples.

DIRECTIONS FOR THE NEXT SIX PAGES ARE PRESENTED BELOW:

THE NEXT SIX PAGES CONTAIN EXAMPLES OF CONFLICTS WHICH OFTEN OCCUR IN RESIDENCE HALLS. FOR EACH OF THESE EXAMPLES, YOU WILL BE ASKED TO ANSWER THE QUESTIONS BELOW.

1. What is causing this conflict?

2. If this conflict really happened, how would you like to see it resolved? (PLEASE BE SPECIFIC!!!). You do not have to play any of the roles in the example, just tell me EXACTLY what you would like the various people involved in the solution to do AND describe the solution IN DETAIL. My ultimate goal is to find out precisely what SOLUTION you desire AND what the people involved in the conflict must do to reach the solution that you suggest.

FOR EACH EXAMPLE ON THE NEXT SIX PAGES, YOU WILL BE ASKED TO INDICATE HOW CONFIDENT YOU ARE THAT YOUR SOLUTION WILL ACCOMPLISH THE FOLLOWING GOALS:

3. solve the problem.

4. satisfy everyone involved.

5. be fair.

6. cost less time, money, and hassle than other solutions.

THE SCALE BELOW WILL BE USED TO INDICATE HOW CONFIDENT YOU ARE THAT YOUR SOLUTION WILL ACCOMPLISH THE ABOVE GOALS. ON THE NEXT EIGHT PAGES, THE SCALE BELOW WILL APPEAR TO THE RIGHT OF EACH PARTIAL SENTENCE PRESENTED ABOVE. PLEASE CIRCLE THE NUMBER ON THE SCALE WHICH CORRESPONDS TO YOUR LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE.

-----1------2------3------4------5------6------7------
+        +           +
not confident/somewhat confident/very confident/extremely conf.
("Either" frame)
1. You bought the refrigerator which is in your suite. You have been letting your three suitemates use the refrigerator, but for the past two weeks your coke and food have been disappearing. You think your roommate is taking your Coke and food because last night when you came home your roommate was drinking a Coke, and this morning when you looked in the refrigerator, one of your Cokes was missing. You are angry about this.

("Either" frame)
2. Your hall has voted to have "quiet hours" from 10:00 p.m. until 8:00 a.m. all year long. During the winter term, you enjoyed being able to study in your room for a couple of hours after 10 p.m. before you went to bed because it was so quiet. Now it is spring, and when you and your neighbor's windows are open on hot nights, you can hear your neighbor's stereo, making it very difficult for you to study.

("Negotiation" frame)
3. You and your roommate share a bathroom. It becomes obvious after a short time that your standards for cleanliness are different. When you get up after your roommate, you find toothpaste in the sink, hair clogging the shower drain, water everywhere, and sometimes clothes or a towel are left where you have to move them. You are becoming angry about this.

("Choice" frame)
4. Your roommate came back to the room late one night after drinking too much and managed to break the window in your room while horsing around. You paid $100.00 to the hall director to fix the window since your roommate was short on cash and promised to pay you back the next pay day. It has been two months and your roommate has been paid four times since the window was broken. You need the money now to pay for the ticket to the beach for spring vacation.

("Either" frame)
5. You work best late at night and like to sleep late in the morning. You were fortunate to get afternoon classes this term so that you could sleep in and not worry about missing classes. However, your roommate is an early riser and has an 8:00 a.m. class every day of the week. Your roommate gets up at 7:00 a.m. every day and wakes you up and you can not get back to sleep. After several weeks of this, you find yourself falling asleep during the day so
that you have missed a couple of classes and have not gotten your homework done.

("Either" frame)

6. Your roommate has lots of friends, is very popular, and plans to pledge a Greek social organization next year. Your roommate's friends are always in your room talking, and when you come in they ignore you and do not even get off your bed to let you sit down. You have begun to avoid your room until late at night, but you are getting tired of feeling like you do not have any place to call "home" on campus.
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Type of Conflict Frames Used By Respondents To Interpret

Hypothetical Disputes From the Final DRQ
### Type of Conflict Frames Used By Respondents To Interpret

**Hypothetical Disputes From the Final DRQ**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Conflict Frames Used</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>R/w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>R/w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>R/w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R/w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R/w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R/w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R/w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R/w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R/w</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TYPES OF FRAMES**

| DESIRED | E | E | E | N | R/w | E |

R/w = "right/wrong" or "choice" conflict frame.
N = "negotiation" frame.
E = a "right/wrong" is desired on the initial administration and a "negotiation" frame is desired on later administrations.
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Interview Questions
Interview Questions

1. WHAT ACTIVITIES OR ORGANIZATIONS HAVE YOU BEEN INVOLVED IN AT OHIO STATE OR IN HIGH SCHOOL?

2. WERE ANY OF THESE LEADERSHIP POSITIONS? DESCRIBE THE ROLE YOU PLAYED IN THESE ACTIVITIES.

3. LET’S SAY I NEEDED TO CONTACT A ADULT TO GIVE ME A REFERENCE FOR YOU FOR THIS POSITION. THINK OF THE ADULT THAT YOU WOULD PUT ME IN CONTACT WITH.......NOW, DESCRIBE THIS ADULT TO ME.

4. NOW, TELL ME WHAT THIS ADULT WOULD SAY ABOUT YOU.

5. THINK OF THE LAST CONFLICT THAT YOU WERE INVOLVED IN WITH ANOTHER PERSON AND MAKE SURE IT IS ONE YOU CAN TALK ABOUT. TELL ME WHAT THAT CONFLICT WAS ABOUT.

6. HOW WAS IT RESOLVED? LOOKING BACK, COULD IT HAVE BEEN RESOLVED IN A BETTER WAY?

7. IF YOU ARE SELECTED TO BE A MEDIATOR, YOU COULD END UP DEALING WITH A LOT OF PEOPLE WHO ARE VERY DIFFERENT FROM YOURSELF. ARE YOU A RACIST? IF NO, DO YOU EVER MAKE RACIST JOKES, OR STOP OTHER PEOPLE FROM TELLING RACIST JOKES? IF YES, WHY DID YOU SAY "YES"?

   PROBE HERE.

8. HOW DO YOU HANDLE CRITICISM AND EVALUATION?

9. DO YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS?
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