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ABSTRACT

This thesis explores relations between research and practice in the field of conflict resolution. In the first phase of the thesis, the development of the conflict resolution movement was reviewed. This included a discussion of its origins as a multidisciplinary field of inquiry, the sociohistorical influences on its development, and critical accounts of the two major forces in conflict resolution: alternative dispute resolution and mediation. The public face of mediation and its institutionalisation were discussed in relation to empirical accounts of its efficacy.

This conceptual analysis indicated that research and practice in conflict resolution exist as separate entities, and that there has been a rejection of traditional models of science by many practitioners. This stimulated the second phase of the thesis that comprised empirical investigations into the relationship between research and practice in conflict resolution. Consultation with conflict resolution experts identified four domains of potential difference between researchers and practitioners. These were incorporated into a survey instrument that measured activities and attitudes relevant to the conflict resolution field; issues relevant to the scientist-practitioner debate in the conflict resolution field; general value systems; and, general personality characteristics.

Survey data were gathered from British conflict resolution researchers and practitioners. Data analyses included comparisons between researchers and practitioners, and also between groups that were identified to have different professional interests in the field. These groups were therapeutic, community, legal, applied researcher and theoretical researcher interest groups. A series of semi-structured qualitative interviews were also conducted, to further explore differences between researchers and practitioners, and interest groups.
The results of analyses suggested that the differences between researchers and practitioners, and between interest groups, were principally related to epistemic values, the struggle for epistemic authority, and opinions about the professionalisation of the field. It was concluded that the traditional scientist-practitioner model of relations between research and practice is inadequate in conflict resolution. Therefore it was suggested that the future of conflict resolution requires that epistemological differences be more fully understood and the implicit skills of conflict resolution practitioners be more highly valued.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION AND ORIENTATION

1.1 Introduction

Conflict is an inevitable and pervasive aspect of human life. It is perhaps not surprising, therefore, that both the theory and practice of conflict resolution are fundamental issues for psychology. During the last 20 years there has been rapid growth in interest and experimentation with new approaches to the cooperative, non-adversarial resolution of conflict. In the first part of this thesis an overview of the objectives and extent of this new conflict resolution field is provided through a critical review of the influences that have effected conflict resolution development.

Effects of the significant shift in the theory and practice of conflict resolution have been felt across the social milieu. These include rapid developments in diverse areas from family counselling to neighbourhood dispute settlement, and from victim-offender mediation to new processes for proceedings in law. These changes have involved researchers and practitioners from diverse backgrounds, encompassing disciplines such as law, psychology, politics, social work and religious studies. The conflict resolution
processes of recent years have primarily aimed at reducing the delays in traditional methods of dispute settlement and accelerating the processes associated with social and individual change. These developments have been favourably accepted by the general public. Conflict resolution as an applied technology is certainly "booming". Universities have recently begun to offer degrees in the topic, governments have begun funding research programs and public services, and entrepreneurs now offer their services as practitioners, consultants and workshop leaders.

The conflict resolution movement has been described as being "logical" (Dance, 1993), "common sense" (Acland, 1990) and a "paradigmatic shift" (Burton, 1985) in how societies deal with conflict. Further, there is a growing movement that proclaims modern conflict resolution techniques to be decentralised, flexible, localised forms of managing disputes that surpass more traditional legalistic approaches. Many different conflict resolution approaches and techniques have emerged as a result of this shift in focus, leading to a social movement of significant proportions (Schlosberg, 1995). It should also be noted that there is an abundance of terms and labels for the conflict resolution movement. Conflict resolution, alternative dispute resolution, mediation, third-party intervention, conciliation, and negotiation are all terms now used to describe practices of conflict resolution that embrace a less adversarial approach to settling disputes. In many cases these terms are used interchangeably, and are assumed by many to mean virtually the same thing. Very few accounts exist that clearly define the boundaries between the different approaches listed above and/or discuss the theoretical perspectives behind them. Therefore, as an emerging field, the theory and practice of these new approaches to the resolution of conflict are difficult to summarise or define.
effectively. This is largely due to the fact that the field has grown relatively quickly, it is multidisciplinary, and theoretical parameters are not yet well established.

In recent years the practice of conflict resolution techniques have by far outgrown the theoretical and research development of this field (Kressel & Pruitt, 1989). This has grown to the point where practitioners have a more complete understanding of the processes in question than do researchers. Thus, conflict resolution is an excellent example of a field where it has been “practice” that has driven “theory”. This is contrary to the traditional logical empiricist approach to the development of a new field, where theory is supposed to prescribe practice.

It can be argued that these changes have been too fast and dramatic for an accurate account of all the significant developments to be made effectively. Since the mid 1980s the field of conflict resolution has moved rapidly from one main idea to another: “power bargaining” and “negotiation” have been superseded by “conflict analysis” and the discovery of agreed options in a “win-win” approach. It is now clear that there is considerable confusion both in academic institutions and in the market place over concepts and terminology. At the same time, a “professionalism” is emerging in the conflict resolution movement that aims to legitimise the field. As a result, general tensions exist between schools of thought, and between research and practice interests.

### 1.2 Aims and structure of the thesis

The primary goal of this thesis is to establish an understanding of the relationship between research and practice in light of the current developments in the conflict resolution field. In order to achieve this, eight broad aims are addressed. These are
listed below with corresponding chapters in order to denote where they are addressed in
the body of the thesis.

Aim 1: Review the multidisciplinary interests in conflict and conflict resolution
(Chapter 2).

Aim 2: Outline the development of the conflict resolution field from a socio-
historical perspective (Chapters 3 and 4).

Aim 3: Review the contributions of law to the development of the conflict resolution
movement (Chapter 3).

Aim 4: Review the development of mediation and its contribution to the conflict
resolution movement (Chapter 4).

Aim 5: Review the results of traditional social scientific inquiry into mediation
research and the efficacy of mediation (Chapter 4).

Aim 6: Provide an overview of the relationship between research and practice in
psychology (Chapter 5).

Aim 7: Review the literature concerning research and practice in conflict resolution
and determine research aims (Chapter 6).

Aim 8: Undertake quantitative and qualitative research into the relationship between
research and practice in the conflict resolution field (Chapters 7 through 12).

Chapters 2 through 6 constitute the first section of the thesis, providing the necessary
background information to establish a critical understanding of the development of the
conflict resolution movement. In the past, authors have presented some aspects of this
 literature, but few accounts have sought to bring together the diverse influences on
conflict resolution.

The multidisciplinary influences on conflict and conflict resolution are reviewed in
Chapter 2 in order to explain the broad interest in the topic of conflict, and to
demonstrate how the majority of previous approaches have been based on a behaviourist philosophy. More recent approaches have addressed the cognitive and affective aspects of the experience of conflict. It is proposed that this change in focus has been a catalyst in the development of the modern conflict resolution movement.

In Chapters 3 and 4 the two most significant components of the conflict resolution movement are described. These are the input of legal perspectives and the popularity of the mediation technique. It is acknowledged that these two areas are interrelated, but for the purposes of the current thesis they are addressed separately in an effort to describe their different influences.

Chapter 3 provides an account of the influences of international relations and the development of alternative dispute resolution, while Chapter 4 describes the institutionalisation and public presentation of mediation. An underlying theme in both Chapters 3 and 4 is that the conflict resolution movement is, at least in part, a product of the social and political forces of the time. In the latter part of Chapter 4, a review of traditional approaches to mediation research is presented, with particular reference to efficacy research. Following this the emerging difficulties between research and practice in conflict resolution are identified.

In order to establish an understanding of the common themes in research and practice, an overview of the relationship between research and practice in the field of psychology is presented in Chapter 5. It is intended that this will identify general issues about values and epistemological differences between research and practice communities that can inform an inquiry into this relationship in the conflict resolution field.
On the basis of the findings of Chapter 2 through 5, a review of the polarisation of the relationship between research and practice in conflict resolution is presented in Chapter 6. A proposal for research is then outlined, comprising five broad research aims. These aims incorporate a primary objective of the research which was to include the views of both researchers and practitioners in the construction of research questions. To preserve the chronology of the thesis, research aims are not listed in this introduction (refer to Section 6.5 for details).

Chapters 7 through 12 comprise the empirical part of this thesis including both quantitative and qualitative components. This approach has been used to identify the customary approaches of both researchers and practitioners, and to maximise the possibilities of collecting informative data. Chapters 7 through 10 describe the quantitative inquiry involving a substantive survey of researchers and practitioners in the conflict resolution field. Chapter 7 provides an account of the development of the survey instrument by describing the processes through which a focus group suggested four domains to guide the investigation. The structuring of the survey around these domains is then detailed. The methodology for the survey is reported in Chapter 8. Chapters 9 and 10 present the results of the survey on the basis of two different approaches to the analyses of data. These are described in detail in the relevant chapters.

Chapters 11 and 12 report the conduct of the qualitative inquiry. Chapter 11 provides an introduction to the advantages of a qualitative methodology, with particular reference to understanding the relationship between research and practice. The actual method used is then described, comprising a series of semi-structured interviews with
Researchers and practitioners from a number of different conflict resolution backgrounds. This is followed by a discussion of the methods of analysis of these data. Results are presented in Chapter 12.

Chapter 13 provides the opportunity for reflection on the entire thesis. First, the extent to which both the thesis aims (conceptual analyses) and research aims (empirical analyses) were fulfilled is discussed. Second, the findings of the quantitative and qualitative inquiries are discussed in terms of the research-practice distinction, and also between different professional subgroups. Third, the methodological difficulties associated with this thesis are discussed. Finally, future research directions for the study of the relationship between research and practice in conflict resolution are provided.
2.0 Introduction

In this chapter an overview of the multidisciplinary basis of the modern conflict resolution movement is presented. This includes a description of the various academic and philosophical influences on the study of conflict, and then a discussion of the changing definitional trends in the field. Section 2.1 provides an introduction to the long history of the study of conflict and Section 2.2 describes the multidisciplinary interest in conflict. Following this, Sections 2.3 through 2.6 detail the major attempts to understand the psychological, social, political and anthropological aspects of conflict respectively. Section 2.7 then summarises the definitional issues associated with conflict and identifies the tendency in the literature to utilise a behaviourist framework. Section 2.8 describes some of the exceptions to this tendency that focus more on the cognitive and affective aspects of conflict. The movement towards broader definitions of conflict and conflict resolution is summarised in Section 2.9, where conflict resolution is proposed as a new area of multidisciplinary concern. The chapter is summarised in Section 2.10.
2.1 Conflict theory

The study of conflict has had a long tradition. Early examples of this can be seen in the philosophical writings of Thucydides, Aristotle, Machiavelli and Hobbes.

Contemporary authors have attempted to clarify the concept of conflict from diverse perspectives such as class struggles, evolutionary adaptation, military power, ethnic differences and spiritual values (Kainz, 1987). Indeed the study of conflict is much broader than psychology alone, being embraced by such disciplines as sociology, law, politics, philosophy, economics and religion.

Social scientists have been interested in conflict from two broad perspectives. First, how conflict relations permeate and shape all aspects of human interaction and social structure (a conflict perspective to social life), and second, how a conflict perspective helps elucidate the beginning, escalation, reduction, and consequences of conflict situations (Kriesberg, 1982). This latter point contains the impetus for the current thesis that seeks to further clarify the origins, structure and current challenges of the modern "conflict resolution" movement.

The word conflict was originally derived from the Latin word “confligere” meaning “to strike together”. The study of conflict and conflict resolution has been most influenced by the examination of what causes this “striking together” and therefore why conflicts occur. In fact, Lewis (1990, p. vii), wrote that “... we know more about how conflicts get started than we do about how to resolve them ...”. It was thought, as has been the case with many applied social sciences, that an understanding of the theoretical basis of conflict would result in the development of solutions. In other words, it was thought
that the remedies for how to resolve conflicts would become clear once the correct theory to explain conflict had been discovered (Burton, 1990).

There has been a dramatic increase in the interest in conflict and conflict resolution in recent years. The early focus on theory has now been balanced by a growing interest in the practice of conflict resolution. Conflict resolution has been broadly proclaimed as a new field in the social sciences, concerned specifically with "... the nature of conflict as a generic human problem and with techniques or initiatives that might be applied productively in addressing conflicts ..." (Lewis, 1990, p. vii). The aim of the early part of this thesis is to investigate the academic and historical origins of this new conflict resolution movement. In order to understand this phenomenon which Lewis calls a "new field", it is necessary to overview the nature of conflict and conflict theory as it has been approached from a variety of academic perspectives. This is particularly relevant as the modern conflict resolution movement has been characterised by many commentators as a multidisciplinary endeavour.

2.2 The multidisciplinary nature of conflict

While this thesis focuses predominantly on a psychological interpretation, contributions to the scholarly understanding of conflict and conflict resolution have been provided by many different academic disciplines, including sociology, law, politics, philosophy, economics and religion (Burton, 1990; Fisher, 1990; 1997; Moore, 1978; Lewis, 1990; Schellenberg, 1982). The diverse origins of the modern conflict resolution movement are outlined below through an overview of psychological, social, anthropological and political contributions to the understanding of conflict. However, the study of the various aspects of conflict are not exclusive to their respective discipline bases. For
example, a sociologist may be interested in the political and anthropological aspects of conflict, or a psychologist may study social aspects of conflict.

Many authors have claimed that the multidisciplinary aspects of conflict, considered in their totality, form the very basis of the modern conflict resolution movement (e.g., Tillett, 1991). However, the broad discipline base of conflict and conflict resolution makes it difficult to effectively define and explain conflict. The following summary of the psychological, social, political and anthropological aspects of conflict is therefore necessary to both define the broad nature of conflict, and to provide an understanding of the socio-historical context and epistemological themes that have influenced the study of conflict. This provides a useful platform upon which to base an understanding of the new field of conflict resolution.

2.3 Psychological aspects of conflict

A plethora of definitions of conflict are to be found in the psychological literature. A large number of these focus on interpersonal conflict. For example, a commonly cited definition of interpersonal conflict is:

"... A situation of competition in which the parties are aware of the incompatibility of potential future positions in which each party wishes to occupy a position which is incompatible with the wishes of the other ...". (Boulding, 1962, p. 62).

Another common way of defining conflict is in terms of its meaning as a verb. For example, Simmel (1969, p. 18), proposed that conflict is designed to resolve divergent dualisms. That is, "... it is a way of achieving some kind of unity, even if it is through the annihilation of one of the conflicting parties...". Wright (1990, p. 15), also defined conflict grammatically both as a substantive and as a verb. He offers a definition in two
parts. In his model conflict is both "... used to refer to inconsistencies in the motions, sentiments, purposes, or claims of entities ...", and "... the process of resolving these inconsistencies ...". These three definitions are representative of the general tendency in psychology to define conflict in terms of "competition", and to objectify or externalise conflict behaviour.

These definitions may be sufficient if a discussion of the conflict resolution field is limited to the activities of a mediator in situations of interpersonal conflict. However, they do not accommodate the cognitive and affective aspects of an individual's psyche, which presumably accounts for the reason a person "wishes to occupy a position", or why a party "perceives" in a certain way. Therefore, it can be argued that if there is to be a complete theory of the origins of conflict and its resolution, it is necessary to delve deeper into the origins and causes of conflict. These factors are particularly relevant to practitioners, who are often in the position of needing to address long term and emotionally based conflicts (Carstensen, Gottman & Levenson, 1995; Dillon & Emery, 1996; Olekalns, 1997). This issue will be expanded in subsequent sections. In general, psychology has tended to take a behaviourist perspective in the study of conflict, focussing predominantly on overt events. Therefore, in recent years, interpersonal and social conflict have been the most frequently cited issues in the psychological study of conflict.

The exception to this tendency is psychoanalytic theory which focuses specifically on mental events, although it has not been utilised in the contemporary study of conflict. The major tenets of psychoanalytic theory relevant to conflict are outlined below.
because it is possible that the rejection of psychoanalytic theory may have contributed to
the omission of the more cognitive and affective aspects of conflict.

In the late 1800s, Freud was one of the first theorists to propose the central importance
of conflict in the human psyche, generating what was probably the first modern
approach to investigating conflict from a psychological perspective. In Freudian theory
the psychological aspects of conflict are considered to be intrapsychic or internal to the
individual, rather than being interpersonal or group oriented. This approach emphasised
tensions between various ego states and instincts. For example, in his early work, Freud
placed a great deal of emphasis on the conflicts between libidinal wishes and super ego
demands (and prohibitions), and emphasised that reactions to social conflicts could be
internalised as a result of these processes (Moore & Fine, 1995).

Freud’s work also emphasised the importance of understanding that conflict could be
both conscious and/or unconscious (Fancher, 1996; Westen, 1998). He argued for the
central role of conflict in personality development. That is, personality was seen as the
product of conflict between repressed libidinal wishes and anxiety (that serves to inhibit
action). Freudian theories also emphasise that while external conflict can occur, there is
always an internal source at the root of the problem that actually causes the conflict
(Dunn, 1993; Mitchell & Black, 1995). Freud’s theory of defence mechanisms as the
source of many conflicts further emphasises the importance of cognitive and affective
factors in the resolution of conflict (Gerth, 1991). In recent years, what Freud originally
described as intrapsychic conflict has been called intrapersonal conflict. Further
elaboration of intrapersonal conflict, and the importance of cognitive and affective
factors, is described in Sections 2.7 and 2.8.
Clearly there has been much controversy around psychoanalytic theory. Most Freudian concepts have been challenged by the broader psychological community. This is particularly true of Freudian explanations of personality development. While there are many good reasons to reject Freudian ideas (see Crews (1996) and Rotkin, Rotkin and Zaretsky (1975) for substantive reviews), it is also possible that the broader psychological community was somewhat uncomfortable with the concept of personality formation being based on a series of conflicts (Borbely, 1995). Despite the social and methodological concerns that have been raised about Freud’s approach, he identified conflict as a primary psychological event which motivated much of the psychological inquiry that followed. Many of these original theoretical ideas about conflict are still accepted by psychiatrists and neo-Freudians who utilise psychoanalytic concepts.

A common definition now used for psychological conflict is based on motivation theory. That is, conflict occurs when an individual is motivated to engage in two or more mutually exclusive activities (Grzelak, 1994). It is also generally accepted that psychological conflict can occur at various levels of the human psyche and human behaviour. Overt behaviour, verbal behaviour, cognitive (or symbolic) behaviour, and affective behaviour, can all involve choices that are potentially conflictual (Larkin, Frazer & Semenchuk, 1996). However, this inclusive approach has not been incorporated into mainstream psychological thought as yet.

One of the first comprehensive models of psychological conflict was presented by Lewin (1935). He proposed an analysis of personality based on field theory, where the behaviour of an individual was seen as a function of the field of psychological forces in
a given situation. Lewin argued that these fields were influenced by the positive and negative valences ascribed to the outcomes of any situation, and that conflict occurred when valences for outcomes were of equal strength.

Lewin developed a taxonomy of conflict situations in order to explain the behaviour of individuals (Dollard & Miller, 1950). These included: approach - approach conflict where one individual is in conflict over two goals of equal positive valence; avoidance - avoidance conflict describes situations in which an individual must choose between two goals of equal negative valence; approach - avoidance conflict was used to explain situations where one goal has equal positive and negative valences; and finally, double approach - avoidance conflict is proposed to explain conflict situations where two goals each involve an approach - avoidance decision.

Miller (1959) used this taxonomy to establish a theoretical model of conflict using laboratory based animal studies. He focussed on the concept of approach - avoidance conflict, arguing that this type of conflict was most relevant to human behaviour, particularly in the areas of psychopathology and social behaviour. Miller devised experimental approach - avoidance conflict situations in a stimulus - response learning theory framework. After a series of studies Miller concluded that the outcomes of conflict situations can be predicted on the basis of knowledge about the strength of the competing response tendencies and the effects of prior exposure to learning stimuli.

These studies established a convention for subsequent approaches to conflict that have also focussed on primarily overt behavioural models. Thus a "behaviourist" ideal formed the basis of any inquiry into conflict. While this was influenced by the logical
empiricist movement in psychology and the adoption of rigid behaviourist precepts, it
was also, at least in part, stimulated by the broad rejection of psychoanalytic theory and
other psychodynamic influences. Therefore the majority of psychological inquiry into
the theoretical characteristics of conflict have taken place within a behaviourist
epistemology.

More recent psychological approaches to conflict embrace decision making or
information processing models (Amason & Sapienza, 1997; De Dreu & Van de Vliert,
1997). While focussing on cognitive behaviour rather than simple overt behaviour, this
approach is also based on a reductionist epistemology. Decision making expositions of
conflict (e.g., Bergadaa & Thietart, 1997; Gummer, 1997; Kahneman, Slovic &
Tversky, 1982) explore computer metaphors and mechanistic information processing
approaches to conflict. Mental events, as behaviours, can be equally characterised as
simple stimulus and response phenomena that can be "ideally" used to predict conflict
behaviour. Thus a cognitive approach to conflict may also be underwritten by

In summary, with the exception of early Freudian theories, psychological approaches to
the study of conflict have tended to emphasise overt behavioural events. This has been
at the expense of a consideration of cognitive and affective factors. However, in recent
years some psychological approaches to the study of conflict have returned to an
inclusion of more internal events. These developments are described in Sections 2.7
and 2.8.
2.4 Social aspects of conflict

The social aspects of conflict are fundamental to an understanding of conflict behaviour and conflict resolution. Commonly, social theorists assert that conflict can best be defined as the struggle around “... values or claims to status, power and scarce resources ...” where competing parties aim to gain “desired values” and “neutralise, injure or eliminate” each other (Coser, 1968, p. 232).

Conflict has been considered a major social phenomenon by modern social theorists. For example, Marxist social philosophy emphasised conflict as a key explanatory variable in social structures. Simmel (1955, p. 17) wrote that “... conflict is a form of sociation ... that ultimately hold(s) the group together ...”. Weber (1949, p. 26) argued that conflict is an integral part of social life and that “Peace is nothing more than a change in the form of the conflict.” Further, Parsons (1951) described conflict as a “sickness” of the social body.

A significant movement in the sociological understanding of conflict was the attempt to objectify the basis of conflict and separate it from its inherent subjective elements. For example, Coser (1968, p. 233) proposed that failure to describe social conflict in terms of objective events would result in “... excessively psychologistic explanations, which can not do justice to the structure of conflict or to the situations that give rise to it ...” The need to objectify and define conflict behaviourally led to numerous analyses of social factors that were thought to be relevant to conflict situations (Coser, 1967; Schellenberg, 1982). Sociologists identified variables like the unequal distribution of income, status, power and control over territory as central areas of study in understanding the social aspects of conflict (Collins, 1985). Coser (1968, p. 233)
affirmed the importance for sociologists to separate conflict behaviour from affective factors such as "... aggressiveness, resentment, hatred and the like ...", in order to properly understand conflict situations. He also argued that "... Conflict and hostile sentiments, although often associated, are in fact, different phenomena ...".

The focus on objective conflict behaviour led to a number of sociological descriptions. These included realistic and non-realistic conflict, ingroup and outgroup phenomena, the structural impact of conflict on society, and discussions of the possibility of social change through conflict. In the same period, social psychology also embraced the behaviourist paradigm. This resulted in what were later referred to as "landmark" studies into conflict behaviour in social psychology, that were actually based on decision making models. Such experiments had little in common with the real life social aspects of conflict behaviour.

An example of this was the "trucking game", devised by Deutsch and Krauss (1960), which is generally considered to be an important theoretical model for understanding social conflict. A description of such experiments is included in most introductory psychology textbooks. To suggest that conflict behaviour exists independently of emotions is limiting, possibly naive, and indicative of a positivist approach that ignores mental and symbolic events in favour of a so-called "objective" view of reality. A more detailed discussion of the tendency for psychology to embrace behaviourist theories is included in Chapter 5.

In contrast, an important contribution to the understanding of the social aspects of conflict is the perspective offered by Foucault. Foucault’s work covered a broad range
of topics including psychiatry and mental illness (1967), the human sciences (1970), the production of knowledge (1972), medicine (1973), the prison system (1977), and sexuality (1986). Two themes central to the writings of Foucault are power and knowledge. A brief explication of Foucault’s approach to these issues is important to illustrate the relevance of his perspective on social conflict.

Foucault aimed to establish an understanding of how power affects everyday life. He is critical of the ‘commodity’ view of power that proposes power can be held, possessed, or embodied in an institution. In contrast, he proposed that power is best conceived as a relational phenomenon, that becomes most apparent when it is exercised. Therefore Foucault was interested in the practices, techniques and procedures that give power effect. He wrote, “... power is exercised by virtue of things being known and people being seen ...” (Foucault, 1980, p. 154).

This approach gave rise to the concept that Foucault has been most appreciated for, ‘power-knowledge’. Foucault proposed that knowledge is not detached or independent, and the methods of accumulation of knowledge are not neutral instruments. Rather, power and knowledge are integrally related. He wrote:

The exercise of power itself creates and causes to emerge new objects of knowledge and accumulates new bodies of information ... the exercise of power perpetually creates knowledge and, conversely, knowledge constantly induces effects of power ... It is not possible for power to be exercised without knowledge, it is impossible for knowledge not to engender power. (Foucault, 1980, p. 52).

Foucault also argued that traditional approaches describe the effects of power in negative terms as a phenomenon that represses or excludes. He claimed that power is not negative, but on the contrary, it is creative.
In fact, power produces; it produces reality; it produces domains of objects and rituals of truth. The individual and the knowledge that may be gained of him belong to this production. (Foucault, 1977, p. 194).

In addition, Foucault’s concept of the individual is that the human subject is produced historically, created through the correlative elements of power and knowledge. This offers insight into the subjective aspects of social conflict that have been ignored by many social theorists (Battershill, 1986; Swingewood, 1985). Foucault (1980) argued that the power-knowledge relationship operates in such a way that it limits an individual’s course of social action. This is particularly relevant in instances of social conflict where social institutions are also structured to minimise opportunities for conflict. Similarly, this perspective can be identified in Marxist theory where it is claimed that ideology controls society and therefore minimises conflict (Cain, 1974). In contrast to conventional approaches that would claim “if conflict is not evident it does not exist”, a Foucauldian perspective argues that the control, avoidance and minimisation of overt conflict is conflict. This is an exception to the tendency of traditional approaches to social conflict that have avoided a consideration of covert factors.

In summary, Foucault addressed the important issue of conflict and power and challenged some of the assumptions held by the majority of the social theorists who preceded him. In Foucault’s account of social conflict, power is not something that is possessed by an individual, group, or social class; and conflicts arise from not only physical coercion, but also from dynamics such as the relationship between power and knowledge (Dreyfus & Rabinow, 1983). This approach further highlights the need to address the covert aspects of conflict.
2.5 Political aspects of conflict

The aim of inquiries into the study of conflict from a political perspective is to explain how conflict affects humanity through broader socially organised structures. Therefore political explanations of conflict have tended to also emphasise social factors. For example, in the nineteenth century Marx and Engels analysed society in terms of “class conflict” (Cain, 1974; Deutsch, 1990) and Social Darwinists examined conflicts between different societies (Deutsch, 1990; Moerk, 1997; Sanderson, 1990). These approaches contributed much to the way in which conflict has been interpreted in the political arena. The Marxist theory of conflict developed as a doctrine for change and revolution that has clearly affected the rise and fall of many political systems. It can also be argued that Social Darwinism, while conceptually simplistic, with its concepts of “survival of the fittest” and “the conquest state”, has made a significant (but harder to detect) impact on the development and functioning of many political systems (Schellenberg, 1982).

These underlying ideas have influenced the primarily competitive nature of political explanations of conflict. North (1968), a political theorist, defined conflict in terms of its political function as follows:

“... A conflict emerges whenever two or more persons (or groups) seek to possess the same object, occupy the same space or the same exclusive position, play incompatible roles, maintain incompatible goals, or undertake mutually incompatible means for achieving their purposes ...” (p. 226).

This definition emphasises a competitive relationship between political adversaries. A possible explanation for this is that it is widely accepted in political science that all political relationships are best characterised dualistically as either “conflictual” and/or “integrative”. Therefore the issue of conflict plays a major role in the categorisation of
all political relationships. It is proposed by political theorists that some degree of community, organisation or integration is fundamental in the concept of conflict (Bernard, 1957). A political approach to conflict has also demonstrated that conflict requires interaction, considerable communication, reciprocal ties and subtle understanding between antagonists (Coser, 1956; Moore, 1991a, 1991b).

When applied to situations in which a political approach to conflict is necessary, such as international relations and organised military interventions, consideration of these concepts becomes important. North (1968) wrote that most social scientists had neglected the importance of understanding conflict in relation to politics, until the political turmoil of the 1960s, and the burgeoning threat of wide scale damage from nuclear war. The emergence of politically influenced theories of international relations and war strategies has subsequently become a major focus for political theorists.

The development of bargaining theories, third party intervention by “super” powers, international mediation, and negotiation are a few of the outcomes that have been influenced by the political approach to conflict. These concepts are discussed further in Chapter 3. However, for the current review, it should be noted that traditionally these approaches also attempted to objectify conflict situations. The aim was to reduce conflict to mathematical equations of cost-benefit analyses and to propose diplomacy guidelines based on what is essentially a decision making model (Belay, 1997; Elgstrom, 1994; Gilboa, 1979). An example of this is “game theory” (e.g., Deutsch, 1990; Deutsch & Krauss, 1960), where little or no attention was given to the values and needs of conflicting parties. These psychological constructs cannot easily be reduced to simple components in a conflict equation (see Bok (1989) for a full description). More
recent research (detailed in Chapter 3) suggests that in most cases psychological variables dictate the most expedient solution to politically motivated conflict situations (Banks, 1984; Deutsch, 1990).

2.6 Anthropological aspects of conflict

Anthropology emphasises the cultural aspects of conflict and aims to demonstrate that conflict as a multi-dimensional social process. Anthropologists have been recording instances of conflict since anthropology began as a formal area of academic inquiry (Nakhleh, 1975). Perhaps the most central point made by an anthropological approach is that conflict can occur in a variety of diverse guises in different cultures. Witchcraft practices, feuds, factionalism, warfare, competitive games, contradictory values, and discord between spouses have all been identified by anthropologists as useful areas from which to seek a broader understanding of conflict (Foley, 1986; Harcourt, 1992). It is commonly suggested that these conflict situations are mechanisms for displacing conflict from one level of social grouping to another. Further, the institutionalisation and social regulation of conflict is frequently described by anthropologists (Moore, 1978; Nader & Todd, 1978).

The major contribution of the anthropological approach to conflict is the observation that conflict is a natural phenomenon that occurs in all human (and ethnographers claim also non-human) societies, although its form and intensity will vary between cultures. LeVine (1961) outlined five different forms of conflict indicating behaviours that occur transculturally: physical aggression, public verbal dispute, covert verbal aggression, breach of expectation, and avoidance. It is proposed that most of these, if not all, exist
in different cultural groups, making conflict a core part of the organisation of societies, and therefore important to the lives of individuals.

In addition, conflict can have different functional purposes and can exist in different structural forms. For example, in some cultures physical conflict (and aggression) is predominant, while in others verbal aggression is more frequent. One culture may have organised a violent sport to symbolically portray and release conflict, while another culture might have institutionalised feuds or witchcraft practices. Anthropologists have also given numerous examples of societies that severely inhibit ingroup aggression and at the same time create war with surrounding outgroups (Nader & Todd, 1978).

Anthropological approaches to the study of conflict have also been affected by the general movement towards a behaviourist approach in the last thirty years. For example, Nader (1968) wrote that studies of the anthropological aspects of conflict have been primarily influenced by the “... structural - functional theory of social organisation and only indirectly by the psychoanalytic theory of personality ...” (p. 257). Anthropological approaches to conflict also claim to take a non-subjective (i.e., objective) approach to conflict, in which intrapersonal conflict and individual differences between people are disregarded. Of course, it can be argued that the study of individual differences is not inherent to anthropology. However, the key issue to emphasise is that anthropology, along with social and political approaches to understanding conflict, also stresses the importance of objectifying conflict and embraces a behaviourist paradigm.
2.7 Definitional issues

It is clear that the issue of conflict permeates the activities of many academic
f endeavours. The various definitions and the theoretical positions outlined above
demonstrate the diversity of perspectives about conflict. While there are obvious
advantages of multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary concern for a field, there are also
substantial disadvantages.

One of the significant difficulties associated with the study of conflict from a
multidisciplinary perspective is that the meaning and application of conflict theory is so
diverse. Tillett (1991) describes six broad categories of conflict. The first,
intrapers onal conflict, is conflict an individual feels within themselves. This can
include inner conflict about decisions (e.g., competing loyalties, competing demands).
The second, interpersonal conflict, refers to the many conflicts that occur between two
individuals (e.g., relationship difficulties). Intragroup conflict includes those conflicts
that occur within a specific group (e.g., competing factions in a political party). The
fourth category is intergroup conflict, which includes those conflicts that occur between
different groups (e.g., conflict between gangs). Fifth is value conflict, which refers to
conflict that occurs within or between groups, or individuals, and is associated with
differences in values, ideologies, beliefs or morals (e.g., conflict between conservative
and liberal approaches to politics). The sixth category described by Tillett is
international conflict, and encompasses those conflicts that occur between nation states,
or international organisations (e.g., the conflict between the North Atlantic Treaty
Organisation (NATO) and Yugoslavia).
The attempt to categorise the various levels of conflict is a direct result of the recent multidisciplinary interest in conflict and conflict resolution. As can be interpreted from Tillett’s (1991) categories, the study of conflict must include the consideration of conflict from an intrapersonal level, through interpersonal and social conflicts, to international disputes. The focus on diverse levels of conflict has led to the tendency to propose general theories that purport to apply to all conflict situations. However, such generalisations about conflict have been confusing and inaccurate. Despite this, a unifying theme in studies of conflict has been a focus on the escalation of conflict and conflict behaviour. In recent years greater interest has been directed towards the de-escalation of conflict situations and conflict resolution.

As elucidated above, most disciplines focus only on overt, behaviourally definable aspects of conflict. The epistemic gains of this approach are detailed in Chapter 5. However, to understand the underlying cause of conflict or to attempt to find generic commonalities, inquiry must progress from a mere examination and analysis of the behaviour of the parties and external consequences of behaviours. Therefore, further consideration of the psychological components of conflict and methods of conflict resolution are necessary.

While the early trends in applied conflict resolution included a consideration of the psychological aspects of interpersonal conflict, there was very little consideration of the intrapersonal components or psychological reasons for conflict. Therefore, conflict resolution methods that were behaviourally defined and external to the psychological processes of the individual were sought. For example:
"... Conflict can be divided into two categories: intrapersonal and inter-personal. Mediation is primarily concerned with interpersonal conflicts - situations that arise between individuals or groups of individuals ..." (Folberg & Taylor, 1984, p. 19).

This division implies that mediation aims to address only the conflict between people, with little focus on the cognitive and affective factors (or intrapersonal factors) that predispose, precipitate and perpetuate conflict situations. However, most practitioners with first hand experience of mediation argue that much of the mediation process is in fact concerned with addressing the intrapersonal aspects of the interpersonal conflict. These issues are expanded in Chapter 6.

Despite this seemingly obvious omission, many conflict resolution theorists have deliberately chosen not to delve into the "black box" of cognitive and affective components of conflict. Rather, they have focussed on simple analyses of the interaction between behavioural issues and the positions (interests) of the parties in the dispute. It could be argued that this kind of overt behavioural analysis is sufficient in many mediation and alternative dispute resolution situations, and that many mediators see their role as leading the parties to a mutually satisfactory conclusion, even if this means that the conflict has not been resolved, particularly at an intrapersonal level. For example, Folberg and Taylor (1984) argued that conflict resolution should be treated as a behavioural subject only, and that the mediator need not know what is inside the "black box" of a conflicting party's mind. That is, if the conflict is resolved, the causes are irrelevant. The analogy is that as long as an ill patient appears to recover from an ailment, there is no need to further investigate either the symptoms or the cause.
The traditional emphasis on primarily behavioural approaches (based in simple positivism) limits the potential for successful conflict resolution. To deny that it is necessary to understand and address the cognitive and affective aspects of conflict is regressive. However, this has been characteristic of many of the applied conflict management technologies and conflict resolution practices that were developed in the late 1980s. Such practices relied heavily on management training practices and simplistic conflict resolution courses. This trend has also exacerbated the current crisis between the practice and theory of conflict and conflict resolution in recent years. This point is addressed in significant detail in subsequent chapters.

2.8 Cognitive and affective aspects of conflict

Having stated that many conflict resolution theorists do not delve into the metaphorical "black box" of the human psyche, it should be noted that there are a few exceptions to this trend that have emerged from the multidisciplinary approaches to the field. These exceptions have focussed on the cognitive and affective factors inherent in intrapersonal conflict and the importance of learned responses to conflict situations.

Intrapersonal conflict is often not obvious to others, frequently remaining private and undisclosed. However, the effects of intrapersonal conflict inevitably become manifest through interpersonal conflict. This is especially the case if the individual experiencing conflict is erroneously misinterpreting the behaviour and motives of the other party because their interpretations and assumptions are affected by their intrapersonal conflict. Similarly, interpersonal conflicts can trigger previously dormant intrapersonal conflicts, particularly if another party or situation reminds the individual of another situation where a conflict has occurred (Tillett, 1991).
Many theorists have proposed that the source or origins of intrapersonal conflict are to be found in the interpersonal relations of early childhood. Accounts of these ideas are included in Freudian psychoanalytic theory (Dunn, 1993; Mitchell & Black, 1995), instinctual theories of aggression and predisposition to conflict (see Mummendey (1996) for a summary), social learning approaches to understanding how children learn to deal with conflict (Bandura, 1973; Eron, 1994), and sociobiological approaches to understanding conflict (Wilson, 1975, 1978). Also, developmental psychologists assert that children's learning about conflict is a normal stage in understanding the processes of social interaction and the attainment of social cognitive skills (Forrester, 1992). Further, it is acknowledged that these processes of learning have a lasting effect on an individual's approach to conflict and conflict resolution (Durkin, 1995).

Therefore it can be argued that the intrapersonal and learned ways of dealing with conflict (which are bound to be repeated in later life) influence how an individual approaches interpersonal conflicts. The implication is that what might appear to be interpersonal conflict can also be considered as intrapersonal conflict because of the impact of cognitive and emotional reactions, values, and learned ways of dealing with conflict. This further supports the idea that conflicts cannot simply be considered in terms of their overt, external manifestation, but that they also require the consideration of internal events.

In contrast to the behaviourally orientated theorists described in Sections 2.3 through 2.6, in recent years other theorists have emphasised the role of intrapersonal conflict and mental events in the theory and practice of conflict resolution. For example, Heitler
(1990, p. 5) defined the term conflict with specific emphasis on cognitive variables, as "... a situation in which seemingly incompatible elements exert force in opposing or divergent directions ..." and these forces may clearly be objective or subjective. She cited Lewin (1951) who defined conflict as the overlapping of two force fields which had "positive valence" (an impulse to do something) and "negative valence" (an impulse not to do something). Heitler also cited Pruitt and Rubin (1986) who defined conflict as meaning perceived divergences of interest, or a belief that the parties' current aspirations cannot be achieved simultaneously. Heitler (1990) concluded her explanation of conflict by stating that a person's perception of a situation influences the extent to which conflict occurs. That is: "... Conflict exist(s) if people think it exists even if the situation does not in fact include inherently contradictory factors ..." (p. 5).

When defining conflict, Burton (1990) argued that the distinction between conflicts and disputes must be made. He claimed that disputes are "... ordinary ideas, choices, preferences and interests which ... are part of normal social living ...". In contrast, conflicts are defined as "... those whose sources are deeply rooted in human behaviours ..." (p. 54). Burton also claimed that conflicts relate to the "... human needs or values of the individual which cannot be traded or bargained with ..." (1990, p. 241). That is, needs and values are not negotiable. Further, it is argued by some theorists that these needs and values are the most available psychological concepts that can be used to address intrapersonal conflict in a practical manner (Baybrooke, 1987; Burton, 1990; Coate & Rosati, 1988). The concepts of human needs and conflict are further detailed in Chapter 3.
Other approaches to conflict resolution focus upon the external behaviour and manifestations of conflict but maintain the importance of subjective factors when attempting to resolve conflict. For example, practitioners of conflict resolution often utilise the analogy of an “iceberg” when explaining the need to address the undisclosed and unconscious intrapersonal aspects of conflict. The iceberg metaphor emphasises that the small visible part of an iceberg is like the outward behavioural manifestation of conflict, while the massive part of the iceberg that remains unseen (under the ocean) is like the underlying cognitive and affective aspects (including needs and values) in any conflict situation (Tillett, 1991). Perhaps this is akin to the behaviourists' attempt to explain the mind by studying behaviour (Hebb, 1980).

A recognition of the centrality of cognitive and affective factors in conflict has also led to new conceptions of the meaning of conflict. Conflict has traditionally been considered a negative occurrence leading, for example, to break downs in communication and to the destruction of relationships. However, in recent years more expansive views of the topic have emerged. Conflict is now seen, at least by some, as providing opportunities for promoting new ideas, encouraging better understanding, strengthening personal relationships, and facilitating more effective solutions to problems (Tillett, 1991). This concept has had a major impact on the development of the modern conflict resolution movement described in the following chapters.

In addition, from a historical perspective, it is also clear that the acknowledgment of cognitive and affective factors in how conflict was approached was inevitable. The behaviourist ideals of the 1950s and 1960s received extensive critical examination in the 1970s and 1980s in most areas of academic study. Arguably, it was only a matter of
time before the academic inquiry into conflict would reflect this general trend. This change in theoretical direction from an objective approach to conflict to an examination of more subjective factors has been a central factor in the development of the modern conflict resolution movement.

In particular, these issues have effected diverse changes in the philosophy of conflict resolution practice. This can be conceived as a shift from a behaviourist approach to practice to a more constructivist perspective. In recent years this shift has been denoted by a consideration of the individual characteristics of disputants, including the cognitive and affective aspects of the conflict, the needs and interests of disputants, and the way that they perceive or "construct" the conflict situation. These constructivist principles have also been incorporated into the way that conflict resolution processes have been structured. This is in contrast to the simple behavioural analyses of disputant behaviour and negotiation tactics that characterised traditional approaches to conflict resolution. Further, it is obvious that such developments might lead to difficulties between research and practice in conflict resolution because most research paradigms are characteristically behaviourist and positivist in nature. These issues will be considered at length in Chapter 6.

2.9 A new area of academic inquiry

Revisiting Lewis' (1990) statement that we know more about how conflicts arise than we do about how to solve them, the related fields of conflict management and conflict resolution have been a more recent development than the early attempts to understand the structure and basis of conflict. Therefore the field of conflict resolution can be considered as a relatively new area of academic study and professional application. The
study of how conflicts can best be resolved, and the strategies which can be developed to facilitate effective resolution, is also a relatively recent development in social psychology. In the last ten years the field has grown rapidly, with the new interest in conflict and conflict resolution forging a transformation in how conflict and its resolution is approached.

While the field of academic study is not yet clearly defined, Kreisberg (1986) proposed three fundamental areas that are agreed upon as worthy of inquiry in the study of conflict resolution. Kreisberg claimed that the escalation and de-escalation of conflict situations can be accounted for by: (1) internal developments in adversary groups; that is, the various social psychological processes and organisational developments that effect the individual and collective commitment to the cause at hand; (2) interactions between the two adversary groups; that is, the nature of the interactions (e.g., intimidating or conciliatory); and (3) the conduct of actors not initially involved in conflict; that is, the involvement of interested parties, specifically the effect of third-party mediators.

However, while there may be agreement as to the relevant topics for an inquiry into conflict resolution, there appears to be no clear consensus as to the limits or boundaries of this inquiry. Definitions for the field of conflict resolution have tended to be diverse.

For example:

"... Definitions of the field of conflict resolution range from deterrent strategies and Star Wars (the Strategic Defense Initiative), through power-bargaining techniques, normative and legal approaches, to psychological attempts to change attitudes of participants in simulation groups, to "problem solving", which itself can be interpreted to mean any of the above ..." (Burton, 1986, p. 174).
Due to this broad range of possibilities and the accompanying theoretical perspectives, the field of conflict resolution is difficult to comprehend academically. Tillett (1991, p. 1) summarised the recent changes in approaches to conflict resolution as resulting in "... a multi-disciplinary, analytical, problem-solving approach to conflict which seeks to enable the participants to work collaboratively towards its resolution..."

In particular, definitions and explanations of conflict resolution have become increasingly broad as a more motivational model (highlighting needs and interests) has been adopted. This has led to increasing difficulties in the operationalisation of conflict resolution definitions as they involve the "study of the totality of human relationships" (Tillett, 1991) and are:

"... conditioned by the totality of the environment - economic, political, social and ecological - in which these relationships are enacted ... encompassing personality and cultural differences, and deals with this person in the total society, encompassing social differences ..." (Burton, 1988, p. 2).

Burton (1990, p. 1-2) attempted to clarify the situation and define the scope and areas of concern for conflict resolution by summarising five primary features of this newly defined field. First, it is claimed that conflicts are deeply-rooted in human needs and may require major environmental and policy restructuring for their resolution. Second, some behaviours that are endemic in all social relationships, and that may be legally classified as ordinary crimes, are possibly symptomatic of underlying conflicts. Third, the study of conflict resolution is concerned with conflict as a universal phenomenon. That is, conflict is seen as affecting all cultures, at all stages of political, social and economic development, and at all societal levels from the interpersonal to the international. Burton argues that inquiry in this field necessarily seeks a generic explanation. Fourth, the study of conflict resolution seeks to identify a means of
resolution, as distinct from its containment, suppression or enforced settlement. In this sense the field is concerned with the "... analysis and solving of the problems, whether human, institutional, or both, that give rise to conflicts, and the discovery of the options that meet the needs of those involved ..." (p. 2). Finally, Burton asserted that the study of conflict resolution seeks explanations of conflict that make prediction possible. It was stressed that this was not aimed merely at prevention, but also "provention". According to Burton (1990), "provention" implies the promotion of an environment conducive to ongoing harmonious relationships.

2.10 Summary

In this chapter the study of conflict as a multidisciplinary concern has been demonstrated. The major theories from psychological, social, political and anthropological domains were reviewed and it was argued that the study of conflict has been traditionally approached from a behaviourist perspective. The introduction of cognitive and affective aspects to the understanding of conflict as a catalyst for the modern conflict resolution movement was elucidated. Recent approaches to conflict resolution that focus on the needs and interests of disputants were described and it was proposed that the multidisciplinary field of conflict resolution can be considered as a new area of academic inquiry. It was also proposed that these changes may prompt significant difficulties for the relationship between research and practice in conflict resolution.
CHAPTER 3

LEGAL INFLUENCES ON THE CONFLICT RESOLUTION FIELD

3.0 Introduction

The following chapter provides an overview of the legal influences that effected the development of the modern conflict resolution field. Section 3.1 details the influences of law from the perspective of international relations. Section 3.2 provides an analysis of legal influences on conflict resolution at a domestic level, by detailing the development of alternative dispute resolution, which constitutes a large proportion of the modern conflict resolution movement. Section 3.3 then provides an account of some of the concerns about the legalisation of conflict resolution. The chapter is summarised in Section 3.4.
3.1 **International influences**

While the field of conflict resolution is currently of interest to many theoretical and practical endeavours (as detailed in Chapter 2), many of the original influences on the development of the modern conflict resolution movement came from the fields of international relations and international law. A review of developments in international relations is essential in order to understand the current influences on conflict resolution. As will be elucidated below, theorists broadly agree that the field of international relations has traditionally been based on the "law and order" model. Therefore, this section will comprise a review of the law and order model, outline proposed alternatives, describe these more cooperative approaches, and illustrate the changing philosophies in international relations.

3.1.1 **International relations and the "law and order" model**

In recent years the field of international relations has been dominated and regulated (if not practically, at least rhetorically) by the United Nations. After the Second World War the Charter for the United Nations was drafted in San Francisco (Kaloudis, 1993). The stated aim of the United Nations was to preserve peace in the world by the development of a "one nation-state" world society (Lengyel, 1986; Ryan, 1990). There were internationally shared expectations about conflict behaviour, and a Security Council was established to enforce the "Law and Order" of the time.

Many theorists now agree that there were very clear difficulties with the adoption of the "one nation-state" approach (Banks, 1984; Light & Groom, 1985). These problems included serious ideological deficiencies in the United Nations model. An internationally based law and order model for the common good was ideal in theory.
However, there soon developed a widely shared belief that the “common good” that was practiced and protected by the law and order model of the United Nations was the “common good” as interpreted by those in power (at both the domestic and international levels). A fundamental limitation of the United Nations is that the political authority of a country is sanctioned by its membership to the United Nations. It is therefore possible that political powers that have minor domestic support, but are legitimated by their membership of the United Nations, can legitimately use military forces (internal and/or foreign) to maintain unpopular governments and oppress opposition. There is little doubt that such practices have been, and continue to be, widespread (Soedjatmoko, 1983).

Many theorists (e.g., Banks, 1984; Light & Groom, 1985) argue that the United Nations was flawed from the outset. Many of its original members were, and still are, not accepted authorities by the people of the country they represent. In many such countries there are serious unresolved conflicts, but the United Nations Security Council cannot intervene due to the member state’s presence in the United Nations and subsequent protection by a domestic jurisdiction clause. This anomaly is particularly poignant when the violation of human rights is suspected.

In addition to these problems, the United Nations has been said to lack any functional validity as it has no jurisdiction over matters of international concern that invoke a veto (Banks, 1984). The United Nations has no military forces of its own at its disposal. While it does have the potential for coercive power through the Security Council, decisions to use this require agreement of the “great powers”. The result has been that United Nations military forces tend to only be used when the Security Council (i.e.,
primarily the victors of World War 2), approves an action. This has left the organisation relatively ineffective in resolving international and/or domestic conflicts, except for limited success in peace keeping roles (Bobrow & Boyer, 1997; Segal, 1995, 1996).

In discussing the reason for this, Burton (1979, 1986, 1988) wrote that at the time of the drafting of the United Nations charter, few people knew of any way to manage conflict outside of the traditional law and order “power” framework. The model of coercive power that had “worked” at a domestic level was therefore applied internationally. Burton (1984) added that at the time the United Nations was inaugurated the goal was to prevent aggression from the losers of World War 2 (i.e., Germany and Japan), and authoritarian control by an international body (headed primarily by the victors of World War 2) was deemed the best way to do that. This authoritarian approach was adopted with essentially no consideration of the causes of World War 2, or of what could be done to address similar problems in the future (Boutros-Ghali, 1995).

The original philosophical framework of the United Nations, that to some extent still persists today, is the idea that if people are aggressive the state must respond with aggression. Consequently, readiness to defend against aggressive acts remains a priority of most state policy. Therefore, for many years, superiority of power was the goal of states. This approach led to adversarial diplomacy/politics and arms escalation (e.g., USA - USSR Cold War). That is, international relations and the global society remained firmly enmeshed in the classical framework where a law and order approach was normative (Moore, 1991a, 1991b). Mediation and third party interventions were used in the almost total absence of any problem-solving endeavour. In the early 1980s there was growing concern about the inflexibility and lack of success of these
approaches. This led the Secretary-General of the United Nations to propose that change in these processes was vital. However, no suggestions for alternatives to the traditional law and order mediation process were offered (United Nations Secretary General Report, 1983).

3.1.2 Alternatives to law and order

It was not until the early 1960s that there was any significant or effective challenge to the normal authoritarian approach to international relations (Burton, 1988, 1990). The impetus for this change came initially from the field of industrial relations. The seminal work of Blake, Shepard and Mouton (1964) stressed the need for communication between workers and management as a means to the desired levels of cooperation and resulting productivity. This development also coincided with the integration of cybernetic heuristic principles into decision making theory (Clemson, 1984; George, 1979). Cybernetics emphasised the advantages of non-hierarchical decision making processes, resulting in the transition to interactive models of decision making, rather than authoritarian hierarchical approaches (Deutsch, 1963).

While these developments heralded an exponential rate of growth of cooperative, non-hierarchical conflict resolution mechanisms in industrial relations, these developments were not readily accepted by those involved in international relations. There were, however, some advances made at a non-official level. The law and order power view was challenged by what was called the “Behavioural View” (not to be confused with the behaviourist psychology of the 1960s). In the late 1960s, a London based group, “The Centre for the Analysis of Conflict”, began exploring alternative ways to resolve conflict. According to Burton (1986), their aim was to “... falsify the proposition that
disputing parties were unwilling to cooperate in resolving conflicts ...” (p. 176). Rather than settling conflict by the application of legal processes, the objective was to understand the nature of the conflict, and how to resolve it, by establishing an understanding of it through the parties concerned. In this approach parties to a dispute would cooperatively endeavour to resolve their own conflicts, with minimal third party assistance. Disputants were given their conflict in an exploratory and analytical framework in which they remained “free decision makers”.

Conflicting parties were invited to work together until an acceptable option was agreed upon, rather than hand over decision making to a court or a third party mediator. Early experiments that utilised this problem solving approach to international disputes enjoyed a great deal of success. This success posed a serious challenge to the long held proposition that conflicting parties would not meet together to discuss their problem. A variety of other conflicts, including industrial and community problems, were also successfully addressed using this model. Overall, the experiments at the Centre for Conflict Analysis led to serious doubts about the validity of the authoritarian law and order model (Burton, 1986). These developments created the impetus for a new, more cooperative approach to conflict resolution in international relations.

In a discussion of the law and order model, Burton (1987a) proposed that approaches to conflict resolution are governed to a large extent by our view of society. He described the contrast between a “billiard-ball” model of society and the “cobweb” model of society. The billiard-ball society is a metaphor for nation states that interact with each other as separate and distinct entities, with each having no consideration for the position of the others. It is clear that the political world view of the 1960s fitted well with the
billiard-ball model, and was well served by a law and order approach. The cobweb model on the other hand represents the de facto relationships that form both between and within the nation states, thus forming a web of relationships which lead to a softening of boundaries. Clearly the cobweb view of the world is better served by a less adversarial, cooperative approach, and is potentially suited to current times where nations are more likely to share interests.

3.1.3 Cooperative approaches to international relations

As the law and order model began to be critically examined in terms of its practical relevance for achieving results in the international arena, a body of theory that supported the development of cooperative approaches was emerging. It should be noted that there have been many contradictory and confusing descriptions of these developments in the literature. Consequently, the following summary aims to distil some of the major influences in the emergence of cooperative approaches to conflict resolution, rather than to provide a precise retrospective analysis of these developments.

There is wide agreement (e.g., Banks, 1986; Burton, 1990; Light & Groom, 1985), that a fundamental advance in the development of alternatives to the law and order approach was Sites' (1973, 1990) observation that the distribution of power was central to the resolution of conflict. Sites emphasised the need to reconstruct how power is distributed in conflict resolution and the importance of attributing effective power not to authorities (e.g., governments, the United Nations, etc.), but to individuals and groups. Sites' other main contribution was the proposition that people in conflict pursue certain human needs, by using every means at their disposal, to the point where their actions override the need for valued relationships (Sandole, 1990).
Sites (1990) concluded that there are certain needs that will be pursued regardless of the consequences and if, for example, parties to a conflict have no relevant valued relationship, unrestrained violence may be the outcome. Sites also made the distinction between these fundamental human needs that cannot be directly negotiated, and 'interests' (e.g., commercial and role interests) that can be bargained. That is, both needs and interests are relevant in all disputes, but needs are less likely to be negotiated than interests. In recent years a burgeoning body of literature has developed that supports these concepts (Gillwald, 1990; Mitchell, 1990; Nudler, 1990; Roy, 1990; Sandole, 1990).

In summary, Sites' (1973) work was revolutionary for a number of reasons. First, he challenged the traditional law and order model of authority and resolution by legal settlement that was based on the assumption that conflicting parties could not meet together to cooperate. Second, he emphasised the importance of individuals and groups in conflict resolution rather than the traditional power bases and structures common to traditional conflict resolution practices. This was perhaps the first step in taking concepts of conflict resolution away from the legalistic context of international relations into the broader area of social relations. Underlying Sites' thesis was the notion that to solve international conflicts, the fundamentals were the same as they would be for solving other (less high powered) social and interpersonal conflicts (Sites, 1990).

Central to this new approach was the concept of human needs theory as first proposed by Maslow (e.g., Maslow, 1954, 1972). In short, Maslow's model suggested that human needs exist in a hierarchy: with self actualising needs (e.g., personality
development) at the top; followed by esteem and social recognition needs (e.g., self esteem); then social needs (e.g., affiliation); then security needs (e.g., shelter); and, finally survival needs (e.g., food) at the base of the hierarchy. In general, it was Maslow's contention that each level of needs must be fulfilled (starting with the most basic level) before the next level can be met. It should also be noted that Malsow's system is only one of many approaches to the issue of human needs. For other accounts see Burton (1990).

With respect to conflict resolution, a human needs approach would propose first, that it is important to address the needs of the parties involved in the dispute. Second, that it is important to address the correct level of needs relevant to the conflict (Gillwald, 1990). Therefore, it would follow that there is no point trying to negotiate about social needs if survival needs are threatened. For example, in a workplace relations dispute the management may be concerned with the esteem and social recognition needs level, while the employees may be more affected by their future ability to fulfil survival needs. A human needs approach to conflict therefore aims to identify and recognise the needs of all participants in a conflict situation, both in order to provide a suitable basis for resolution and to increase the motivation of participants to work towards that resolution.

This approach is in contrast to the law and order model that focuses primarily on interests, and assumes that individuals could be socialised and authoritatively coerced into desired outcomes by means of negotiation and bargaining. The development of theory and application of conflict resolution based on this assumption leads to drawn out, complicated conflicts (which are the major concerns in international politics). It can be argued that the law and order approach to the resolution of conflict is doomed to
fail because the focus is most often only on the interests of disputants, with no mention of the non-negotiable values or needs of disputants (Burton, 1987b).

The adoption of a “needs and interests” model (rather than a “law and order” model), led to the idea that parties in conflict need to learn to ascertain their motivations, and explore means by which their needs can be satisfied in a successful outcome (and by the conflict resolution process). This approach is the antithesis of the authoritarian model of non-interactive negotiation and diplomacy that emphasised “interests” only. For example, the human needs most often threatened in conflict situations are in the areas of “security” and “identity” and other non-negotiable values, which are the very issues that remain ignored by authoritarian models. In contrast, the needs and interests model aims to address such issues (Sites, 1973). An excellent example of this approach is offered by Kelman (1990), where a human needs perspective to the practice of conflict resolution in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is provided.

To some extent, this approach has changed the objective of conflict resolution, especially at the international level, to encompass processes that involve the exploration of how human-societal needs (held in common between parties) can be satisfied. This process of conflict resolution soon became associated with the possibility of a “win-win” outcome. A win-win situation is a resolution where both parties' human-societal needs are met (Burton, 1985). Several research centres were subsequently established to test the theory and processes of the needs and interests model, and these achieved positive results (Burton, 1987a).
3.1.4 Changing philosophy in international relations

Burton (1986) suggested that the paradigm shift in the resolution of conflict in the international arena was, at least in part, due also to developments in the philosophy of science. The Popper (1957) and Kuhn (1962) debate led to the identification of certain shortcomings in controlled experiments and empirically based theorising. Through these developments it was shown that a formal deductive reasoning approach to scientific inquiry (that relies on falsification), was impractical because such testing was usually not possible in applied settings. Burton reported that at that time the response to these assertions by people involved in international conflict resolution was also a clear rejection of the empiricist rationale. For example:

"... We are dealing with behaviour in open systems. Any control or simulation is likely to lead to false conclusions ... The ordinary controlled experiments do not apply. They are too simplistic for such complex realities ..." (Burton, 1986, p. 177).

Banks (1986) also suggested that these developments led to a questioning of the consensus assumptions of traditional political theory. The results indicated that the various foundations that constructed the law and order model of international relations were likely to actually be the antecedents and perpetuators of conflict situations. In other words, the consensus assumptions of the law and order model were based in the social and political views of the powerful, and these actually created a great deal of the conflict in the international arena.

This is most clearly the case when ruling parties have questionable political legitimisation (Burton, 1988). In enforcing the norms and roles of a traditional law and order model, with people who do not necessarily accept such norms, dysfunctional relationships and conflict are the most likely outcome. Burton argued that this is
because these practices deny individuality and the development of alternatives based on the human - societal needs of those who are not involved in the policy making of the powerful class.

The shift away from the law and order model for the resolution of international conflicts has led to a variety of relatively new, more expansive models. While these models approach the subject from different directions and backgrounds, Deutsch (1991) claimed that most approaches share the following four common themes: (1) it is commonly agreed that the cooperative and competitive interests of the disputants give rise to cooperative and competitive behavioural tactics in settling conflicts; (2) it is generally accepted that conflict is not always harmful or destructive, but rather can be conceived as constructive, and positive change may flow from conflict; (3) it is accepted that in most conflicts the disputants will have different levels of power when compared to each other and at different points during the conflict resolution process (in conflict resolution constancy is rare); and, (4) it is now commonly accepted that to gain an understanding of the conflict resolution process consideration of both the subjective (values, goals, expectations, perceptions) and objective (power, skills, resources) characteristics of the disputants and the conflict resolution process is required.

Sites’ (1990) account of needs as “analogues of emotions” provided an ontological base for the inclusion of needs and values in the analysis of conflict situations. The basic tenet is that if you have little or no understanding of the preconceptions held by the parties, then it is not possible to mediate a dispute effectively or equitably. Further, new insights about conflict situations are actually experienced both intellectually and emotionally when both objective and subjective factors are addressed (Deutsch, 1991).
From this new focus on the needs and values of conflicting parties coupled a "win-win" approach, a new optimism emerged in conflict resolution. Doob (1985) claimed that with this new approach even apparently intractable conflicts may be resolvable. He wrote, if it is possible to:

"... peer beneath the ostensible reason for their existence and thus to uncover the 'real' objectives ... Non neurotic persons of good-will, capable of participating and striving to reach a novel resolution, assemble for some period of time, ... at a neutral site where they feel detached and comfortable ... under the auspices of a third party ... the participants are taught to recognise their own psychological and social strengths and weaknesses and to improve the ways in which they communicate with others ...." (Doob, 1985, p. 150).

However, he added that three further difficulties must be overcome to achieve effective resolutions. First, parties must be willing and able to interact both with themselves and with others. Second, there are obvious problems that can plague interactions. Third, after resolutions have been agreed upon there may be difficulties in adhering to them (Doob, 1985). Comments such as these were reflected in the changing research focus of that time. This is best characterised as a move away from the study of theoretical concepts such as bargaining and strategic choice models, towards a variety of more applied factors relevant to an understanding of the deficiencies of human beings' decision making abilities and willingness to address conflict issues.

This encompassed the study of such issues as decision making fallibility, misperceptions, projections, stereotypes, defective informative, selective exposure, defensive avoidance, impatience, and feigned conformity (e.g., Abelson & Levi, 1985; Janis, 1982; Jervis, 1976), factors that effect the longevity of resolutions (Fisher & Ury, 1981), and training programs that aimed to improve conflict resolution success (e.g., Bradford, Gibb & Benne, 1964; Delberg, Van de Ven, & Gustafson, 1975; Doob &
Foltz, 1974). Issues relevant to understanding conflict resolution processes, including more recent research, are discussed further in Chapters 4 and 7.

3.2 Domestic influences

The basis of conflict resolution models in law have also had an effect on the development of conflict resolution at the domestic level. The law has been one of the most significant influences in the development of the modern conflict resolution movement. The rejection of the law and order model that was experienced at an international level also held ramifications for domestic policy about conflict resolution. Specifically this has been characterised by a movement away from formal legal systems toward decentralised forms of managing disputes. Littlefield, Love, Peck, and Wertheim (1993) write that this change utilises less adversarial means of negotiation than is traditionally used in legal procedures, and has led to a “quiet revolution” in the practice of dispute settlement. In recent years this quiet revolution has become known as “alternative dispute resolution” (Pruitt & Kressel, 1985). This movement has been influenced by a number of factors including increased demands on the traditional legal system. The current section will detail these influences, and describe the development and breadth of alternative dispute resolution practices.

3.2.1 Increased use of the legal system

Over the past 40 years there has been an increase in the amount of litigation in most Western countries. In the United States of America (USA), the number of criminal complaints increased by more than 100% during the period from 1950 to 1980. During the same period civil actions more than tripled (Rosenberg, 1981). In more recent years similar trends have been reported in the United Kingdom (UK) (Acland, 1990;
Harrington, 1991) and Australia (Altobelli, 1995). Due to increasing demands on the court system, attention to finding alternatives to the traditional methods of legal dispute management has also increased.

The most substantive body of literature addressing this issue exists in accounts that describe the rise of alternative dispute resolution in the USA. Despite moves to make courts and legal processes more efficient, the system has been overloaded since the early 1980s (Feely, 1983), and has been unable to reduce backlogs (Acland, 1990). Increasing numbers of individuals who perhaps never before would have sought formal legal intervention for dispute settlement, now turn to the formal legal system (and eventually to the courts) to help them resolve their conflicts (Hurst, 1981). Further, there has been an overwhelming rise in minor felony and misdemeanour complaints (Rosenberg 1981). This is of particular relevance to this argument because minor felony and misdemeanour cases most often involve victims and offenders who have ongoing relationships (e.g., spouses, parents and children, and friends) while traditionally, the law was more accustomed to cases that involved strangers. This has led to a complex problem for the legal system.

Although many of these minor disputes involving people in ongoing relationships actually lack criminal intent (or even a criminal act), the criminal complaint is the only avenue immediately available to them (Hurst, 1981). With limited resources it is perhaps tempting for courts to dismiss such cases on the grounds that they have no criminal and/or legal relevance. However, if this course of action is taken, the possibility exists that the conflict will worsen and eventually result in a serious criminal act. On the other hand, if the court does decide to hear such a case, the legal officers are
faced with the difficulty of deciding a case which may be social rather than legal (Posner, 1990). Therefore, in recent years, legal personnel have been forced to make decisions about social, psychological and emotional aspects of litigant's lives, regardless of the legal relevance of these matters. This is especially relevant in the lower courts where community, family and divorce matters are most often heard (Davies & Clarke, 1991). As a result, the court systems of most Western countries are not only faced with far greater caseloads, but also the additional burden of the increasing complexity of cases in both the criminal and civil areas (Hurst 1981; Lempert 1978; Sarat & Cavanaugh 1978).

3.2.2 Inadequacies of the legal system

Another possible reason more people are now turning to the law is the increasing “bureaucratization” of our societies, and the increasing depersonalisation of social life (Marshall, 1985). In our large, complex societies alienation between individuals and the major social institutions is common (Marshall, 1986). In the last forty years the general populace have faced increasing levels of conflict in their lives due to both the increasing threats of disorder and violence associated with our accelerating economic and technological development, and the psychological difficulty associated with adapting to such changes (Marshall, 1985).

However, it can also be argued that the law can lead to peace in society, because legal processes have become reified to a position of authority and legitimacy in society. The winners and losers of legal proceedings usually abide by the legal ruling, otherwise there is further legal recourse. The law is also expected to manage any violence associated with a dispute, taking the possibility of retaliation (and associated emotional
responses) out of the hands of individual parties. It is clear that these processes certainly add power to the law, but these most valuable features are perhaps also the law’s most limiting. These limitations are particularly evident in cases where conflict is drawn out over long periods of time, and in situations that require the establishment of better relations between conflicting parties for the future. In the words of Marshall (1985, p. 16):

"... While the law is ideally constructed in theory to defuse conflicts arising over offenses committed by strangers, such as burglary, or a traffic incident, or specific disagreements occurring between persons who normally get along (e.g., over the building of an extension that shades a neighboring garden), it can be less than perfect when the presenting issue is only one of an extended series of accusations and counteraccusations. In such cases its very impersonality, formality and refusal to entertain 'extraneous' considerations can obviate any attempt to obtain a useful and realistic settlement ..."

From this account, and numerous others (e.g., Acland, 1990; Davies & Clarke, 1991; Goldberg, Green, & Sander, 1985), it is evident that the law is limited in its relevance to the resolution of conflict in social and interpersonal situations. This is the case for many of the same reasons that the law and order model is unsuitable for use in international disputes. The legalistic approach is based on authoritarian notions (social and political), and is most often administered by members of the more powerful classes in most Western societies. There is little regard for the emotionally based needs and values of disputants in traditional legalistic approaches to resolving conflict (Burton 1990; Deutsch, 1991; Doob, 1985; Tillett, 1991). As mentioned previously, these deficiencies are particularly relevant considering the drastic increase in requests for legal intervention in cases that have minimal criminal significance between parties who have ongoing emotional relationships (e.g., Hurst, 1981; Rosenberg, 1981).
3.2.3 The rise of alternative dispute resolution

The issues discussed above have resulted in growing dissatisfaction with the legal system, leading to a search for alternatives to traditional legal mechanisms for settling disputes. The general aim has been to discover opportunities for the resolution of conflicts that stress personal participation of parties and flexibility of processes, known as alternative dispute resolution (ADR). Most of the significant developments in ADR were initiated in the USA in the late 1960s (Tillett, 1991).

The growth in ADR practices has been one of the most powerful factors in the development of the conflict resolution movement making it sometimes difficult to accurately distinguish exactly what techniques and practices constitute the ADR field. Some ADR techniques are exactly the same as those used in non-legal settings, for example, mediation. For the sake of simplicity the definition of ADR in this chapter will be limited to those conflict resolution methods that are associated with the legal system and, in particular, with the courts.

ADR is the term given to conflict resolution processes that are either used in addition to, or as an “alternative” to, traditional legal practices. These processes are called alternative because their primary purpose has been to provide an alternative to the traditional legal system. Goldberg, Green and Sander (1985, p. 5) suggest that ADR has four separate goals: (1) to relieve court congestion as well as undue cost and delay; (2) to enhance community involvement in the dispute resolution process; (3) to facilitate access to justice; and (4) to provide more “effective” dispute resolution.
The term alternative dispute resolution now encompasses a wide range of processes and techniques including "adjudication", "arbitration", "mediation", "mediation/arbitration", "mini trial" and "expert testimony". Some of these are used within the legal system (in the court system) and some are used in community settings in services that remain under the jurisdiction of the court. These approaches vary depending on whether outcomes are binding or non-binding, and whether the processes are voluntary or involuntary (Tillett, 1991).

There is now a general consensus in the sociological, social psychological and legal literature that ADR practices provide a very attractive alternative to traditional legal processes. For example, Susskind and Ozawa (1985) argue that ADR practices are more likely to result in "more acceptable" outcomes for disputants than would the traditional court system. They claim ADR practices are less formal, less confrontational, more flexible, cost less than traditional systems (the courts), and are more adaptable to the specific needs of parties. The other major advantage cited by authors is that ADR practices allow some opportunity to address relevant psychological issues (Duffy & Thomson, 1992; Ray, 1982).

3.2.4 The breadth of alternative dispute resolution

While ADR originated in the USA, its use has also enjoyed much popularity in Australia and other parts of the world. The development of ADR in Australia is outlined in this section as an example of the breadth of the field. By the early 1990s ADR was already a significant part of Australia's legal system, with ADR practices institutionalised in many organisations. A number of Australian government agencies (e.g., The Industrial Relations Commission, The Anti-Discrimination Commission) are
now required by law to utilise ADR processes as either a prerequisite to legal intervention or, in some cases, as the only process available (Tillett, 1991).

Further evidence of the widespread acceptance of ADR in Australia is apparent from its adoption by the business sector. Many companies and private organisations now use ADR processes for the management of conflict in their business affairs. However, the rapid acceptance of this approach has been based on anecdotal evidence of the success of ADR applications for business purposes in other countries, particularly the experiences of American companies.

Research that empirically demonstrates the success of ADR is virtually nonexistent, arguably because data to provide such evidence would have been difficult to obtain (e.g., it would be difficult to set a control group). Furthermore, practitioners might argue that empirical support is perhaps irrelevant to the successful practice of ADR. The bottom line for business (and business people prefer to deal with “bottom lines” rather than “empirical proof”) is that ADR is purported to be cheaper than the costly legal alternatives, and is aimed at producing an outcome that satisfies both parties, thus maintaining the goodwill between business peers. The attitude of “using what works” (to be expanded on later in this thesis) is very common in professional communities that use ADR and other conflict resolution practices.

Very little research has inquired into the efficacy of ADR practices in Australia. One lone exception to this was the work of Singer (1995) who considered the concept of “user satisfaction” as a measure of success. The references to ADR that do exist in the formal academic literature tend to describe the use of such practices and proclaim their
benefits, with little supporting evidence or consideration of critical analyses. Recent Australian accounts reflect the diversity of applications of ADR, but the number of articles do not necessarily reflect the ever increasing number of groups that employ ADR practices. Notable among commerce and business related reviews are Reikert’s (1990) account of the advantages of ADR for managing commercial disputes in Australia, and Park’s (1993) summary of enforcing ADR clauses in corporate disputes.

The Australian Commercial Dispute Centre was set up in Sydney in the 1980s, with the use of government funding, to actively support the use of ADR practices for the resolution of commercial disputes. Its very formation was a significant step in the cultural validation of ADR practices for the Australian business community. Since then the Australian Commercial Dispute Centre has been portrayed as an attractive alternative for business parties because of long court delays (Henderson, 1989), being helpful for practitioners of ADR (Batterby, 1988; Newton, 1988), and for providing a “commonsense solution” to business disputes (Dance, 1993). The centre has provided a focal point for the business community to come to terms with ADR practices. The success of the Australian Commercial Dispute Centre has legitimised ADR practices for business applications in Australia. These developments have also been supported by many legal professionals who have developed successful careers in the practice of ADR techniques. As ADR is most formally associated with legal practice there has been an ongoing concern for the training of legal professionals in these practices (David, 1991). There has also been a significant degree of entrepreneurialism and opportunism on behalf of the legal profession and this has contributed to the success of ADR.
This has resulted in a burgeoning Australian literature detailing the successful application of ADR practices in business areas, however these accounts do not typically incorporate a critical analysis. For example, Drake (1991) and Hill and Waters (1994) provide accounts of the successful use of ADR for insurance related disputes, concluding that there are significant benefits in using conciliation and/or mediation as an alternative to normal litigation practices. Similarly, numerous authors have proclaimed the benefits of ADR practices for use as an alternative to litigation in the areas of accounting (Dale, 1993; Kenfield, 1992; Ricketson, 1988; Williams, 1995), banking (McDonald, 1992) and taxation (Astor & Pascoe, 1994). Reports of the use of ADR practices in Australia for specific business purposes have been evident in the fields of building (Finlay, 1987; Rogers, 1992; Scott, 1990), information technology (Ahrens, 1990; Sharpe, 1988), medicine (Currie, 1998), and real estate (Hyam, 1995).

Another area that has applied ADR extensively is family law. Issues of family law are inherently complex and generally involve a consideration of social and psychological factors. To a large extent, such factors have been ignored in legal processes. This is predominantly due to the fact that legal proceedings are designed to depersonalise disputants through concepts of "neutrality" and "precedence". In contrast, ADR processes aim to allow parties to be more involved in their case. They attempt to meet the emotional needs of parties and provide a flexible, less confrontational process than the traditional court system (David, 1991). ADR practices have been used successfully in family law where these more subjective emotional needs are more obvious, for example, in the areas of divorce settlement (Davies & Clarke, 1991), domestic violence (Nicholson, 1995), child custody disputes (Swain, 1995), grievance procedures in family law (Theobald, 1988), and equal access to justice for women (Mack, 1995).
3.3 Concerns about the legalisation of conflict resolution

While many authors are still coming to terms with the full impact of the decentralisation of legal processes and the broad acceptance of ADR practices, some commentaries have started to raise important questions about the philosophical underpinnings and processes of ADR, and the effect of the legalisation of conflict resolution. This is a refreshing change from the almost evangelical nature of most articles that, until recently, have unequivocally proclaimed the superiority of ADR. The current section details the emerging philosophical critiques of ADR, with particular reference to the relationship between legal theory and social theory, and legal discourse.

3.3.1 Philosophical critiques of alternative dispute resolution

One approach to a critical analysis of ADR has been to evaluate the claims normally made about the process: that it is less expensive, faster and more convenient. For example, a study by Kornhauser (1992) demonstrated that in a large proportion of ADR cases, the costs of ADR in fact exceed the cost of court based settlements. Similarly, Street (1990) critically examined the nature of expert appraisals in ADR, and concluded that the use of these processes do not make ADR practices faster or more convenient, rather they simply represent a repeal of traditional legal processes.

The main focus of recent critiques of ADR practices is whether ADR really does provide better access to “justice” than the traditional legal system. This issue was debated by Chesterman (1993) who provoked further reviews of such claims. Herriot (1994) went so far as to examine whether ADR practices could be construed as a threat to democracy. Other authors have proposed that more critical analyses of ADR practices are required. For example:
"... A disturbing trend is developing in the common law systems of GB, the US, Canada, Australia, & New Zealand: that of "privatizing" justice by way of so-called alternative dispute resolution procedures, eg, counseling, mediation, & conciliation ..." (Scutt, 1988, p. 503).

Scutt (1988) presented a negative view of advances in the legalisation of conflict resolution procedures through ADR for two reasons. These were directed primarily at the use of ADR in family law, equal opportunity and anti-discrimination cases, and neighbourhood disputes. First, it was argued that ADR procedures fail to adequately acknowledge "power differentials" between the disputing parties (particularly between husbands and wives or males and females involved in other intimate relationships).

Second, Scutt claimed that ADR practices have the effect of handling disputes "behind closed doors". This practice therefore hides from public view the structural inequalities in society that facilitate disputes. This issue is commonly argued from a feminist perspective. In particular, Scutt described the irony of what she called the "privatization of justice" that is occurring just when women are becoming increasingly outspoken about "... sexual harassment and abuse, criminal assault by intimate associates, job discrimination, and unequal divorce settlements ..."(p. 503). She concluded that authors need to be more aware of the broader political, social and psychological effects of ADR, as such processes may have the effect of "depoliticizing feminist efforts". Similarly, Regehr (1994) argued that the use of ADR in child custody mediation is bound to disadvantage women because it creates an illusion that they have an equal voice in the relationship, but does not provide skills or support for them to use in future negotiations.

Some feminist authors claim that ADR and mediation can be used effectively for the advancement of women's issues. Indeed, ADR techniques were originally met with a
degree of enthusiasm by feminists because they were theoretically anti-adversarial and based on a relationship model. For example, Leitch (1986) used concepts from family therapy to develop a feminist-oriented mediation model. Also, Cooks and Hale (1992) argued that a feminist approach to ADR has led to the significant empowerment of female mediators. More recently, Edwards (1997) proposed a "feminist-informed mediation process", providing an overview of the seven issues commonly raised in feminist critiques of family mediation. These were: protection of women and children's rights; spousal and child support; equal distribution of marital property; negotiations; empowerment; custody; and spousal abuse. Edwards concluded that each of these categories can be effectively addressed using a feminist perspective, leading to significant benefits for women.

In one of the first major critical accounts of ADR, Harrington (1985) identified a series of contradictions in ADR's publicity, rhetoric, and methods of self-evaluation, arguing that such issues seriously challenge many of the knowledge claims of ADR. On the same theme, Hofrichter (1987) argued from a socialist perspective that neighbourhood justice centers have the effect of discouraging people from "political organizing". However, these critiques are not shared by all authors. In light of these contrary accounts, Delgado (1988, p. 145) concluded that ADR is effective primarily because its methodology "avoid(s) disputes and social problems".

In a more recent account that discussed the implications of the criticisms described above, Harrington (1991) asserted that ADR was constructed from the legal realist tradition. She argued that while justice in the lower courts included ADR processes of arbitration, mediation, and negotiation they were in danger of becoming normative
practices, and hence institutionalised. The implication is that with institutionalisation, the proposed benefits of ADR practices (e.g., faster, less confrontational, less expensive, etc.) will be compromised. Harrington also raised questions about the direction of research, stating that ADR research has "... an overriding concern with policy formation, in which rights are fixed and formal, and insufficient attention to social relations and institutional authority ..." (p. 26).

Therefore the original tenets of the ADR movement should be reviewed. These practices were initially proposed as an alternative to the formal rational approach of the contemporary legal system (Teubner, 1983; Weber, 1954). The formal rational approach requires that cases be decided by applying logically consistent abstract rules that are independent of normative criteria (Weber, 1954). ADR was introduced to address cases that were more normative than legal. Therefore, many practitioners and philosophically aware authors claim that it is of critical importance to analyse the possible effects of institutionalisation on the mediation process (Harrington, 1991).

Finally, in summary of such critiques, Palumbo, Musheno and Hallett (1994) wrote that while ADR has been "tremendously successful", programs have fast become "institutionalised in various states". It is now common for authors to question how ADR is being politically constructed, by whom, and with what consequences. The implication being that ADR, while appearing to be a liberating, more holistic approach to the resolution of conflict, is more accurately described as an extension of state control (Menkel-Meadow, 1984; 1985). This gives rise to important questions about the nature of the relationship between the law and social theory.
3.3.2 Legal theory and social theory

Legal theory and social theory were once closely related. Scheppelle (1994) provided a history of the relationship between jurisprudence and sociology, writing that the great sociologists (Marx, Durkheim and Weber) had “strong and deep ties to the law”. He wrote that for these social theorists the law represented a system of ideas in:

"... rational legality, ideology, doctrine. Law was important because it provided an intellectual framework within which bureaucrats, capitalists, and common people thought about and acted in the social world ..." (p. 385).

Thus the fundamental assumptions of the law were deeply embedded in social theory. A law and order model reflected these assumptions and was therefore readily accepted by social institutions. This provides evidence for the ongoing relationship between social and legal theory.

In attempts to understand the growing interest in ADR, it is possible that the relationship between social and legal theory may again provide some insight. Harrington (1991) claimed that the rise in ADR is neither random nor indeterminate, but is a socially constructed form of legal ideology called “informalism”. This is based on the Legal Realist conception of legality, which highlights the contrast between legal theory and what happens in the actual practice of the law. That is, the gap between what the legal rule books prescribe and the behaviour of lawyers. Harrington’s approach asserts that law accentuates the divisions between ideal legal principles and the reality of law that is grounded in action, and then integrates these differences into normative practice. An excellent example of this is the growth of informal plea bargaining which is now accepted as a “natural and inevitable phenomenon” (Harrington, 1991, p. 27).
ADR has now been integrated into the behavioural reality of the law. This is largely due to the influence of simple positivism and the commonsense humanism of Legal Realism, which is an issue that some authors have expressed considerable concern about. Harrington (1991, p. 28) states:

"... Realism explains law according to the assumptions that positivism in social science - law is what can be observed in the behaviour of individuals. These assumptions have become the commonsense view of law, taken for granted by legal scholars and legal practitioners ..."

It is also possible that the development of the ADR movement may be associated with the current crisis in contemporary legal theory. In the last decade there has been a trend toward "critical jurisprudence" which has criticised the current status of law from social, political and methodological perspectives. Critiques have come from the positions of equality and access to legal institutions (Fuller, 1969; Scheppele, 1988), feminist theory (Menkel-Meadow, 1988; Rhode, 1990) and critical race theory (Harris, 1990). It can be argued that such critical reflection about the aims and practices of law have created an excellent environment for ADR and mediation to flourish.

3.3.3 Legal discourse

From a critical perspective the law represents a societal institution that is both depersonalised and formalised. These characteristics give power and strength to the law as a method of dispute settlement. The law is portrayed as being based on "expert" judgement, and it is performed in a most impersonal manner. Thus it appears to be impartial in judgement, fair in process, and independent of societal and political forces. Of course, this idealised portrayal is unrealistic, and as a result the law has been a logical target for critical literary theory. Its claims about objectivity and stability are an obvious point of contention with postmodern thought which questions the possibility of
finding an objective truth. The resulting deconstruction of the law has led to many questions about current legal processes being able to effectively manage the resolution of conflict, both philosophically and practically.

There has also been a growing interest in “narrative jurisprudence” in both legal and social science circles. In fact, Scheppelle (1989) argued that all legal discourse can be interpreted as discursive “story telling”. This is further evidence of both the impact of postmodern thought on the legal field, and the application of methods from the humanities in legal settings. By accentuating some of the philosophical and operational deficiencies of the traditional legal system, a space has been created for alternative approaches to arise. Thus ADR has been seen by many as a new, practical technology that meets some of the aforementioned inadequacies of the traditional system. This has clearly been a significant factor in the broad acceptance of ADR throughout the legal sector. However, there have been significant concerns expressed by some legal and social theorists about the lack of critical analysis associated with the rapid acceptance of ADR. In spite of these critiques, the field has continued to grow.

3.4 Summary

In Chapter 3 the major legal influences on the modern conflict resolution movement were described. This was achieved through a description of legal approaches to the resolution of conflict in international relations through the law and order model. The ineffectiveness of the law and order approach to conflict resolution was detailed, and the interest in new, more cooperative approaches to conflict resolution were outlined. This trend was also detailed at a domestic level, through an analysis of the limitations of the hierarchical approach of the traditional legal system and the development of alternative
dispute resolution procedures. Critical accounts of legalistic approaches to conflict resolution and the rise of alternative dispute resolution were provided. The broad acceptance of alternative dispute resolution was described and it was noted that legal influences have constituted a major force in the development of the modern conflict resolution movement.
CHAPTER 4

MEDIATION

4.0 Introduction

Mediation has emerged as the most popular technique of the modern conflict resolution movement, and its development is inextricably linked to the development of the conflict resolution field. Section 4.1 describes some of the defining characteristics of mediation. The social, historical and political forces that have effected the development of mediation are detailed in Section 4.2. Following this, the institutionalisation of mediation and the public face of the mediation enterprise are described in Sections 4.3 and 4.4 respectively. Some of the issues raised in these sections are then considered briefly in Section 4.5, with particular emphasis given to the professionalisation of mediation. Sections 4.6 and 4.7 provide a review of the substantial body of research that has attempted to explain the structure and function of mediation and test its efficacy. Methodological issues pertinent to mediation research are detailed in Section 4.8. A consideration of the art and science of mediation practice is provided in Section 4.9, including details of practitioners' growing resistance to efficacy research. Finally, the chapter is summarised in Section 4.10.
4.1 Definition of mediation

The most widely applied practical technology of the new conflict resolution movement is mediation. The term mediation comes from the Latin “medius” which means to be “in the middle of”. The intermediary characteristic of mediation was emphasised by the “law and order” model of mediators as negotiators in political and international disputes. However, in the modern conflict resolution movement, mediation has become accessible at all levels of the social milieu. The essential principle underlying mediation is that an impartial third party mediator, who is not specifically concerned with the content of the conflict, assists the parties in the resolution of the conflict (Banks, 1986).

The aim of the mediation process is to assist the conflicting parties to clarify and focus on the issues in the conflict, identify their interests, and to create options in negotiating a mutually acceptable agreement. This is accomplished in an informal setting, usually with no legally imposed rules. The mediator does not have the authority to impose a solution on either party. When both parties agree on a solution, the agreement may be put in writing by the parties, the mediator, or a lawyer. If the parties are unable to reach a mutually acceptable agreement, they still have the option of taking their dispute to litigation in the court system (Boulle, 1996; Duffy & Grosch, 1991; Moore, 1986; Rahim, 1989).

In traditional legal methods of conflict resolution an arbitrator or judge makes the final decision about an issue after the disputants have presented their cases through legal representatives. A similar process occurs in the case of arbitration where the parties can present their own cases if they wish, but an arbitrator still makes the final decision about the settlement. Mediation presents an alternative to the judicial approach to the
resolution of conflict where the third party is a facilitator of negotiation between parties rather than arbitrator. In mediation the parties retain power to make their own decisions and formulate a mutually acceptable solution together (Boulle, 1996).

The informal nature of this process makes it very difficult to define exactly what mediation is, and is not. Folberg and Taylor (1984, p. 7) state that mediation "... falls along a spectrum that defies a strict definition ...". They claim that mediation is best understood as a "process" that transcends the content of the conflict that it is intended to resolve. Therefore they define mediation as:

"... the 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. Mediation is a process that emphasizes the participants’ own responsibility for making decisions that affect their lives. It is therefore a self-empowering process ..." (pp. 6-7).

The wide variability of mediator styles cause difficulty in formulating specific definitions and analysing theoretical perspectives. The third party mediator who is intervening in a dispute often has a wide variety of skills and techniques available to them. For example, mediators often utilise skills they have learned from a related area, such as counselling, in their work (Scutt, 1988). The broad multidisciplinary base of mediation and the cross-fertilisation of ideas and techniques also contribute to definitional difficulties (Fry & Bjoerkqvist, 1997; Leviton & Greenstone, 1997). In summary, mediators tend to overlap different methods in the settlement of dispute, making consistent definitions almost impossible.
4.2 The development of mediation

This section describes the development of the mediation technique from its historical roots as a pre-legal approach to dispute settlement, to the current proliferation of mediation practice as part of the modern conflict resolution movement. In particular, the social and political forces that affected its development, and the development of community justice centres, are reviewed. Following this, an overview of the breadth of mediation practice is provided.

4.2.1 The history of mediation

Some of mediation's newest proponents claim it to be a late twentieth century American invention to resolve disputes without resorting to formal litigation in the quagmire of the adversarial legal system. However, it is clear that mediation in fact takes its cue from very old pre-legal mechanisms that originated in non-western countries. Blades (1984) calls the modern form of mediation an "old art revitalized". It is difficult to ascertain the precise era when mediation began, but it is relatively safe to assume that its history is long. For example, Kramer (1963) reports that one of the earliest recorded mediations took place over 4000 years ago in Mesopotamia when a Sumerian ruler averted a war by mediating an agreement regarding the ownership of land.

According to anthropologists there is overwhelming evidence that mediation, in some form or another, was an integral part of the social regulation processes adopted by many old cultures (Folberg, 1983; Fry & Bjoerkqvist, 1997; Nader, 1969, 1980). In support of this, Barnes (1994) writes that the peace-making techniques from Samoan, Hawaiian, Laotian, Filipino, Japanese, Chinese, and Native American cultures have their basis in
mediation. Similarly, Wall and Callister (1995a) provide an outline of “Ho'oponopono” a form of mediation practiced by the Kahuna of ancient Hawaiian cultures.

While there has been some debate about its formal beginning as an organised dispute resolution mechanism, it is largely accepted that mediation was first formally implemented as part of a “social policy” in the Ming Dynasty (1368 to 1644) in what is now the People's Republic of China (Brown, 1982). During this period formal mediation processes were conducted by community leaders, and were actively encouraged as an alternative to seeking arbitration from the local magistrate. Thus, it appears that at least 600 years ago mediation processes were used to resolve a wide range of minor disputes as a community based alternative to the formal dispute settlement processes of the State (Keltner, 1987; Wall & Blum, 1991).

Mediation can also be traced to seventeenth century European jurisprudence. At that time the German jurist Johann Wolfgang Textor analysed the principles of mediation in the resolution of international disputes. He identified eight fundamental principles considered by some authors to form the basis of mediation three centuries later: (1) authority; (2) unbias; (3) agreement; (4) the obligation to accept and offer mediation; (5) the right to refuse mediation; (6) the ‘sound reasons’ requirement; (7) the limitations on agency; and (8) the legitimacy of compulsory mediation (Lind, 1992).

In the twentieth century mediation was first revitalised in non-Western countries. For example, some of the earliest and most systematic attempts to introduce the mediation principle were in communist countries through conventions like the "workers " and "community" courts of the former Soviet Union (Marshall, 1985). The community
court is central to the ideology of communism. Such courts were run by members of the local neighbourhood and involved the utilisation of simple mediation processes to negotiate the settlement of a dispute with the help of a third-party. Similar systems were established in Eastern Europe and other socialist countries (Greenhouse & Hayden, 1994; Lieberman, 1981).

These early attempts to introduce mediation processes at a community level were not without their difficulties. The community court systems in communist countries were sometimes seen as an extension of formal social control and ideological indoctrination. However, the possible manipulation of such processes are not just a trait of communist systems (Chesterman, 1993; Schepple, 1988). In recent years similar concerns have been raised about the possible corruption associated with the formalisation of mediation in Western capitalist systems. As mentioned in the previous chapter, these fears include possible exploitation of less-powerful individuals (Singer, 1979), the use of coercion (Tomasie, 1982), the expansion of state control and the denial of due process (Abel, 1982).

In Western countries mediation was originally proposed as an alternative to the formal rational approach of the contemporary legal system in the 1950s (Weber 1954). This rational approach was seen as limited and inappropriate for the subject matter of a considerable proportion of legal disputes by many political and legal theorists (e.g., Weber, 1954). However, as was outlined in the previous chapter, in countries with Anglo-American forms of law the evolution of mediation was more highly influenced by rising demands on the legal system than by political and ideological philosophies.
For example, it has been noted that the development of a social process like mediation was essential in the USA purely to cope with its excessive legalism (Lieberman, 1981).

4.2.2 Social and political influences on the modern era of mediation

While the formal processes of alternative dispute resolution were described in Chapter 3, the conflict resolution technique that has received the most attention has been mediation (Menkel-Meadow, 1995; Tomasic, 1982). Mediation was first formally introduced as a serious and viable alternative to the court process in the USA in the early 1970s (Danzig 1973; Danzig & Lowy 1975). The timing of the introduction of mediation, is socially and historically meaningful.

The 1960s and early 1970s were a time of substantial social change in the USA (and globally). During this period a "social consciousness" was emerging, leading many Americans to question some of the axioms underpinning American society. This new awareness was particularly focussed on the power of the State. For example, historical events such as the Holocaust and the nuclear arms race challenged widely held beliefs about unlimited progress and other fundamental ideals in North American culture (Collier et al., 1991). Various social and political disruptions also sparked widespread movements in the arts, humanities and social sciences that questioned the traditional assumptions associated with a modernist philosophy. It is possible therefore, that the questioning of the court system, and the resulting emphasis on a more personal and interactive procedure like mediation, was related to a broader questioning of modernist ideals.
An explanation for this change in emphasis can also be found in the emerging postmodernist literature of that time. Postmodernism emerged in response to the economic recession and political strife that pervaded the USA (Collier, Minton & Reynolds, 1991). In response, some postmodernists blamed the modern world for the ills of society, including the legal problems, and called for a return to premodernist philosophies (e.g., Nicholson & Seidman, 1995). The general rejection of modernist philosophy included the way modernist North American society dealt with conflict. There was wide condemnation of aggressive acts and the tendency to war at an international level, and grave concerns about excessive national security policies and excessive legalism at a domestic level (Marshall, 1985). Therefore, the emerging postmodernist view was a significant part of the social climate in which mediation was embraced.

In short, commentaries from a postmodern perspective seek to deconstruct and understand the current modernist beliefs about truth, knowledge, power, individualism and language (Steenbarger, 1993). Typically they challenge the modernist assumption that “reason” provides an objective foundation for knowledge. Postmodern writers also question the implicit assumption that knowledge based on reason will be necessarily socially beneficial (Collier et al., 1991). These, and related, postmodern principles question the very basis of many of our social and political institutions. For example, the structure and function of the legal systems of most Western countries are directly based on modernist principles of rational logic, neutrality, power and knowledge.

Another important socio-historical factor at this time was the birth of the Peace movement in the USA as a backlash against the Vietnam war. Protest against the
Vietnam war resulted in a significant challenge to the social and political status quo in the USA. There were many messages associated with the peace movement, including most obviously the importance of a peaceful approach to the resolution of conflict. However, there were also more subtly embedded messages, including the empowerment of individuals to make decisions independently of the State. The rapid acceptance of mediation could be seen as having been influenced by these ideas. In fact, in many parts of the world, the movement away from the court system towards mediation has been led by social and peace activists of the 1970s.

There were a variety of other aims, hopes and influences in the development of the mediation enterprise. It is now generally acknowledged that the broad acceptance of mediation was assisted and validated by the human potential movement, religious notions of pacification (Kraybill, 1982), as well as the Peace movement (Cappelletti, 1978). It was also broadly accepted that mediation would make the legal system more efficient and less expensive (Marshall, 1985). The rise of mediation was complementary to the general acceptance of "individualism" that was emerging in North America at that time (Lukes, 1984). Therefore the social, economic and political forces were aligned to support and legitimise the ongoing development of mediation.

In summary, it is clear that the social and political forces of the time were suitable for the development of mediation and the new conflict resolution movement. Contributing to this was the general rejection of modernist philosophies in intellectual circles, and the development of the peace movement. Coupled with this, the frustration with excessive legalism, and a general dissatisfaction with restrictive government policy across all
segments of North American society, created a fertile environment in which mediation could grow.

4.2.3 Community justice centres

In the mid 1970s "community mediation" was the most significant area of application of mediation principles in North America. McGillis and Mullen (1977) claimed that community mediation had its origins in three seminal academic papers of the mid 1970s. First, they cited the work of Richard Danzig who argued for a "community moot" model of justice. This idea was borrowed from the systems of justice used by small tribal societies where the community was involved in decision making, and consensus decisions were reached. Second, they cited Eric Fisher's "community court" model, influenced by the activities in socialist countries, and proposed as an extension of the legal system rather than as a complete alternative to it. Third, McGillis and Mullen cited the "dispute resolution center" model suggested by Frank Sander who argued that dispute resolution centres should inhabit the middle ground between Danzig's "community moot" and Fisher's "community court". It was therefore suggested that "dispute resolution centers" should operate in conjunction with community representatives to avoid the possible political coercion inherent in the community court model. However, it was also argued that dispute resolution centers should not be completely under community control, as proposed in the community moot approach (Sander, 1984).

Despite considerable legal resistance, and some community resistance (Auerbach, 1983), the United States Department of Justice established an experimental program of three "Neighbourhood Justice Centres" in 1976 and 1977 (Marshall, 1985; Sander,
1984). They were operated by mediators who were local lay volunteers, given approximately 40 hours training before beginning their responsibilities as mediators (Sander, 1984). The resulting structure was a free, community based method for resolving conflict that had minimal reliance on formal legal processes. This was seen as a landmark victory for the conflict resolution movement and signalled the beginning of community based mediation in North America.

The experimental programs proved to be successful and subsequently many hundreds of community mediation centres were established in the USA. Most centres have a mix of caseloads, receiving cases both directly from the parties involved who choose to come to mediation, and also via referrals from criminal justice agencies (Carnevale, Putnam, Conlon, & O'Connor, 1991; Duffy & Thomson, 1992). Community mediation centres vary considerably with respect to their attachment to the formal legal system. In some places they have become an integral part of existing legal processes and are closely related to the court system. In other places they operate in relative isolation from the formal legal system. In all cases the move towards mediation has been particularly effective in the resolution of relationship difficulties and neighbourhood "squabbles" (Marshall, 1985).

Success with these community mediation programs led to the formalisation of many of the programs that had been previously designed to train community volunteers, and this led to the birth of mediation as a profession. Further discussion of training and other professional issues in mediation are included in Chapter 6. In addition to the growing interest in community mediation there was considerable interest in mediation as a tool for use in the management of business disputes. While this issue has been reviewed in
Chapter 3, it is worth noting the significant cross-fertilisation of ideas between community and business applications of mediation. In the late 1970s labour relations was probably the most significant field of application of mediation in the USA (apart from the community mediation programs). This was enhanced by the fact that many community mediators learned to apply their skills for business applications (Getman, 1979). Subsequently the general technique of mediation emerged as a popular choice to augment the traditional court system in many fields.

4.2.4 The breadth of mediation practice

While the growing interest in and applications of mediation continued to expand in North America, other countries were also quick to embrace these concepts. This was perhaps most notable in the UK, where early uses of mediation focused primarily on applications in the field of labour relations. However, with the growing success of mediation techniques for community issues in the USA, practitioners in the UK also began using mediation in this domain. Therefore, mediation practices in the UK expanded to include the use of mediation in general community-based mediation centres (mostly reliant on referrals from the courts), decisions over custody of children during divorce settlements, and victim-offender reconciliation programs (Smith, 1995; Van Slyck, Newland & Stern, 1992). While victim-offender programs can also be credited as originating in the USA, they have been particularly well developed and utilised extensively in the UK (Marshall, 1985, 1995; Umbreit, 1995) and New Zealand (Galaway, 1995).

Victim-offender reconciliation programs involve bringing together victims and offenders, (whether prosecuted or not), for mediation after a crime or offence has been
committed. This application was particularly interesting as it accentuated, for the first time, the therapeutic and affective benefits of mediation. The bringing together of "victims" and "offenders" for the purposes of mediation implies a therapeutic gain for the "victim" and expected affective and behavioural changes in the "offender". This represents a significant change in the focus of mediation practices. The possible therapeutic benefits of mediation identify it as a tool to be used by practitioners from “helping” professions. This issue is central to understanding some of the current difficulties in the conflict resolution field and will be discussed in depth in Chapter 6.

The use of mediation in situations where a therapeutic gain is desirable (e.g., in relationship counselling or divorce mediation) corresponds with the emergence of psychological definitions for mediation and conflict that emphasise affective factors.

In 1980, Community Justice Centres were established in Sydney, Australia. These community mediation services were based on the successful USA models, and operated primarily within the legal system (Tillett, 1991). Significant developments in the use of mediation for business in Australia have also been made by the Australian Commercial Disputes Centre based in Sydney (Fulton, 1989). This service offers a wide variety of conflict resolution processes, focusing specifically on mediation for business clients. The development of mediation in Australia took a similar route to that in the UK and USA, and is now a burgeoning industry of broad application and appeal.

Mediation has been used to manage conflict and resolve disputes in many areas. The most substantial are: public sector labour mediation (see Lewin, Feuille and Kochan (1977) and Maggioli (1985) for reviews); organisational management (see Lewicki, Weiss and Lewin (1992) and Wall and Callister (1995b) for reviews); community
mediation (see Duffy, Grosch, and Olczak (1991) and Ray (1981, 1982) for reviews); domestic violence (see Thoennes, Salem and Pearson (1995) for a review); and, divorce and family mediation (see Emery and Wyer (1987), Hysjulien, Wood, Benjamin and Andrew (1994) and Kressel, Frontera, Forlenza, Butler and Fish (1994) for reviews).

Anecdotal evidence for the increasing popularity of mediation can also be found in the increased use of the word in the language of popular culture. It is now very common for the term “mediation” to be mentioned in the media, in the workplace, and in everyday conversation. For example, “mediation” was recently introduced as the method of dispute settlement for racial vilification cases between Australian Rules Football players by the Australian Football League’s players tribunal. This perhaps represents the ultimate acceptance by popular culture in Australia. In recent months, several high profile cases have publicised the use of mediation for the resolution of racial discrimination disputes. This has introduced the term “mediation” to a very broad cross-section of the community and is clear evidence that mediation has now entered the public discourse in Australia.

It is also important to recognise the substantial contributions of mediation to international relations, as explained in Chapter 2 (see Touval and Zartman (1985) for a review). However, it is clear that the somewhat drawn out and unamiable mediation processes that were traditionally practiced by politicians, diplomats and international lawyers are now the property of the masses. The focus has shifted from international relations to the management of simpler, more common disputes. This is further evidence that the traditional “law and order” based model of mediation originally utilised in the negotiations of international relations has been replaced by Burton’s (e.g.,
1990) concept of a “needs and interests” model of mediation which is more relevant to everyday disputes.

4.3 The institutionalisation of mediation

In the preceding sections it was argued that the conflict resolution movement, and the specific technique of mediation, have developed in a historical context in which they were very likely to succeed. The broad acceptance of mediation as the most widely used tool of the conflict resolution movement was indeed rapid. However, mediation did not progress in a “scientific” manner. A positivist approach to applying a practical technique such as mediation would proclaim the need for a theoretical and empirical research base for practical techniques. This was clearly not the case for the practice of mediation. In contrast, once the mediation technique was identified as an alternative to the traditional conflict resolution methods of the legal system, it was readily embraced and actively encouraged with only minimal reflection about the validity, reliability or effectiveness of the mediation process. The mediation movement was viewed as a revolutionary change to the way conflict could be resolved. There were an overwhelming number of logical arguments that supported the use of mediation, and while anecdotal evidence was amassed, critical analysis was minimal.

As is the case with the development of many fields, (e.g., see Ghoulson, Shadish, Neimeyer and Houts (1989) for an account of the development of the psychology of science, and in particular the field of personal construct theory), mediation invented and defined itself in familiar ways. The current section provides an overview of the development of mediation through various professional activities and resources, including conferences, professional associations, research grants, academic training
programs, journals, and books. It is proposed that these customary processes have provided a degree of validity and legitimacy to the mediation technique, and have contributed to the institutionalisation of the conflict resolution field.

4.3.1 Conferences

Conferences about a particular area of inquiry tend to be a defining point in the development of a field (Ghoulson et al., 1989). In the case of mediation, this was initiated through communication networks that grew to be formalised when newsletters about specific areas of mediation emerged in different parts of the world and informal meetings between interested groups of people led to conferences being proposed (Abelson & Levi, 1985). Initially conferences were organised in broad areas and subsequently, as the field became more defined, in specific areas of mediation application. Early conferences on conflict resolution were said to have been organised by religious organisations such as “Friends”, a Quaker group, and “Pugwash”, a social activism network (Doob, 1975). Additionally, government institutions interested in the use of mediation in labour-management confrontations organised conferences (Vroom & Yetton, 1973). The involvement of such groups is evidence for the diverse practice oriented interest, rather than research orientated interest, in the development of this field. In more recent years conferences have predominantly been convened by the various professional associations relevant to the field. This signifies the bonding together of various original influences in the field (e.g., the peace movement and religious ideals) and is evidence for the developing professionalisation of the field.
4.3.2 Professional associations

The formation of professional associations strengthens and validates a developing field, giving political authority and a unified front for its workers. In 1973 the Society for Professionals in Dispute Resolution (SPIDR) was inaugurated in the USA (Barrett, 1997). This is the oldest professional organisation for mediators in the USA. Its original charter was to support members of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service who worked to resolve industrial and public employee disputes. In the early 1980s SPIDR broadened its boundaries to include other areas of mediation such as family and community mediation. At this time in the USA two other associations, the Family Mediation Association and the Academy of Family Mediation, were also formally established (Pruitt & Kressel, 1985).

In the UK the Forum for Initiatives in Reparation and Mediation (FIRM) was founded as an umbrella organisation for the various mediation and conflict resolution services offered. In Australia, the Australian Dispute Resolution Association (ADRA) dominates these areas. This was initiated in the late 1980s through the amalgamation of various state based groups that had similar aims and resulted in creating a broader discipline base and growing legitimacy for the field. It should be noted that associations designed specifically for practitioners engaged in mediation practices from specific occupational groups (e.g., Lawyers Engaged in Alternative Dispute Resolution - LEADR) also exist. The Conflict Resolution Network is another association of primary significance in Australia. This organisation was founded in 1986 under the auspices of the United Nations Association of Australia. It utilises an applied, peace orientated approach to conflict resolution, and is widely accepted as the central body for training and technique development in Australia.
These professional structures establish a network for parties involved in the field and provide a vehicle for their political agency. In recent years this has been particularly important as the field has become more professionalised. Professional associations have the role of controlling the dissemination of information and making public comment on issues of political significance. They also provide the reference point for professional standards and training programs. This establishes a power base for the field and lends further credibility to the mediation process.

4.3.3 Research grants

Another significant factor in the development of any field is the establishment of research programs. Research in itself is validating, and research funding is further evidence of the broad acceptance of the field both at an academic level, and by the social milieu. In making funds available for research an acceptance of the goals and benefits of the research area by the funding agency is implied.

In the USA, the National Institute for Dispute Resolution was established as a private funding organisation in 1983. The aim of this body was to fund research into the techniques and practice of dispute resolution methods like mediation (Pruitt & Kressel, 1985). Similar research funding trends have subsequently been supported by the Law and Social Sciences Program of the National Science Foundation (USA). The allocation of funds for research from these powerful academic bodies signifies the acceptance of mediation into mainstream academia, and further validates the conflict resolution field. In Australia in 1997, funds for research were offered by the Australian Commercial Dispute Centre and The Law Society. This demonstrates the acceptance of mediation
by arguably the two most powerful sectors of the community, that is the professions of business and law.

4.3.4 Academic training programs

Specific academic training programs in mediation were first offered in the USA under the auspices of academic centres such as The Center for Conflict Resolution at George Mason University (Burton & Sandole, 1986). Similar training programs are now also available in other parts of the world, creating a pathway toward professionalisation. Another popular trend in recent years is for topics in conflict resolution, alternative dispute resolution and mediation, to be offered as part of mainstream studies in law, politics and the social sciences in many Universities throughout the world (David, 1991). In addition, negotiation theory and mediation skills are now being taught to university students all over the world using the internet (McKersie & Fonstad, 1997)

In light of the growing academic approach to training, it is reasonable to propose that in a few years time the volunteer training programs, responsible for training the large majority of current mediators, will be deemed unsuitable. Instead they will be replaced by formal academic professional training programs. While this has been cause for considerable concern among existing practitioners who do not necessarily accept the need for university endorsed training (see also Chapter 6), it is further evidence for the broad institutionalisation of mediation.

4.3.5 Journals

The development of journals is considered evidence of the standing of a scholarly discipline and therefore further advances the legitimacy of the field. That is, as “peer
reviewed” journals are established, so too is epistemic standing. In the case of mediation, this was first achieved by acceptance of mediation within existing journals. The *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, which was initiated in 1957, originally focussed on the use of third party intervention in political and international conflicts. With the advent of interest in more popularised uses of third party intervention through mediation, it began including more community orientated research in the 1970s. Other related journals that focussed more overtly on peace also responded to the new movement in mediation in similar ways. For example, the *Journal of Peace Research* (initiated in 1964), the *Journal of Peace Science* (initiated in 1973), and *Conflict Management and Peace Science* (initiated in 1980) also now focus on the use of mediation and various related peace building practices in communities.

The first journal with a specific focus on mediation was *Mediation Quarterly*, which began in 1983. *Mediation Quarterly* is the official journal of the USA based Academy of Family Mediators, and focuses specifically on family, divorce and community mediation. The *Negotiation Journal* began in 1985 and focuses on the specific uses of mediation for negotiation purposes. While this journal is reasonably theoretical, it is also very “process” orientated, seeking evidence for how mediation works. The other major journal in the mediation field is *Dispute Resolution*. This journal originally began in 1946 as the *Arbitration Journal*, but changed its name to *Dispute Resolution* in 1993, reflecting change in the field. The journal is currently published by the American Arbitration Association and focuses on both general and legal applications of mediation.

Other less well known peer reviewed journals have become popular in recent years. Such journals are most often published by professional bodies in the country of their
origin, in an effort to provide a forum for their members to share both research findings and practical advances. In doing so, they further assist the trend towards the professionalisation of mediation. For example, *Mediation* began in 1985 as the official journal of Mediation UK and FIRM, both professional associations for mediators in the UK. Similarly, the *Australian Dispute Resolution Journal* was initiated in 1990 as the journal for the Australian Dispute Resolution Association.

In response to these developments, and as a further sign of the general acceptance of mediation as a legitimate area of inquiry, other established and well respected journals have also recognised the growing interest in conflict resolution and mediation. Many social, political and psychological journals now accept articles for publication that focus on mediation research and some journals have devoted whole issues to the area. For example, the *Journal of Social Issues* devoted an entire issue to "The Mediation of Social Conflict" in 1985, and simultaneously in the Spring (northern hemisphere) of 1988, *Policy Studies Journal* released a "Symposium on Alternative Dispute Resolution and Public Policy", and *Communication Research* published a special issue entitled "Communication, Conflict, and Dispute Resolution".

Within psychology, the *Annual Review of Psychology* included a fifty page review of "Negotiation and Mediation" in 1992, and *Australian Psychologist* devoted an issue to "The Psychology of Peace and Conflict" in 1993. In particular, the inclusion of the review in the *Annual Review of Psychology* is a substantial achievement for mediation advocates. This further legitimises mediation and also asserts the discipline of psychology's broad acceptance of the field.
4.3.6 Books

In addition to the developing academic literature, a substantial number of practice orientated works were published in the late 1970s, and similar texts have continued to be published. These have varied from evangelistic accounts proclaiming the many and varied benefits of mediation, to "how to" guides. Practitioner manuals (e.g., Kessler, 1978; Underhill, 1981), and books espousing effective mediation methods (e.g., Fisher & Brown, 1988; Folberg & Taylor, 1984; Mitchell & Banks, 1996) were particularly numerous. Over the course of time the multidisciplinary appeal of mediation has become apparent. Practitioners in the areas of psychology, law, counselling, social work, politics and many more, have produced texts about the usefulness of mediation for their profession (see Fry & Bjoerkqvist (1997) for a review).

4.3.7 Summary of the institutionalisation of mediation

With so many professional groups involved, and so many established and potential areas of application, the field convinced both its own members and the community of its legitimacy. The processes listed above (Sections 4.3.1 through 4.3.6) demonstrate a methodical approach to establishing the validity of mediation which, as noted in Section 4.3, is also common in other new fields. The resulting institutionalisation of mediation further contributed to its legitimacy. However, it should be noted that the rapid growth and diverse applications of mediation were based predominantly on evangelistic accounts of the field, rather than on empirical evidence. While this is hardly remarkable, it is clearly not in keeping with the assumptions of a traditional empirical approach which asserts that application should be based in theory and research. However, the emergence of conferences, professional associations and academic training programs have given an erroneous impression of scientific validity. It was not
until recent years (late 1980s - 1990s) that any serious attempts were made to scientifically validate applications of mediation. While the research in this area will be reviewed shortly, it is pertinent to first consider the public face of mediation, and review its knowledge claims.

4.4 The public face of the mediation enterprise

There are many parties involved in the mediation field that have vested interests in mediation being accepted as the preferred method of conflict resolution. In this sense mediation has become “big business”. Mediation practices have entered the mainstream of community, judicial, business and social dispute resolution, and the claims of its proponents aim to legitimise mediation. Various knowledge claims, rhetorical assertions, and exaggerated accounts of mediation effectiveness are presented to the public in order to maintain its legitimacy. Consequently the “public face” of mediation deserves examination.

Exaggerated and emotive accounts of mediation effectiveness are particularly evident in the promotion of mediation for business purposes. The possible financial benefits for companies are often cited. The following quotations from the dustcover of Acland’s (1990) book are illustrative of this point:

“… In 1988, 61 leading US corporations saved an estimated (US)$49 million in legal costs by employing Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) techniques, including mediation…”

and

“… In the United States, several hundred corporations, including many from Fortune 500, have pledged themselves to avoid litigation whenever possible by using mediation and other ADR approaches…”
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In an attempt to convince the reader of the value of mediation, corporations like Coca Cola, IBM, Ford, Sony and Rank Xerox were listed by Acland (1990, p. 14) in an attempt to further legitimise the field, stating that "... by 1990 there were over 600 Alternative Dispute Resolution companies in North America ..." offering mediation as a business service. He cited the Seattle based company US Arbitration and Mediation Inc., claiming they turn over millions of dollars per annum with their handling of over 400 cases a month through more than 30 offices situated throughout the USA. Acland also proclaims the high success rate of mediation, using the example of the Australian Commercial Dispute Centre which also offers mediation services to business, claiming that they have successfully resolved 139 out of 140 cases submitted to them. Even the title of Acland’s (1990) best selling book - *A sudden outbreak of commonsense* - is testimony to the powerful rhetoric that is a part of the mediation movement. It suggests the self promoting nature of the movement. Embedded in the rhetoric of mediation are assumptions about the many advantages of mediation that make it the "common sense" answer to the resolution of conflict.

Therefore a review of the supposed advantages of mediation from the popularised literature, upon which the public face of mediation is based, is perhaps most effectively and safely conducted by considering arguments and assertions as "rhetorical devices". This is a term borrowed specifically from the field of discourse analysis, and asserts that there is a rhetorical component to the knowledge claims of the mediation enterprise that aims to legitimise and justify the mediation process. It should be noted that this perspective does not discount that there may be some realistic basis to the proposed benefits and knowledge claims of mediation.
In recent years a plethora of books, user guides and manuals have been published that promote the many advantages of mediation. When these accounts refer to the "advantages of mediation", the subtext implies that they are referring to the advantages of mediation over traditional court based dispute settlement processes. The many resources that have flooded the market are not typically scholarly works based on theoretical methods or outcome research. Rather they comprise a popularised literature that is based on anecdotal evidence and is predominantly practice related.

In general these works portray mediation as a revolutionary practice that can be used to solve all problems that are based on conflict. The purpose of these resources range from spreading the word about the advantages of mediation and promoting the use of mediation, to encouraging the reader to become a mediator in their personal and professional lives. The proposed advantages of mediation commonly used to establish its epistemic validity, include the following assertions: mediation is flexible; mediation is cost effective; mediation is time efficient; mediation is user friendly; mediation builds relationships; mediation values emotions; and, mediation leads to empowerment. The following eight subsections present an overview of these propositions.

4.4.1 Mediation is flexible

One of the most frequently emphasised advantages of mediation is its proposed flexibility. Proponents of mediation argue that processes can be used for just about any sort of dispute or conflict situation. For example:

"... Other than criminal matters, which are generally accepted as best dealt with in the traditional court-based manner, there are virtually no other forms of conflict which cannot be dealt with by mediation on at least some occasions ..." (Acland, 1990, p. 12).
The broad areas of application of mediation are supported by the assertion that mediation processes can vary with respect to their level of formality. It is commonly argued that mediation can range from the very basic and informal processes of simple problem solving, to very complex formal procedures that are akin to legal processes (e.g., Tillett, 1991). Central to these arguments are underlying notions of freedom from the rigid practices of legal process and increased involvement of the disputing parties in mediation.

These assertions of flexibility are significantly enhanced by the declaration that the mediation processes that are used in most forms of community, individual and business mediation, are in fact voluntary. Parties to a dispute usually enter the mediation by choice. While they are assisted by a mediator who acts as a facilitator, rather than as an "adjudicator", they choose how much information they reveal and finally decide on an agreement for themselves (Cornelius, Faire & Hall, 1994). Most accounts of the voluntary nature of mediation are usually accompanied by a series of anecdotal examples of great mediation successes, which reinforce the notion that mediation was the "right" voluntary choice to make. It is also common to read accounts claiming that when someone is unhappy in a conflict situation, they only have themselves to blame if they do not choose mediation.

In mediation, disputants are also free to leave the process at any time. This is juxtaposed with traditional court based dispute settlement procedures where legal rules ensure the continuation of processes. There are potential difficulties with such an open system. For example, actually getting parties to voluntarily mediate, and dealing with ongoing communication problems can be a difficulty that is overcome by the imposed
procedures of the court system. In this event, proponents of mediation would argue that if the mediation is not successful, or parties refuse to cooperate and complete the process, formal litigation procedures are available. The notion of a “fallback position” contributes to the “what have you got to lose” rhetoric that is often associated with mediation.

4.4.2 Mediation builds relationships

The public face of mediation is also endorsed by claims that mediation preserves, builds and improves relationships between parties involved in a dispute (e.g., Boulle, 1996; Cornelius & Faire, 1989; Haynes, 1981; Kreidler, 1984). This assertion is supported with arguments against the formal dispute settlement used by the legal system. Most accounts claim that the adversarial nature of litigation is absent from the “cooperative” processes of mediation. Another claim is that mediation processes focus on present and future relations between parties, rather than on past events or actions as has been the case with traditional legal processes that utilise the historical institution of "precedent" (de Bono, 1985). This assists the portrayal of mediation as the “progressive” and “modern” way to address conflict.

In accounts that focus on the benefits of mediation for relationships, the so called "win-lose" basis of most traditional forms of dispute settlement is usually described in considerable detail. This is achieved through the use of emotive examples that outline various situations where an ongoing relationship between disputants is essential. Commonly used examples include: (1) child custody disputes - where divorcing parents need to agree on the custody arrangements for the well being of the children;
(2) business relationships - where an ongoing partnership or cooperative solution would be more financially beneficial than an aggressive, mutually harmful dispute; and,

(3) community conflicts (e.g., racial) - where an ongoing relationship between disputants is vital if disputants plan to remain living in the same neighbourhood.

Further examples of these tendencies are provided by Cornelius et al. (1994), Landau, Bartoletti and Mesbur (1987) and, Moore (1986).

Implicit to these examples is the general assumption that mediation is superior to litigation because it avoids the probable “mud-slinging”, public exposure and potential discrediting that disputants risk in a court case that is most often open to the public. Obviously this assumption cannot be proven (an issue not raised by most proponents of mediation), but at face value it is a convincing argument. However a number of academic authors who have raised concerns about the potential privacy of mediation processes. For example, Scutt (1988) is concerned that mediation practices have the effect of handling disputes “behind closed doors”, thereby hiding from public view the structural inequalities in society that facilitate disputes. Further, Hofrichter (1987) argues that this could have the effect of discouraging people from addressing existing social inequalities. However as these concerns are more often raised in academic rather than public circles, it is unlikely they will have made any significant impact on the public face of mediation.

As mentioned in Chapter 3, the growth of mediation was largely in response to a crowded court system. This was primarily the result of a large number of people turning to the courts as their only mechanism of complaint (Hurst, 1981), and the fact that many of the complaints involved people who were in some sort of social relationship
(Rosenberg, 1981). It can also be argued that this overload was due to an over reliance on the modernist perspective that the "logic" and "reason" of the courts would prevail in the resolution of disputes. The mediation movement grew from a perceived need to more efficiently resolve conflicts that are generated from the intensity and duration of intimate relationships. Therefore the inherent aim of mediation has been to rebuild and improve these relationships.

Proponents of mediation assert that because of the ongoing nature of most relationships, in order for there to be lasting change (e.g., "second order change" as described by cybernetic theory, see Trappel, 1983), it is essential that both parties come away from the resolution of their dispute with a measure of satisfaction (Cornelius et al., 1994). That is, the notion of a "win-win" approach has now become the most powerful part of the conflict resolution rhetoric. Many authors (e.g., Acland, 1990; de Bono, 1985), contrast this with adversarial approaches to conflict resolution (e.g., litigation or arbitration) where it is likely that one or more of the parties will inevitably be dissatisfied with the outcome.

In traditional legal processes the final verdict of the court is absolute. There is a clear winner and a clear loser, and the disputants themselves contribute little towards the solution. Consequently, pro-mediation authors argue that lasting change and improved relations are unlikely to occur with litigation. Mediation is therefore presented as the logical alternative that will constructively improve existing relationships. Many authors extrapolate a rather self-fulfilling argument that conflict should be seen as an opportunity for change, or as an opportunity for improving relationships. That is, conflict is a constructive rather than destructive process (e.g., Derlega & Grzlak, 1982;
Deutsch, 1991). The therapeutic implications of this assertion (e.g., personal growth and change) are also used in the justification of mediation processes.

4.4.3 Mediation is time effective

In descriptions of the time benefits of using mediation, proponents usually compare the mediation process with the often very long, drawn out nature of conflict resolution via the court system. Mediation is presented as a self directed process where the parties involved determine their own time for the mediation process, rather than having it dictated by the courts. Long court waiting lists and lengthy settlement processes are often cited to support the advantages of mediation (e.g., Cornelius et al., 1994; Haynes, 1981). The speed of mediation is emphasised with accounts of fast resolutions where disputants agree to mediate and the dispute is resolved within days and sometimes hours (e.g., Moore, 1986).

It is also argued that the time taken for different forms of dispute resolution is inextricably linked to the goals of the dispute resolution processes. Proponents of mediation assert that the goal of legal counsel is to best protect his/her client in an adversarial exchange. This takes a great deal of preparation time and can lead to lengthy delays due to organisational complexities. The goal of the mediator, on the other hand, is to provide an opportunity for the disputants to resolve the dispute to their own satisfaction, whatever that might be. With the goal being settlement, rather than protection, it is argued that the mediation process is much faster than traditional legal processes (Rogers & McEwen, 1994).
The issues involved are less clear than such arguments would propose. For example, some authors admit that the preparation times for mediation and court can be similar (e.g., Tomasic, 1982). Further, the actual amount of time that disputants spend in the mediation process can be equivalent to, or sometimes even longer than, the time requirements of a traditional court settlement. Most cases actually spend little "real" time in court. It is waiting to be scheduled for the court process that is time consuming. However, these issues are generally not included in the accounts that present the public face of the mediation enterprise.

4.4.4 Mediation is cost effective

Mediation is increasingly marketed to the public as a less expensive alternative to court based proceedings. Proponents of mediation argue that mediation is less expensive because it is faster, and because it does not necessarily involve lawyers. Convincing accounts of the reasons for mediation being less costly than litigation point out that only large corporations and wealthy individuals retain access to courts as a forum in which to address disputes (e.g., Acland, 1990; Rogers & McEwen, 1994). That is, ‘justice’ is out of the price range of most people. Mediation is therefore presented as a more economically viable option for a whole range of clients (Boulle, 1996). While there is probably some truth regarding the expense of legal processes, these claims are often exaggerated and sensationalised by using extreme cases as examples. The result has been the development of very effective and emotional arguments supporting the use of mediation.

It is important to note the general view in popular culture that professionals, including legal professionals, charge exorbitantly for their services. Many pro-mediation accounts
emphasise that expensive legal fees are not relevant to mediation. This has been a powerful point of leverage in promoting mediation to the general public. For example, advertisements are common place in the USA, including slogans such as: "Don’t be ripped off by the law - try mediation. You’ve got nothing to lose and everything to gain". The public acceptance of mediation is facilitated by these practices.

4.4.5 Mediation is user friendly

A number of reasons are commonly offered in support of the premise that mediation is user friendly. For example, mediation is proposed to be more accessible to people than litigation because there are no lengthy waiting lists. It is also emphasised that mediation is not based on the intricate rules and inflexibility of the court system, and many authors assert that mediation excludes the "pomp and ceremony" of the courts. For example:

"... No wigs; no gowns; no rigmerole; no set times and places. Even the most hassle-averse disputant can think about sorting out that problem which has been rumbling on for so long ..." (Acland, 1990, p. 23).

Proponents of mediation claim it uses plain language and is "jargon" free (Cornelius & Faire, 1989; Cornelius et al., 1994). While there is a definite case for this position, if the language of mediation is compared with the language of the law (that requires a very specialised and privileged understanding), it would be unreasonable to say that mediation is devoid of its own specific jargon (Fisher & Ury, 1992). Specific terms and phrases such as "win-win solutions", "brainstorming", "separating the people from the problem", and "developing your BATNA" (Best Alternative to a Negotiated Agreement), are difficult for people to understand unless they are involved in the conflict resolution field.
Perhaps the most convincing of the arguments for the "user-friendliness" of mediation is the claim that disputants find mediation less intimidating than court processes. Proponents of mediation usually claim that this issue is central to the aims of mediation. For example, Danzig and Lowy (1975) claim that the primary objective of mediation is the resolution of the dispute, not the establishment of facts, the discovery of guilt or innocence, or the determination of responsibility. This is also commonly emphasised by arguments that mediation is less formal and is less threatening than court based conflict resolution (Cornelius et al., 1994; Irving & Benjamin, 1987; Rogers & McEwen, 1994).

Most pro-mediation accounts add that while it is common for disputants to experience high levels of stress and anxiety during conflicts, court processes have the potential to make the conflict situation even more debilitating and dehumanising (e.g., Irving & Benjamin, 1987). It is argued that the reduction in the level of angst and the attention to emotions, which is characteristic of mediation, tends to reduce the effect of any power imbalance between the parties. This apparently frees the disputants to negotiate more assertively and effectively, and the consequent settlements are therefore supposed to be frequently fairer compromises (Duffy & Thomson, 1992).

An alternative proposition is that anxiety cannot be avoided. While the goal of mediation may be to create a user friendly environment where there is less formality and therefore less anxiety, it can also be argued that some anxiety is an unavoidable part of any conflict situation (Bolton, 1987). This particularly applies when the disputants themselves have to present their side of the argument, which is the case in most mediation situations.
4.4.6 Mediation values emotions

While many of the formal definitions of conflict (refer to Chapter 2) tend not to include reference to the emotional aspects or effects of conflict, it is reasonable to claim that there is an affective component inherent in all conflicts. It is likely that the repression of the affective aspects of conflict by traditional legal processes are a vestige of positivist and behaviourist approaches to conflict and conflict resolution that neglected to focus on "internal" events. Court and legal processes also tend to avoid emotions, typically requiring objective, dispassionate accounts of a case which do not provide a forum for the expression of emotions. In most cases, courts frown on any display of emotion. The judge, like the positivist scientist, is "neutral", making decisions on the basis of the "facts" of the case from a "value free" perspective. As the scientist builds on the basis of established theory, the judge uses the established rules of "precedent". Thus there are similarities in the philosophical aims and methods of law and science. As such, idealised legal processes are open to similar criticisms to those often made of positivist science. For example, it can be argued that it is impossible for emotional factors not to play a role in the legal settlement of conflict situations.

Proponents of mediation suggest that the repression of feelings results in unsatisfactory settlements that do not last, and inevitably require further resolution (Landau et al., 1987). In order to gain a complete understanding of conflict the resolution process requires that the subjective (e.g., values, goals, expectations, perceptions) and objective (e.g., power issues, skills, resources) characteristics of the dispute and the disputants be recognised and considered (e.g., Bolton, 1987; Deutsch, 1991). Therefore in contrast to court based procedures, most mediation practices encourage disputants to inform the other about how they feel.
As the expression of emotions are encouraged in mediation, proponents claim that this: (1) allows disputants the opportunity to express their feelings to the other and that this has a cathartic or therapeutic effect; and, (2) allows disputants to “separate the people from the problem”, so that separated from the feelings, they are more likely to effectively tackle the substantive issues at hand (e.g., Cormack, 1989). Thus mediation is presented to the public as being a process that allows disputants to express how they feel, thus healing themselves while resolving the conflict (Cornelius et al., 1994).

4.4.7 Mediation leads to empowerment

“Empowerment” is a word that has been used with increasing frequency in recent years. As such it has become an integral part of the general rhetoric of many social movements that wish to present a humanistic or transformative impression. The popular construction of empowerment is that it gives people control over their lives and the confidence to assert their needs. In mediation, empowerment is claimed to be an inherent part of the process because the participants enter the process voluntarily, choose how much information they provide/reveal, are free to withdraw from the process at any time, and make their own decisions about an agreement (e.g., Folberg & Taylor, 1984).

Mediation is said to provide greater overall satisfaction with the resolution of disputes because it empowers the disputants to resolve their own conflict. This is accomplished by shifting the burden of responsibility away from the mediator back to the disputants. The disputants are encouraged to explore the larger conflict that frames the immediate dispute which has brought them to mediation. That is, disputants are encouraged to go beyond the facts and analyse the conflict that divides them (e.g., de Bono, 1985, 1990).
The disputants are forced by the mediation process to negotiate their own settlement. The mediator acts as a facilitator, only intervening to remind the disputants that they must ultimately shape the resolution of their conflict. This involvement, in contrast to having justice imposed by a court, endows the individual with a sense of control over the future. This empowerment supposedly enables the disputant to rise to a higher level of functioning. Participation in a mediation process is also proposed to empower disputants by teaching them methods for problem solving that can be used later for other conflicts (Bush & Folger, 1994). It is also claimed by most pro-mediation authors that mediated settlements have a higher compliance rate than those imposed by a court, although Duffy and Thomson (1992) warn that there is only anecdotal evidence for this.

4.4.8 Summary of the public face of the mediation enterprise

The seven assertions about the benefits of mediation discussed above suggest that mediation is a voluntary and confidential process, where a neutral third party creates a safe environment for the parties to voice their interests and concerns, and assists parties to fashion an agreement to meet their needs. They further suggest that mediation is less expensive and faster than bringing the dispute to court, and that mediation empowers disputants to hold to whatever resolution is decided. However, the knowledge claims of pro-mediation authors can be lofty. This point is particularly well summarised below:

"...Mediation works because the mediator is an agent of reality, reason and objectivity, keeping issues in perspective and helping people let go, however reluctantly, of the partiality caused by over-identification with a single point of view ..." (Acland, 1990, p. 29).

Examination of the literature indicates that while the claims of pro-mediation accounts are sometimes convincing, they are exaggerated on other occasions, and often not grounded in realistic data. The public face of mediation has been established through
arguments of assertion, rhetorical statements and simplistic comparisons with traditional legal processes. Despite this, mediation is now seen as the “flag ship” of the conflict resolution movement, and its application to various conflict situations continues to increase.

4.5 The professionalisation of mediation

The institutionalisation of the mediation enterprise has paved the way for practitioners to nominate themselves as “professional mediators”. The issue of professionalisation is currently the subject of a very significant debate in the conflict resolution field. While this issue will be discussed in detail during Chapter 6, it is also noted at this stage in the context of the institutionalisation and public face of mediation. It can be argued that the professional legitimacy of mediation has been created both by the issues detailed in Sections 4.3 and 4.4 and as a consequence of the popularity and professional language used as described below.

4.5.1 Popularity and monopoly

It is generally accepted that the formation of professions involves the establishment of the “popularity” of the area of work and a “monopolisation” of the knowledge base of that process. “Monopoly” is the main goal of well established, publicly accepted professions, and “popularity” is more important for new, emerging professions. For example:

“... Groups of practitioners trying to establish new professional institutions have first to establish the value of their work in the eyes of a clientele. At the same time, however, these would-be professionals have to keep their specialized knowledge from becoming common knowledge ... inherent tension arises between the twin tasks of popularizing one’s contribution to society, so that it is comprehensible enough to be appreciated, and monopolizing one’s knowledge, so that it is incomprehensible enough to be marketable ...” (Brown, 1992, p. 21).
There is evidence for this in the mediation enterprise, including the abundance of accounts that focus on the many benefits of mediation and have established the popularity of the process. Arguably the popularisation of mediation has been achieved through the assertions made by authors and practitioners who have presented the public face of mediation. Mediation is marketed to the public as flexible, time efficient, user friendly, empowering, valuing emotions and producing improved relationships. This marketing is designed to increase the public’s acceptance of, and confidence in, the mediation process, and thereby establish a clientele.

The issue of “monopolisation” has not been obvious in the agenda of the mediation profession until recent times. There are now many concerns in the applied literature about the giving away of mediation, which implies an evolving focus on “monopolisation”. There are calls for increased restrictions for who can practice mediation, sanctioned training programs, and for standards of practice (Menkel-Meadow, 1993). Further, the development of professional associations, conferences, journals, specialised literature, university based training programs and the encouragement of academic research, can be seen as an attempt to establish the specialised nature of the profession, and thereby establish a monopoly over the knowledge. This issue is further elaborated in Chapter 6.

4.5.2 Professional language

It appears that the institutionalisation of a profession requires both the establishment of an original body of knowledge and the maintenance of control over that knowledge. In recent years it has become increasingly accepted that one of the main mechanisms used to regulate the control over professional knowledge is through the establishment of
professional language. This is clearly the case in mediation. The conflict resolution movement has its own specialised language that assists practitioners to impress clients with specific terms and abbreviations (see Section 4.4.5 for examples of this).

Brown (1992) summarised the growing awareness of the social and epistemological power of language across all sections of academic pursuit. She claimed that authors writing from historical, political, anthropological, sociological and psychological perspectives all agree that professional language is associated with the creation of power. It was also noted that in a multi-disciplinary or cross-disciplinary endeavour, consensus is easily missed.

"... One scholar may write of 'communities of discourse', another of the 'jargon', another of 'symbol', another of 'rhetoric', another of 'persuasion', and 'argument', another of 'hegemony', another of 'ideology'. All are describing their observations that language seems to have something to do with power relations within and among communities ..." (Brown, 1992, p. 25).

It can be concluded that language provides a fundamental part of both the social and the epistemological validity of professions, as it defines both the exclusiveness of the professional community and the boundaries of professional knowledge. For mediation there is a specialised language that has been developed which helps to define membership of the profession and supports the public acceptance of practitioner competence. In this endeavour, one of the most powerful forms of language is scientific language. If the mediation enterprise could be characterised as scientific, its public legitimacy would be further assisted. Therefore in recent years, the scientific inquiry into conflict resolution processes, in particular mediation, has received substantial interest. Empirically based accounts of the mediation process are considered in the following section.
4.6 Mediation research

While mediation has been shown to be a very old process that has provided a dispute
resolution mechanism for societies across the ages, formal scientific research into how it
works, or indeed if it works, is relatively new and substantially interdisciplinary:

"... involving important contributions by psychologists, economists,
political scientists, sociologists, anthropologists and scholars in the fields
of communications, industrial relations, law and organisational behaviour

This wide academic base is evidence of the broad interest in the conflict resolution field,
but also suggests the difficulty associated with establishing a comprehensive approach
to conflict resolution research. The current section will therefore summarise different
approaches to mediation research including international and labour relations, laboratory
studies, applied research, the structure of mediator behaviour, and the antecedents of
mediator behaviour.

4.6.1 International and labour relations

Conflict resolution and mediation research was initially conducted in the fields of
international relations and labour relations. The early research in these areas tended to
lack an applied focus, being either very theoretical in nature, or reports of simple case
studies based on personal experiences. In the area of international relations the earliest
writing on mediation was by Jackson (1952) who focussed on case studies of
international mediations and negotiations. Other substantial contributions have been
made by Burton (1969), Fisher and Ury (1978) and Rubin (1981). These volumes,
incorporating case studies and personal experiences, have been particularly influential in
that they have formed the base of the more recent research and theory building
concerning mediation.
Studies dealing with labour management conflict began with the works of Peters (1952, 1955) and have been supported more recently by the work of Kressel (1972) and Kolb (1983, 1985). While these investigations into the use of mediation in international relations and labour relations gave rise to the modern interest in the field, once again the enthusiasm was generated from anecdotal accounts rather than empirical results. This literature does contain a rich series of ideas and potential research questions, but it is clear that no integrated theory has emerged directly from it. However, indications from the use of mediation in international and labour relations gave rise to various laboratory based theoretical research programs.

4.6.2 Laboratory studies

The majority of the laboratory based studies of the 1970s and early 1980s concentrated on mediation in simulated negotiation settings (Shellenberg, 1982). Two broad areas of investigation were established to test propositions about (a) mediator behaviour and (b) the effects of mediation or negotiation. The latter often involved the testing of mathematical models in negotiation by economists and game theorists (e.g., Roth, 1985; Young, 1975). The more famous studies of behaviour involving opposing preferences included the prisoners dilemma (see Pruitt & Kimmel, 1977) and various social dilemmas (see Messick & Brewer, 1983).

The application of reductionist mathematical models to explain complex human conflict behaviour was very ambitious. However, this approach was consistent with the dominant theoretical framework of the traditional empiricist approach dominant at the time. A massive amount of theoretical literature was generated in this period. The two schools of thought to emerge most clearly have been the motivation and strategy
approach and the cognitive approach. The motivation and strategy school focussed on both mediator strategies (see Pruitt, 1981) and the dual concern model (see Filley, 1975), and their relationship to various problem solving behaviours. The cognitive approach utilised the notions of cognitive heuristics and biases (e.g., Kahneman et al., 1982), and also how individuals acquire and use knowledge in their construction of the social reality surrounding the mediation process (e.g., Abric, 1982). The majority of laboratory based studies can be criticised for being exceedingly narrow and making highly restrictive assumptions. In particular, practitioners of mediation criticise such findings because they involve so few variables that they cannot resemble a real life scenario. In view of such criticisms Raiffa (1982) was among the first to make the provocative assertion that mediation constitutes both an "art" and a "science". This is an issue that will be expanded on in considerable detail in Section 4.9.

4.6.3 Applied research

By the 1980s the practice of negotiation and mediation had grown so rapidly that it advanced beyond related research and theory development (Kressel & Pruitt, 1989). In response to this, more applied research was initiated. For example:

"... The increased interest in mediation and the rapid expansion of mediation services in our society have spawned a number of vigorous new research programs in the United States, Canada, and the United Kingdom. The hallmark of these programs is field research, in contrast to the bulk of the prior scholarship. Almost every type of setting in which mediation is now practiced has its research programs. The scholars who run these programs are, for the most part, methodologically sophisticated and knowledgeable in the theories and research findings of the past. These programs are so new that even two years ago it would not have been possible to fill a journal issue with their results ..." (Pruitt & Kressel, 1985, p. 6).

There is no doubt that the growing amount of applied research in recent years is a direct reflection of the extensive growth of mediation practice. Herein lies one of the current
difficulties of the mediation field. Since the mid 1980s it has clearly been the case that practice has driven research, rather than research findings dictating practices, as is usually prescribed by most traditional models of the relationship between research and practice. This issue is further elaborated in Chapter 6.

The recent explosion of applied research can be categorised into two broad areas: (1) the structure of mediator behaviour; and, (2) the antecedents of mediator behaviour. For the purpose of identifying the more specific interests of applied research, a very brief review of the literature in each of these areas follows.

4.6.4 The structure of mediator behaviour

The most substantial area of recent applied mediation research has been in identifying the types of mediator behaviour, in particular, the strategies and tactics that mediators use in the resolution of a dispute. It has been found that the relationship between the mediator and the disputants involved in the dispute can be an important variable in successful mediation outcomes. For example, several studies demonstrate that trust in the mediator (Carnevale & Pegnetter, 1985) and the mediators’ use of “bonding” and other reflexive interventions (Kressel & Pruitt, 1985) are important predictors of a satisfactory settlement. However, it has been found by other authors that disputants’ expectations of mediators have little effect on outcomes (e.g., Burrell, Donohue & Allen, 1990).

Mediators can also have some influence on the relationship between disputants during the mediation process. Research has examined the use of “caucussing” where the mediator separates disputants and meets independently with them. Hilltop (1985) and
Rahim (1989) reported findings that suggest caucussing can be extremely effective when parties show high levels of hostility and low levels of co-operative behaviours. Caucussing therefore provides an opportunity for mediators to subtly present the position of the other party, which greatly assists mediation outcomes.

Research also indicates that mediators can have a profound impact on the success of mediation through they way in which they direct the mediation process to address the issues at hand. For example:

"... dealing with the issues is central to mediation. This process includes identifying the issues, uncovering underlying interests and concerns, setting an agenda, packaging, sequencing and prioritizing the issues, interpreting and shaping proposals, and making suggestions for possible settlement ..." (Carnevale & Pruitt, 1992, p. 564).

Research into the process of structuring issues demonstrates that the structure of the agenda for a mediation has a significant affect, leading to greater disputant satisfaction and increased short term success (Lim & Carnevale, 1990). In addition it has been found that some mediator behaviours are directly orientated towards assisting disputants to “save face” while attempting to reach a settlement. For example, Lim and Carnevale (1990) claimed that certain mediator behaviours were geared towards helping disputants to resolve internal disagreements and save face while making a concession. It has also been found that mediators frequently emphasise positive incentives for concession making (Carnevale, 1986).
4.6.5 Antecedents of mediator behaviour

The other significant area of applied research has been to identify the ways in which mediators choose act in different situations. Carnevale (1986) made the most significant contribution to this area with his strategic choice model, designed to predict mediator behaviour. In this model it was proposed that two antecedent variables interact to predict mediator behaviour. The first variable is the mediator’s estimate of a "win-win" outcome being possible, and the second is related to the level of concern that mediators have for parties to achieve their aspirations. Extensive research using this model shows it to be a robust predictor of mediator behaviour (Carnevale & Conlon, 1988; Carnevale & Henry, 1989; Harris & Carnevale, 1990).

Relevant to the antecedents of mediator behaviour were the concurrent attempts to develop descriptive models of the mediation process. Some of these were borrowed from more general problem solving research (e.g., D'Zurilla, 1988; D'Zurilla & Goldfried, 1971) which proposed a five stage model for problem solving: (1) problem orientation; (2) problem definition and formulation; (3) generation of alternative solutions; (4) decision making; and, (5) solution implementation and verification. Similar models have been proposed by researchers who work specifically in the mediation field. For example Pruitt, Welton, Fry, McGillicuddy, Castrianno and Zubek (1989) developed a three stage model of mediation: (1) “setting the stage”, including gathering information and clarifying the approach to mediation; (2) “problem solving”, including identifying issues and generating alternative ways to deal with them; and (3) “achieving a workable agreement”, through negotiation. More recent integrated models are offered by Barnes (1994), Benjamin (1995), Littlefield et al. (1993) and Ross and Wieland (1996).
The other two substantial areas of research concerning the antecedents of mediator behaviour have involved the linked issues of mediator power and mediator bias. Power is an issue of concern due to the supposed idealised “neutrality” of mediators and the possibility of coercion. Mediator power has been studied from the perspectives of the mediator’s reputation and authority (Kressel & Pruitt, 1989) and from the perspective of the mediator’s ability to reward or punish the disputants (Wall, 1979; Wall & Rude, 1985). Neutrality is perhaps one of the most contentious issues for mediation (Marshall, 1990; Rifkin, Millen & Cobb, 1991). There is no doubt that assumptions about neutrality can significantly contribute to the success of mediation (Carnevale & Pruitt, 1992), but as a concept it is poorly defined and even less well understood. It is likely that emphasis on neutrality arose in order to assert the same kind of epistemic validity as that which is associated with the legal profession. This concept has been challenged by numerous authors. For example, some authors have argued that to be effective and balance power differentials, biased mediator behaviour may be required (e.g., Smith, 1985).

It is clear from this brief review that a substantial literature exists with respect to applied research into mediator behaviour. Most of the research is practically orientated and gives clear prescriptions for practical application of findings. The issue of whether such recommendations have in fact been taken up by practitioners will be discussed in detail later. Prior to that discussion it is necessary to overview the research into the efficacy of mediation and related methodological issues. The question of “does what mediators do, work?” has initiated the majority of mediation research.
4.7  Mediation efficacy research

The current section includes four major objectives. First, it provides a review of the emphasis on evaluation in mediation. Second, it reports the positive evidence for the effectiveness of mediation (including measures of user satisfaction, compliance and reduced costs). Third, it discusses the inconclusive and negative evidence about the effectiveness of mediation (including reduction in court delays, rates of settlement and relations between disputants). Fourth, it addresses the methodological quality of mediation-outcome research.

4.7.1  The emphasis on evaluation

The proliferation of mediation practices has been both considerable and controversial. Extensive utilisation of mediation in favour of the established procedures for dealing with conflict (in particular legal processes), has lent a contentious air to discussions of the effectiveness of mediation (Kressel & Pruitt, 1985). Consequently, a culture of evaluation has entered the conflict resolution field, and the extent to which interested parties can either confirm or reject particular forms of conflict resolution practice is an issue of increasing importance.

These issues are amplified by the emerging professionalisation of the field. For example, funding bodies may want to determine whether to continue funding mediation services and seek research findings to validate or invalidate mediation services. The primary concern of funders tends to be the extent of success in reaching agreements and the cost effectiveness of the process compared with other dispute resolution practices. Alternatively, service providers may want to evaluate their service in order to assess the extent to which they are achieving their goals and to discover ways to improve their
performance. Also, potential clients and referrers may want to evaluate mediation services in order to decide whether to use those services at all, or to use a particular service, and to be better able to assess the appropriateness of mediation at a particular time. These issues further emphasise the need to evaluate the controversial claims of mediation proponents described in the previous section.

There are a number of complex variables associated with the inquiry about the effectiveness of mediation under polemical conditions. For example, Kressel and Pruitt (1985) reported that as there has been very little empirical scrutiny or systematic study of applications of mediation "... empirical questions tend to become oversimplified ..." (p. 180). Further, they asserted that common questions about whether mediation is efficacious include the distorted assumption that mediation is a uniform intervention strategy both within, and across, dispute settings. Despite the fact that this is actually an empirical question in its own right, there continue to be calls for conclusive results about the broad scale efficacy of mediation.

One of the most significant difficulties in evaluating mediation effectiveness is in choosing the variables upon which to make an evaluation. The literature is rich with very general accounts of mediation effectiveness. For example:

"...In different settings and cities, under different sponsors and philosophies, mediation programs have consistently shown that a high proportion of mediated cases end in agreements satisfactory to the parties involved and are upheld by both..." (Roehl & Cook, 1985, p. 163).

Such broad statements provide little evaluatory evidence, which is consistently demanded in the literature. This is not surprising considering the high stakes at issue, which include the potential replacement of legal processes and the substantial rewards
for proponents of mediation. What is likely to be more informative is a review of both
the positive and negative evidence for the effectiveness of mediation, broken down
across a variety of outcome measures.

4.7.2 Positive evidence for the effectiveness of mediation

Three variables consistently used to demonstrate the efficacy of mediation include user
satisfaction, rates of compliance with mediation settlements, and the reduced costs of
mediation. Summaries of the findings in these areas are presented below.

4.7.2.1 User satisfaction

Disputant satisfaction with mediation is usually 75% or greater (Kressel & Pruitt, 1985). Across
diverse criminal and civil dispute areas over 80% of disputants held positive
views towards mediation and were generally satisfied with the mediator, the terms of
agreement, and the mediation process (Roehl & Cook, 1985). Comparable levels of
user satisfaction have been found by Bazerman, Lewicki and Sheppard (1991), Cahn
(1992), Davis, Tichane and Grayson (1980), Kolb and Rubin (1991), and Koopman,
Hunt, Favretto and Coltri (1991). Other authors report even higher levels of user
satisfaction, for example that 97.5% of mediation users would recommend the
mediation to others (Meierding, 1993). Despite these impressive results, other authors
(e.g., Singer, 1995) warn about the simplistic nature of user satisfaction as a measure of
efficacy.

Another method used to seek validation is to compare user satisfaction with mediation
to user satisfaction with other forms of dispute settlement. Some of these include
unmatched attitudinal studies. For example, Meierding (1993) found that over 95% of
persons who had participated in mediation would not have preferred litigation. Other studies compare user satisfaction results obtained from matched samples of mediated and litigated cases. There is overwhelming evidence that disputants find mediation more satisfying than adjudication and other forms of traditional dispute settlement involving courts and lawyers (Ferstenberg, 1992). However, the extent of this satisfaction has been found to vary according to the type of dispute. For example, while a comparison of mediated and litigated cases in the area of divorce and child custody may demonstrate that families are more likely to be satisfied with mediated outcomes (e.g., Sales, Manber & Rohman, 1992), the results are less conclusive for mediation about small claims disputes (e.g., Vidmar, 1985).

McEwen, Mather and Maiman (1994) reported that even lawyers are highly satisfied with mediation. In a study using semi-structured interviews with 163 divorce lawyers, they concluded that divorce lawyers have generally embraced mediation because it helps them manage problems inherent in divorce practice. For example:

"... divorce mediation facilitates both settlement negotiation and trial preparation, permits client participation in decision making without requiring lawyers to surrender control, provides a form for resolving both legal and non-legal issues, and promotes efficient case management ..." (p. 149).

As recent research into user satisfaction is becoming more sophisticated there is also growing evidence that mediation is more useful for some types of disputes than it is for others, and that this is a determining factor in user satisfaction (Shapiro & Rosen, 1994). For example, mediation appears to be more effective, and have higher user satisfaction, when parties are aware that arbitration is the next likely step in the dispute resolution process (McGillicuddy, Welton & Pruitt, 1987). Thus mediation may be seen simply as the lesser of two evils.
4.7.2.2 Rates of compliance

The evidence for rates of compliance with mediated settlements is also generally positive. For example, in follow up interviews with hundreds of disputants who attended mediation sessions at Neighbourhood Justice Centres in the USA, between 67% and 87% of agreements were honoured, and between 3% and 12% of agreements were partially upheld (Roehl & Cook, 1985). Other studies have demonstrated that mediated cases have higher compliance rates than adjudicated case in the areas of small claims (Emery, Matthews & Kitzmann, 1994; McEwen & Maiman, 1981) and divorce and custody disputes (Pearson & Thoennes, 1982; Meierding, 1993; Sales et al., 1992). Kressel and Pruitt (1989) and Pruitt, Peirce, McGillicuddy and Welton (1993) also provided substantial evidence for the generally high rates of compliance in mediated disputes but warn against the various methodological limitations of such studies.

4.7.2.3 Reduced costs

In general, there is favourable evidence to support the claim that mediation reduces the costs of dispute resolution. For example, some studies reported that individuals involved in divorce settlements by para-legal mediation incurred only approximately two thirds of the legal costs that would have been incurred via traditional legal approaches (e.g., Pearson & Thoennes, 1984). While such savings are modest when considered on an individual basis, they represent a significant saving when aggregated. However, this variable is very difficult to measure because it is almost impossible to create methodologically sound comparisons across dispute resolution processes. Nevertheless, there are no shortage of claims from less empirically sound accounts of the cost saving of mediation (e.g., Acland, 1990).
4.7.3 Inconclusive and negative evidence about the effectiveness of mediation

Contrary to the above accounts, some research into the efficacy of mediation produces inconclusive or negative results. Common variables include the failure of mediation to reduce court back logs, inconclusive results about settlement rates and inconclusive results about the improvement of relations between disputants.

4.7.3.1 Reduction in court delays and back logs

One of the original claims about mediation was the possible reduction of the backlog of court cases and the general length of time associated with legal processes. At one level it seems almost unfair to evaluate mediation on this dimension as it gives little information about the quality of the process. This measure does, however, provide some insight into mediation from a practical and social impact perspective. There is very little evidence that mediation makes any substantial contribution to reducing court backlogs or waiting lists (Kressel & Pruitt, 1985). However it appears that virtually no studies have been conducted in this area since the mid 1980s.

There are numerous potential reasons for the lack of impact of mediation in reducing the number of cases that go to court. The most obvious are that mediation is either not yet widely known (Pearson & Thoennes, 1984), or that mediation has not typically been the choice of disputants (Kressel & Pruitt, 1985). In support of the latter possibility Roehl and Cook (1985) report that in the mid 1980s mediation was typically refused by about half of the disputants to whom it was offered. Of course, these figures may be different currently, over a decade later, but the evidence has yet to be determined.
Another significant factor in the apparent failure of mediation to reduce court delays is that cases attracted to mediation may have never in fact progressed to the courts (Pearson, 1983, cited in Carnevale & Pruitt, 1992). This suggests that mediation services address a different section of society’s dispute resolution needs, that are in addition to those commonly addressed through the dispute resolution mechanisms of the courts. If this is so, it would be unreasonable to conclude that mediation is ineffective. Rather, it is more sensible to conclude that the court system cannot meet the full gamut of conflict resolution demands in society (a well documented point), and that mediation, in meeting some of those needs, is a useful adjunct to the courts.

It is ironic that the fate of the mediation movement is likely to rest with the legal profession and more specifically with the court system. Mediation is not likely to ever achieve full autonomy because of its reliance on the courts for referrals. This results in an uneasy alliance with the court system where mediation could ease the backlog of cases, especially at the lower court levels, yet is unlikely to do so because these cases have significant social complexity. Such cases frequently consume an inordinate amount of time, so that any time savings are not likely to be easily identified.

4.7.3.2 Rates of settlement

A more reliable indication of mediation efficacy is provided by an examination of the rates of settlement achieved. While a consistent definition of this variable has not been adhered to in the literature, it essentially refers to how often mediation results in a settlement that is mutually acceptable to all disputants. Outcome studies in all areas of mediation describe very little consistency in this matter. For example the results of studies about settlement rates for labour mediation vary between 28% and 57% (Kressel
& Pruitt, 1985). Vidmar (1985) reported a 54% settlement rate for mediation of small claims disputes, and Kressel (1985) reported a range of 40% to 70% for divorce mediation. More encouraging results are reported in analyses of neighbourhood and community mediation programs where settlement rates are reported to be on average between 65% and 78% (Kressel & Pruitt, 1985). Generally, studies of mediation services that attempt mediation in a wide variety of disputes found settlement rates and the stability of agreements to vary considerably across different types of cases (Roehl & Cook, 1985).

While these results are perhaps quantitatively insubstantial when compared with the 100% settlement rate of adjudicated court based dispute resolution, there are qualitative differences in mediation settlement rates that are extremely difficult to measure. For example, mediation settlement rates incorporate the satisfaction of both parties. This qualitative difference may have an effect on the length of time that mediated disputes remain settled compared with court based settlements (Kressel & Pruitt, 1985).

4.7.3.3 Improvement in relations between disputants

One of the more appealing aspects of the pro-mediation rhetoric is the claim that mediation preserves and improves relationships between disputants. However, outcome research does not support this assertion. Pearson and Thoennes (1984) reported that divorcees who undertook mediation were much more likely to report that the mediation process assisted in "communication, co-operation, and understanding" than those who used adjudication. However, after a nine month follow-up the improvement in relationship variables for mediation cases was not significantly different to controls.
(adjudication). This suggests only a short-term benefit in using mediation, and raises some questions about the claims of pro-mediation authors.

At a more general level, Roehl and Cook (1985) argued that for serious problems requiring substantial behaviour change (e.g., alcoholism, long term unemployment, etc.) mediation should not be expected to provide more impressive results than any existing methodologies. They explained that ongoing disputes between people involved in intimate relations are particularly prone to agreement breakdowns and further problems after the mediation hearing. Similarly, Kressel and Pruitt (1989) expressed concern about the likelihood of single session mediations (which is common in community mediation programs), to produce any change in underlying interpersonal dynamics.

### 4.7.4 Summary of efficacy research

While the mixed findings reported above suggest caution in asserting the broad scale effectiveness of mediation, it is reasonable to conclude that agreements are usually reached, compliance with agreements is acceptable and participants are usually satisfied with both the process and the outcomes (Carnevale & Pruitt, 1992). There remain however, a number of outcome variables upon which the evidence is unclear (Kressel & Pruitt, 1989). In addition, a body of empirical evidence is yet to be gathered which can sanction the confident assertion that mediation practices are qualitatively more effective than traditional judicial practices. A large proportion of the variance in outcome study results is likely to be due to methodological difficulties.
4.8 Methodological issues

A number of comments about the methodological limitations of mediation research are offered below. These are categorised according to issues specific to outcome studies, and other issues of a more general concern for mediation research.

4.8.1 Methodological issues in outcome studies

The first and foremost methodological difficulty for mediation outcome research is that relatively few studies have actually been conducted. These have focussed on specific aspects of mediation, and have included only some of the areas (e.g., divorce mediation) that mediation is supposedly effective (Carnevale & Pruitt, 1992).

A major methodological difficulty is the general absence of control groups. This difficulty is not unique to investigations into the efficacy of mediation. The same dilemma occurs in many fields where there is a therapeutic element in the intervention, such as psychoanalysis and counselling research. In mediation research the typical design is to match people who received mediation with people who received dispute resolution from a legal, court based process (Cormick, 1992). This pairing involves many assumptions, in particular that those in the control group receive comparable court based interventions (Mastrofski, 1990).

Perhaps the more insidious difficulty is that those people who choose mediation, and are therefore included in the experimental group for outcome studies, are most likely to be acting in accordance with a powerful self selection bias. Those attracted to mediation are likely to already be aware of its goals to facilitate co-operative behaviour and thus are already likely to be enthusiastic for compromise and committed to a positive
outcome. Alternatively, people who choose adjudication or other traditional legal interventions are possibly less co-operative (Kressell & Pruitt, 1985).

The randomisation of participants into control and experimental groups is theoretically possible, but this would produce another qualitative difficulty. A substantial part of mediation’s philosophy is its voluntary nature. This is almost inseparable from the mediation process. If participants are forcibly assigned to the experimental (mediation) group it is likely that results would be spurious.

Some authors (e.g., Kressel & Pruitt, 1985; Roehl & Cook, 1985) state that there is a powerful placebo effect associated with mediation. Mediation is a humanistic process that is novel, potentially therapeutic, and usually presented by an enthusiastic practitioner. In this sense the "feel good" element of mediation is likely to account for positive results. In any case it is likely that placebo effects would contaminate attitudinal measures of effectiveness (e.g., general satisfaction), which are in fact the outcome measures on which mediation is often most impressive. Improved methodological criteria, including pre-treatment placebo controls and random allocation to control and experimental groups, would assist in clarifying these points. However, attempts to integrate such suggestions in the past have been undermined by disputant preferences for litigation and other issues related to eliciting cooperation with study methodology (e.g., Kressel, 1985; Pearson & Thoennes, 1984).

Another methodological concern with outcome studies is the lack of strict behavioural controls for mediator behaviour. Further, accounts of mediator behaviours that have led to mediation success have tended to be retrospective self report measures. Such
accounts are useful, but could be improved with more direct behavioural observations of mediation situations. However, attempts at empirical research based on behavioural observations of both mediators and disputants do not tend to produce clear results either, and present another case for further research in the area (Hysjulien et al., 1994).

4.8.2 General methodological issues

Researchers appear to be unable to consistently and accurately assess the practical value of mediation. As described above, attempts to evaluate the effectiveness of mediation techniques have encountered enormous methodological difficulties and results have therefore generally been inconclusive. Several more broad reasons for this confusion are described below.

A significant shortcoming in much of the research into mediation has been its broad focus. More progress towards a theoretical understanding of the mediation process and a reliable assessment of its efficacy might be made if researchers focussed on a narrower, more homogeneous band of disputes (Whiting, 1992). This would require consistency in such variables as the type of dispute, the complexity of the dispute, the severity of the conflict, the cooperativeness of the disputants, the process of mediation and the style and ability of mediators. Clearly this is a daunting proposition that may not be possible given that it includes such a complex set of human behaviours.

At an operational level, it has been proposed that research attempts are hampered by the fact that researchers do not have sufficient knowledge of the "common language" of mediation (Kressel & Pruitt, 1985). Possibly, the diverse range of mediator activities leave researchers confused about which of these particular activities to investigate. In
the past, mediation research has included a very narrow sampling of mediator interventions. Clearer language and a shared understanding of processes by increasing the communication between researchers and practitioners may clarify this difficulty.

At a more philosophical level it could be argued that the tendency of empirical research to reduce complex behaviours to quantitative explanations and causal models is simply not an appropriate way to assess mediation. The tendency of mediation research to focus on the frequency of certain mediator behaviours in the hope of developing operational models is quite simplistic and practically untenable. This is because such research does not consider aspects that are difficult to measure such as mediator timing, language and other psychological events that are all an inherent part of the mediators "skill". This is well expressed in the following quotations from Kressel & Pruitt (1985):

"... when a tactic is used may be more important than how often it is used. This is the issue of timing, with which practitioners are rightly enamoured. Disputes have an internal developmental course. Coordinating interventions with the waxing and waning of such psychological forces as trust, suspicion, and the need for a solution a crucial part of the mediator's skill ...” (p. 195).

"...We count what mediators did (or say they did) rather than how they did it. However, while any fool can separate the parties, only a skilful mediator knows when to do so and what to say to the parties once they are apart! ...” (p. 196).

The most reliable predictor of the success of mediation may be the skill of the mediator. This position may be received favourably by those with an interest in asserting the scientific validity of mediation. Thus while it is valid to speculate as to whether a unified theoretical and empirical literature on mediation will ever be possible (or if it is even necessary), it is reasonable to assume that attempts to establish its epistemic validity with scientific accounts of its effectiveness will continue.
The lack of clear definitions for mediation techniques and the process itself has led to questions from researchers about a consistent theoretical rationale for mediation. Therefore there are regular requests in the literature for more substantive and methodologically sound reviews of mediation outcome studies (e.g., Carnevale & Pruitt, 1992). These are based on the need for empirical evidence and therefore have strict requirements for operationalisation, control and treatment conditions. There have also been calls for the further development of theory and the linking of such theory with practice (Fr'Piere & Work, 1993).

Due to the methodological concerns that have plagued the majority of studies into the efficacy of mediation, both the findings of studies and the appropriateness of using a positivist epistemology to undertake such studies, are questionable. For example, the requirement of random allocation of cases to experimental and control groups is a fundamental assumption of any experiment, and it is clear that this requirement has not been possible in mediation research. Without randomisation of cases, experiments must be considered as, at best, quasi-experimental (Campbell & Stanley, 1963). However, the reasons for there having been a large number of attempts to test the efficacy of mediation using traditional scientific methods are understandable. First, a scientific approach is the dominant paradigm for any form of rigorous inquiry; and second, there are substantial benefits associated with an experimentally or scientifically validated technique (this point is expanded in Chapter 5).

As a result of the evidence provided above, it appears that a positivist approach is not appropriate for evaluating the efficacy of mediation. Therefore new approaches, that are generally considered to be less authoritative than traditional scientific methods of
inquiry, coupled with the acceptance of other forms of evidence, and different methodologies for gaining that evidence, are required. The major advances in this area have come from practitioners, rather than researchers.

4.9 The art and science of mediation practice

Despite the preoccupation with establishing the efficacy of mediation among researchers, there has been substantial resistance to this sort of inquiry from practitioners (Cooks, 1995; Kurien, 1995; Menkel-Meadow, 1993, 1995; Millen, 1994; Van de Vliert, 1992). It seems that practitioners and disputants alike are less concerned with the structure and validity of conflict resolution processes. There has been a growing trend among practitioners to reject the necessity of such theoretical justification and instead to describe mediation as an “art” rather than purely as a “science”.

An emerging idea is that the underlying epistemological values of practitioners of mediation, and perhaps even of the mediation process, are not consistent with the traditional empiricist model that is used by researchers to evaluate it. The principles associated with traditional research methodologies are intrinsically reductionist and are therefore rejected by many practitioners who seek to embrace a more holistic, postmodern approach to their work. Consequently there has been significant tension between practitioners and researchers in the conflict resolution field.

Some popular authors assert that mediation (and other associated conflict resolution skills) can be considered as having both artistic and scientific components. Nevertheless there has been significant appeal for some practitioners in having their work considered “scientific”. For example:
"... Mediation is an art and a craft and a science. There is nothing magical or mysterious about mediation, but there is perhaps more to it than appears at first glance in terms of the understanding of conflict and the practical skills it demands ..." (Acland, 1990, p. 26).

One factor that has made it difficult to assess the extent to which practitioners reject empiricist epistemology has been that many practitioners are outside the reach of academic inquiry. However, some indication of the growing rejection of scientific principles can be gained from literature that has been published in the more applied mediation journals. Some practically orientated authors who have published in these journals seem to completely reject traditional scientific models. For example, Saposnek (1993a), discussed the more artful aspects of mediation, asserting that mediation is a "craft" rather than a science. Mediators have used their craft to promote higher and broader levels of conflict resolution, and effectively tap into the deeper emotional roots of conflict. Saposnek described four levels of conflict resolution: (1) solving a problem, (2) developing a dispute resolution system, (3) integrating conflicting forces, and (4) practical spirituality. The inclusion of a spiritual dimension has been typical of more practice oriented accounts of mediation, even in the academic literature, and provides evidence for a different epistemological framework from that embraced by researchers. Saposnek asserted that the main methods of the "... mediator as artist consist of facilitating communication and promoting empathy, reframing conflict, moving energy within the process, and recognizing the importance of timing ..." (p. 5).

While not directly rejecting the concept of a scientific approach, others have emphasised aspects of their construction and practice of mediation that seem to be in direct opposition to the goals and values of empiricism. Gold (1993) described the healing dimensions of mediation, emphasising the unconscious influences on mediation and the
need for the mediator to work from their “highest consciousness” or “spiritual centre”. Yale (1993) suggested that a spiritual model is best for understanding the practice of mediation, claiming that mediators need to “connect with clients from our hearts to theirs” (p. 13). These concepts were supported by Zumeta (1993), who provided methods for nurturing spirituality between clients, between mediators and clients, and in the mediators themselves. Cloke (1993) described how “forgiveness, symbols, rituals, and story telling” can create the “magic” of mediation. Kirkup (1993) discussed the use of religious perspectives and Victor Frankl’s technique of “logotherapy” in mediation. There has also been a growing body of literature about the “transformative” possibilities of mediation that are incongruent with the causal, reductionist models of empiricism (Folger & Bush, 1996; Rothman, 1996).

Attempts have been made to liken mediation to other traditional practices that are beyond the traditional scientific paradigm. In an early account of the “artful” nature of mediation, Saposnek (1987) likened the practice of mediation to the principles of the Japanese martial art of Aikido which, unlike other martial arts, aims to neutralise and harmlessly redirect the aggression of the attacker while learning about and teaching the attacker. According to Saposnek, the mediator can view challenges from a systems perspective within a multilevel, interactional context, as does the Aikidoist.

The perspective that different epistemological models may provide a more valid vehicle for understanding the practice and underlying processes of mediation has also been supported by other practice orientated authors. For example, Cooks (1995) discussed an “Afrocentric” model of mediation that is based on notions of family and community, and also the "Medicine Wheel" model that is utilised among Native American Indians.
Similarly, Hazlehurst (1988) presented the traditional models utilised by Australian Aboriginals as providing a suitable framework for interpreting mediation. Such approaches are in direct contrast to the typical empirical approach to mediation practice, and are symptomatic of the general tension between the communities of research and practice.

Many practice focussed authors have reinforced the notion that the skill and art of mediation should not be forgotten in the training of mediators and the practice of mediation. This is generally associated with the idea that, because mediation frequently involves emotional concerns, professionals who work in this area would benefit from training in the behavioural sciences (Menkel-Meadow, 1993; Milne, 1983; Volkema, 1986). However, the study of mediation effectiveness has not yet embraced these notions. One of the most significant difficulties in doing so is that the traditional empiricist models that are most often used in outcome studies lack the methodological tools for an inquiry into the more “artistic” aspects of mediation. These issues are addressed in relation to the difficulties that exist between research and practice in conflict resolution in Chapter 6.

4.10 Summary

In the current chapter the recent growth in interest in mediation techniques as adjuncts to existing legal mechanisms, and their integration into mainstream social systems were discussed. The historical influences on this movement, the current knowledge claims of the proponents of mediation, and recent research into the topic were also summarised. The trend towards the rejection of mediation research by practitioners, and the growing interest in alternative models and philosophies for mediation practice were emphasised.
It was proposed that this issue is symptomatic of the gap between research and practice in the conflict resolution field. These problems are not dissimilar to the difficulties that occur between the operation of research and practice in many fields. Therefore a substantive review of the literature that has sought to understand the relationship between research and practice from a psychological point of view will follow in Chapter 5. Questions raised about research and practice in the conflict resolution field will then be addressed in Chapter 6.
CHAPTER 5
THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RESEARCH AND PRACTICE

5.0 Introduction

The aim of Chapter 5 is to provide an understanding of the relationship between research and practice in conflict resolution by reviewing this issue in the context of the broader field of psychology. The difficult relations between research and practice have plagued many fields of endeavour, including medicine, engineering, nursing and law. However, this difficult relationship has been most conspicuous in the field of psychology, and rather than having been resolved, there is an ongoing debate that may inform the conflict resolution field.

There are three broad reasons for including the review of research and practice in psychology. First, the review will identify issues that are related to the way that positivist philosophies work, and how they create and value different types of knowledge. Second, the review will outline how positivist frameworks impact on the relationship between research and practice. Third, it is expected that these discussions
will assist in identifying factors that may be useful to facilitate an understanding of the relationship between research and practice in the conflict resolution movement.

These aims are addressed in five sections. Section 5.1 includes a review of the relevant issues associated with the production of scientific knowledge. Section 5.2 presents the uses of scientific methodology in psychology. A discussion of the development of the scientist-practitioner model, which comprises an effort to bridge the gap between research and practice in psychology, is detailed in Section 5.3. Section 5.4 presents some of the problems associated with the scientist-practitioner model. The future of the relationship between research and practice in psychology is discussed in Section 5.5, and the chapter is summarised in Section 5.6.

An issue to consider in relation to the content of this chapter is that the rationalist legal approach to the resolution of conflict is in many ways similar to the logical empiricist approach to practicing science. In fact, the professions of science and law are based in similar positivist philosophies. Rejection of legal positivism in the law and order model could be held akin to the rejection of logical positivism in science. Also, the trend towards new ways of resolving conflict such as mediation, is perhaps similar to the trend towards new methods in science, such as qualitative research. Hence, the following deconstruction of logical empiricism and other modernist philosophies in psychology can be juxtaposed with the deconstruction of modernist legal philosophy (refer to Chapter 3).
5.1 Scientific knowledge production

The current section provides an overview of scientific knowledge production and the impact of this on the discipline of psychology. The first subsection presents a review of the popular conceptions of the different types of knowledge. In the second subsection the origins of the scientific method are discussed. In the third subsection, various challenges to the traditional view of scientific knowledge are reviewed.

5.1.1 Types of knowledge

The philosopher Charles Peirce proposed four general ways of knowing or fixing belief. The method of tenacity, the method of authority, the method of intuition (or the *a priori* method), and the method of science (Buchler, 1955). It is broadly accepted, both in science and by the general community, that the method of science is the most objective way of knowing "truth", and should be pursued if reliable judgements about reality are to be made (Staats, 1989). To demonstrate this proposition, a brief description of the other ways of knowing is provided.

Knowing based on the method of tenacity is to hold firm to a truth simply because it is known to be true, it has always been true, and will always remain true. Tenacious knowledge is so strong that a truth may be accepted even in the face of strong conflicting evidence. For example, despite the overwhelming medical evidence, a smoker may claim that smoking will not lead to ill-health, because they have personal knowledge of a relative who smoked for fifty years and was not affected.

The method of authority is considered to be superior to the method of tenacity because it is sanctified by tradition and public approval. For example, religious knowledge is true
because the particular religion and the culture that upholds that religion proclaims it to be so. In the same sense, expert knowledge is authoritative knowledge. If an “expert” proclaims something to be true, it is often considered true, because expert knowledge is culturally and publicly accepted.

The *a priori* method is considered superior to the previous two methods because propositions accepted by the “*a priori*” are considered to be “self-evident”. This is based on the contention that human beings reach a consensus about the truth because we are naturally inclined towards discovering truth. In *a priori* knowledge facts “stand to reason”. However, this rationalist position is fraught with definitional and value-based difficulties. For example, there must be consensus about whose “reason” is being used to justify the self-evident *a priori* knowledge claims.

It is claimed that the most advanced way of knowing, superior to the method of tenacity, the method of authority, and the *a priori* method, is the method of science. This is based on the proposition that there are universal truths, independent of space and time, that can be discovered by scientists. For example:

‘... To satisfy our doubts ... therefore, it is necessary that a method should be found by which our beliefs may be determined by nothing human, but by some external permanency - by something upon which our thinking has no effect ... The method must be such that the ultimate conclusion of every man shall be the same. Such is the method of science. Its fundamental hypothesis ... is this: There are real things, whose characters are entirely independent of our opinions about them ...’ (Buchler, 1955, p. 18).

It is claimed that the quality that separates the scientific approach from other ways of knowing is the unique characteristic of self-correction. The scientific method apparently involves built in checks that are anchored in reality “... outside the scientist
and his personal beliefs, perceptions, biases, values, attitudes and emotions ...” (Kerlinger, 1977, p. 6). Further, it is argued that this provides a way of knowing that is objective, and not influenced by characteristics that are external to the facts. Thus a theory of the way some part of the world works must be construed as “something other than myself” (Polanyi, 1958, p. 4). These characteristics are used to define a “scientific method” that governs the way scientists conduct science (Cohen & Nagel, 1966; Fiebleman, 1972; Mill, 1950; Reilly, 1970).

5.1.2 Origins of the scientific method

The first group to be interested in the method of science were in fact philosophers. They were trying to identify what actually constituted scientific knowledge, and what methods science used to achieve its aims of discovering “truth” (Hollis, 1994). This inquiry was originally based on a retrospective analysis of the methods that had been used in early scientific endeavours. The findings of this inquiry became a prescription for knowledge production (Anderson, 1966; Blake, Ducasse & Madden, 1960) and became known as the ‘scientific method’. The scientific method was rapidly accepted as the standard approach for how science should be done (Giere & Westfall, 1973).

This was based on the assumption that observations about reality could be made objectively and independently of the observer’s values, beliefs, history and politics. This leads to a clear distinction between “values” and “facts”. Therefore scientists are in a privileged position as neutral and apolitical observers of “truth”. The science that the positivist scientist does is therefore also claimed to be value free. Variables can be defined and measured and rigorous methodological devices can be used to test hypotheses. Reality can thus be explained in a deterministic and reductionist fashion.
It is clear that a scientific approach has enabled a system that has resulted in great discoveries for the benefit of humanity (e.g., cures for disease, the improvement of living standards). However there have been instances where adherence to an impersonal scientific approach has resulted in catastrophe (e.g., the development of nuclear weapons). Such instances have led to the scientific method being scrutinised. The scientific method can be considered an idealised method of knowledge production. There are many challengeable assumptions associated with the scientific method (Anderson, 1966; Blake et al., 1960; Giere & Westfall, 1973; Miller, 1987; Sellars, 1963). It is not infallible and the use of this method for knowledge production should therefore be subject to monitoring (Feyerabend, 1981, 1993; Gopnik & Meltzoff, 1997). A philosophy of science, or meta-scientific approach, seeks to provide such scrutiny.

5.1.3 Challenges to the traditional view of scientific knowledge

Those authors who have challenged the positivist conceptions of science identify a number of common themes. For example, the claim of neutrality is challenged on the grounds that observations are both theory dependent (Greenwood, 1989) and shaped by the cultural heritage and values of the observer (Polkinghorne, 1984, 1991). Other common critiques question the appropriateness of using positivist philosophy, and methodology, borrowed from the natural sciences, to study and interpret human behaviour (Barker, 1965; Chalmers, 1990; Feyerabend, 1975; Polanyi, 1958).

Authors have also emphasised the need to consider the intrinsic socio-historic factors that accompany the production of knowledge (Gergen & Gergen, 1983). Bickhard (1992) provided an account of the numerous "myths" associated with a positivist epistemology. This analysis included a consideration of operational definitions,
measurement, causality, model testing, and scientific proof. Consistent with these critiques, a number of alternative explanations of the workings of the scientific method have been suggested that question the assumptions of logical empiricism. Among these are the substantive works of Kuhn (1962), Lakatos (1970) and Feyerabend (1975). These authors have actively challenged the assumed basis of science, and have emphasised social epistemology underlying scientific knowledge production. The appreciation of social effects in science has also supported the development of a "social studies of science". This movement has become a strong voice against the various assumptions of positivism in modern psychology.

The positivist concept of discovering universal truths was challenged by Popper (1968, 1969) who argued that to confirm a universal truth was impossible, because it would involve testing every possible hypothetical situation. He therefore espoused a philosophy of science that concentrated on looking for exceptions to theories, focussing on the concept of "disproof" rather than the untestable and idealistic concept of "proof". This became the philosophy of science known as "falsificationism". As theories were falsified, they would be replaced by new explanations that were capable of accommodating the available data. By this process of testing and falsification it was thought that scientific explanation would approach a reasonable approximation of the truth.

However, science does not always progress in accordance with falsificationists' claims (Page, 1996). If the processes of science were accurately accounted for in the falsificationist philosophy, then a single observation that is in opposition to a current theory would lead to the immediate rejection of that theory. It is clear that science does
not progress in this way. Usually there is substantial debate that accompanies the rejection of a theory on the grounds of falsification. In fact, changes in theory usually only result from a considerable number of instances of disproof and the availability of a better alternative. That is, it takes more than one instance of falsification to convince scientists, who are committed to a particular theory, that the theory under examination is insufficient to explain the available data. Of course the very fact that scientists want to retest and check the results of experiments serves to somewhat contradict the myth of scientific objectivity. Even if the need to retest is based on the possibility of human error, this too is evidence against the idealised perfection of the scientific method. A cynical view is that scientists tend to conclude that “there is only a problem with the method when it gives results that were not expected”.

Given the incongruence between the theories and methods that are used to explain science and the actual behaviour patterns of scientists, alternative explanations of how the scientific enterprise progresses have been developed. It is now accepted that the scientific enterprise is far less rational than the falsificationist view that Popper suggested. An alternative view is that the scientific enterprise is the product of social processes. This view was first popularised by Kuhn (1962). His thesis demonstrated that scientific progress could be conceived in terms of paradigmatic shifts in the shared scientific view. “Paradigms” were described as the sum of the methodologies and theoretical assumptions that were accepted by a scientific community at a given time.

Kuhn (1962) distinguished between “normal” science and “revolutionary” science. Normal science was said to occur when there was a stable dominant paradigm with which members of the scientific community were in agreement. Periods of
revolutionary science were said to occur in times of paradigmatic shift in the theories that a scientific community embraces. Kuhn made the important observation that a succession of paradigmatic shifts characterised the history of science, and that scientific revolutions are not dependent on the discovery of new scientific truths, but rather on the accumulation of anomalies. Further, it was proposed that the social and political forces of the time affected which new theory was adopted. It can be surmised that key historical and/or social events could well be aligned to periods of paradigmatic shift. Therefore science becomes very much a social activity where the members of scientific communities continually redefine the goals of science and the processes of inquiry as influenced by social and political contingencies.

The greatest rejection of the idea of social and psychological influences on scientific knowledge production has come from the physical sciences (Feibleman, 1972). However, it is widely accepted that Kuhn (1962) provided evidence that social and psychological factors do influence scientific knowledge production. This raised questions about the idealised assumptions of the scientific method, and suggested that the traditional view of the scientific method was not an accurate representation of the processes of science. There were a range of responses to these ideas. One was the total refutation of Kuhn’s perspective and the assertion that there was no intrusion of social and psychological factors into scientific methodology (Hollis, 1994). An alternative response was to suggest that false and true scientific knowledge should be subject to the same type of causal explanations (Cohen & Nagel, 1966). This resulted in the “Strong Programme” of social science (Barnes & Bloor, 1982). Between these extremes were a range of positions that described different ways in which social and psychological factors intrude on scientific knowledge production (Hollis & Lukes, 1982).
While it is not possible to generalise directly from physical sciences to the social sciences (because, for example, the notion of an experiment is different for a biochemist and a psychologist), most commentators now accept that Kuhn’s basic thesis of the involvement of non-rational factors in the production of scientific knowledge is relevant across the scientific milieu. Further, the argument is frequently made that if psychological and social factors intrude even a little on scientific knowledge production in the physical sciences, the effect must be far greater in the social sciences (Hollis, 1994).

Kuhn’s observations led to other theorists proposing alternative conceptions of science that challenged traditional positivist conceptions. For example, Lakatos (1970) proposed that scientific research programs are supported by a set of basic assumptions that he called a “negative heuristic”, which cannot be modified despite contrary evidence. Hard core assumptions are therefore protected from the challenges of contrary evidence and may never be changed despite the available data. Lakatos argued that surrounding the hard core of this negative heuristic is a protective belt, or a “positive heuristic”, that can accommodate alternative hypotheses. The positive heuristic allows for possible modifications according to the findings of scientific inquiry. In order to advance a research program, and the scientific enterprise in general, Lakatos argued that the scientist chooses a research direction that is currently progressing (rather than degenerating) from the variety of coexisting research programs operating at that time. Lakatos claimed that science progresses by the skilful choice of progressive research programs by scientists who are likely to be already committed to some particular outcome.
Feyerabend (1975) offered a philosophy of science that was antithetical to positivist ideals. The epistemological anarchism or "dadaism" of Feyerabend suggested that each and every theory could only be evaluated in terms of its own frame of reference. He came to this conclusion because he saw no objective way of knowing or understanding the varying accounts of reality and subjective assumptions made by individual scientists. From this position he also argued that no theory of science could successfully account for, or guarantee, scientific progress. Rather, he proposed that rival explanatory accounts might be considered equally valid or "true" within their own frames of reference. That is, there is no externally verifiable truth; rather, only truth that exists within the constructs of the observer.

These alternative descriptions of the way the scientific enterprise operates should not be seen as exhaustive. There is a growing body of thought running counter to most of the claims made by logical positivists and empiricists. This is not to say that the methods and aims associated with that approach to science are completely out of place. However, most alternative philosophies of science encourage greater reflexivity about the processes of the scientific enterprise, and greater reserve in accepting the knowledge claims made by scientists. In this way a more comprehensive account of the processes and findings of science is encouraged.

An increased awareness of the limitations of the traditional scientific method, achieved through an appreciation of the influences of co-existing social, historical and political factors, serves to place scientific knowledge claims in perspective. However, the scientific community has not accepted these well argued and well researched critiques,
presumably because there are secondary gains associated with maintaining the aura of
neutrality and expertness associated with the logical positivistic framework.

5.2 Scientific methodology in psychology

As demonstrated earlier, scientific knowledge is broadly recognised as the most
authoritative and sophisticated way of knowing about the world. Consequently,
scientific knowledge is perceived as a very powerful form of knowledge. In fact, it has
been argued by Habermas (1978) that all knowledge is to be evaluated against that
which is attained using scientific means. To be aligned with this powerful knowledge
base therefore has obvious advantages.

It is widely accepted that contemporary psychology is currently permeated by a
philosophy that is:

"... largely vestigial from behaviourism, which in turn, drew heavily from
positivism ... classical positivism, neopositivism, logical positivism ... and
derivative conceptual distortions ..." (Bickhard, 1992, p. 321).

While many of the restrictions of a purely behaviourist epistemology have been
addressed with the recent adoption of a more cognitivist approach in psychology
(O'Donohue & Smith, 1992), a positivist philosophy still underlies most psychological
data collection and most psychological knowledge production. A scientific heritage in
tune with logical positivism can be held responsible for the widespread acceptance of an
empiricist epistemology in the discipline of psychology (Anderson, 1966; Giere &
Westfall, 1973; Gopnik & Meltzoff, 1997). In general, this approach has emphasised
the concepts of prediction, causality, value neutrality and strong conservatism in the
development of theory.
There are many possible reasons why psychology has been so slow in coming to terms with, and addressing, the limitations of a positivist approach. Various aspects of positivism have become so embedded in the narrative of psychology that it is probable that many psychologists are not even aware of the philosophical preconceptions of the psychology with which they associate themselves. In fact it can be argued that positivism has become implicit in how psychologists think, rather than being explicitly addressed in the contents of those thought processes (Bickhard, 1992).

Extensive critiques of the assumptions underlying positivism, and the implications of such an approach, have been offered by various philosophers and sociologists of science (e.g., Gilbert & Mulkay, 1984; Harre & Secord, 1972; Latour & Woolgar, 1979; Toulmin & Leary, 1985). Over time there has developed a substantial literature that seriously questions the purported scientific basis of the psychology discipline. However, despite intensive criticism and clear demonstrations of the tenuous assumptions underlying positivism, and amidst calls for increased reflexivity in psychology (Bickhard, 1992; John, 1994; Usher, 1991), positivism continues to exercise its overriding influence.

Perhaps the most likely explanation for this is to be found in the argument presented by Foucault (1980) about the relationship between knowledge and power. Foucault suggested that knowledge is related to power and agency in any given area. That is, the greater the acceptance of scientific knowledge, the greater the power of scientists and the social arrangement consistent with that knowledge, to the extent that the research findings and the knowledge claims of scientists are held in high esteem. Psychology as a discipline has gained considerably by aligning itself with this type of knowledge. The
adoption of a scientific label has had the effect of unifying the public face of psychology (Page, 1996; Staats, 1989). By calling itself scientific, psychology justifies itself as a social institution (John, 1984, 1986, 1992) and lays claim to the prestige and various social privileges that are awarded other scientific enterprises (John, 1984).

However, questions have been raised about whether the standard account reflects an accurate and reasonable view of science in psychology. For example, Frank (1984) argued that the power of psychology has little to do with its subject matter and methodologies, and more to do with the fact that it is an enterprise that nominates itself as scientific. The positivist philosophy of science that currently permeates most psychological enterprises is therefore held to be impenetrable to criticisms. Alignment with the methods of science provides a veil that in some way protects the knowledge claims of psychologists, and as a result, their knowledge claims and recommendations are freely accepted. With the “neutral” scientific method driving psychology, there is no need to question its research findings and knowledge claims, because scientific knowledge production uses tools and methodologies that are beyond question.

It has also been suggested that as psychologists play a highly political role in the management of populations (e.g., Pilgrim & Treacher, 1991), the association of psychology with science is ethically problematic. At one level the psychologist can make ideological and political recommendations to the public (based on practice or research), and at the same time due to their association with science, disown any “political” or “ideological” role by pointing to their “disinterested” scientific training and credentials. From this perspective there is privilege of opinion without responsibility, that is, values protected by “facts”.
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Another criticism is that the scientific claims of psychology, particularly those of neutrality and objectivity, result in the coercive social regulation of certain political and social ideologies (Ussher, 1991). Research programs and practice methodologies that support the political and social norms of the time are therefore favoured. The net result is the maintenance of the social order through a science that supports the values and social goals of that order (i.e., programs that support patriarchal, white, western, middle class objectives). Therefore it is asserted that:

"... rather than being an objective paradigm, positivism acts to mystify the conditions of those deemed in need of psychological assessment or intervention, at the same time it reifies the power of the expert, who is protected by the anonymity provided by the supposed objectivity of the positivistic scientist ..." (Ussher, 1991, p. 28).

It is further argued that traditional scientific discourses invite support for claims about science and scientific practice that are both epistemologically and politically regressive and historically mystifying (Harding, 1986). The language of science reinforces the epistemic standing of the psychological enterprise. This is achieved through complex methodological terms and esoteric theoretical language that keeps the general public in awe of the expert, scientific psychologist.

In summary, the history of psychology suggests that it is legitimated by being associated with science (Faust & Meehl, 1992), and psychology remains firmly committed to this association despite the criticisms outlined above. Nowhere is this more clearly evident than in the area of psychological practice. The term "scientist-practitioner" was introduced to the language of psychology in the 1940s, and it remains central to the justification of modern psychological practice. A scientist-practitioner model implies
the undeniable association with “science”. This creates an aura of scientific credibility with which to endorse psychological practice.

5.3 The scientist-practitioner model

This section comprises five subsections that are related to the scientist-practitioner model. The first subsection provides an overview of the historical development of the scientist-practitioner model, and then its acceptance by the psychological community is provided in the second subsection. The third subsection explores the differences in the cultures of research and practice, and the fourth describes the shift towards practice in contemporary psychology. The fifth subsection then overviews the current status of the scientist-practitioner model.

5.3.1 Historical development of the scientist-practitioner model

The concept of the scientist-practitioner was adopted by the American Psychological Association (APA) in 1947 (Bernstein & Kerr, 1993), and it was accepted as the official APA model of training at the Boulder Conference in 1949 (O'Sullivan & Quevillon, 1992). It was intended that adherence to this model would produce professional practicing psychologists who would also be proficient in scientific methodology. It was thought that for assessment and intervention purposes scientist-practitioner psychologists would apply the findings of psychological research to solve the problems that their clients encountered (Kanfer, 1990). Further, scientist-practitioner psychologists were expected to evaluate the effectiveness of their interventions, using their empirical training, and report the findings of their own research back to the scientific community (Bernstein & Kerr, 1993). At the time it was generally accepted that psychology was deficient in what it “knew” about people, and an obvious approach
was to have practitioners collect data (John, 1994; 1998). This occurred at a time when logical positivism was the standard worldview in science, and it was widely believed that “only scientific knowledge could be trusted” (Kanfer, 1990).

The scientist-practitioner model could be construed as ambitious and idealistic, and perhaps destined to fail from the beginning. It has, nevertheless, formed the basis of psychology training programs for the last forty years. In fact, almost every training program since the 1950s has at least given “lip service” to the scientist-practitioner model (Stricker, 1992). While the reasons for this are numerous, it is clear that the choice of the scientist-practitioner model to regulate the training of psychologists is very much rooted in positivist and empiricist dogma (Howard, 1993).

5.3.2 The institutionalisation of the scientist-practitioner model

The original decision to adopt the scientist-practitioner model can be interpreted from sociopolitical and historical perspectives (for a full account see Stricker, 1992). It is now clear that the institutionalisation of the scientist-practitioner model has had positive effects for the public acceptance of psychology. However, while this model has dominated the conceptualisation of psychological practice in recent years, it will be argued that the model has serious deficiencies.

By maintaining the position of the scientist-practitioner and thereby associating with the institution of “science”, the aim was to establish epistemic authority. Scientific knowledge was considered to be the only conclusive and valid form of knowledge, and it would therefore lend credibility to the process of psychological practice (John, 1994; 1998). A scientist-practitioner model distinguished scientific psychological inquiry
from other forms of knowledge that were not scientific, and therefore not reliable or true. Practitioners would be legitimated by the same authority as scientists, and this would add power to their profession and to their individual knowledge claims.

It is claimed that for a profession to be powerful it must have the following characteristics, "... clear, acknowledged expertise; a code of conduct to define the competency limits of its practitioners; and a well-established, systematic knowledge base ..." (Sheehan, 1994, p. 176). This knowledge base is most credible when it is supported by facts provided by scientific inquiry (Abbott, 1988). Further, a powerful profession implicitly assumes that the knowledge claims of scientists will be embraced wholeheartedly by the general public.

Sheehan (1994) also wrote that "... A profession is deemed to be most powerful when it holds esoteric knowledge and when the client has virtually no basis for questioning the professional's judgement ..." (p. 174). Numerous studies of the knowledge claims made by practicing psychologists confirm this to be the case. One example is the excessive use of esoteric jargon in the language used by psychologists (e.g., Harding, 1986). Another example is the tendency for both research and practice orientated psychologists to promote their scientific status by citing "classic scientific studies" to support their knowledge claims (Kornfield, 1990). An interesting finding from Kornfield's research was that the reliance on "classic scientific studies" was often based on a very poor scientific understanding of those studies, and in some instances, a completely incorrect interpretation of them.
The inadequacy of the scientist-practitioner model can be further challenged on the basis that most practitioners do not engage in, or want to engage in, any officially approved forms of scientific research (John, 1994; Pfeiffer, Burd & Wright, 1992). In support of this, pure researchers argue that practitioners are in fact not adequately trained for practical research. Further, given that most training models espouse the fundamental importance of research skills (which are very rarely used by practitioners), it can be argued that practitioners are not adequately prepared for effective practice by training programs that focus on the "scientist-practitioner" model.

5.3.3 Value differences in the cultures of research and practice

There seems to be an inherent tension between research and practice, between the applied and the theoretical, between the scientist and the professional. This tension appears to be common in most disciplines where there is an interest in both theoretical and applied knowledge. An early example of this conflict is provided by Flexner in 1925 (as cited in Stricker, 1992) when he identified the need for greater cooperation and a common ethic for researchers and practitioners in the field of medical education.

Snow (1965) claimed that the differences between the "sciences" and the "humanities" were akin to "cultural differences". There are clear epistemological differences in research and practice communities. In fact, many aspects of traditional empirical methodologies are by definition reductionist, and therefore in opposition to the more holistic epistemologies embraced by many practitioners. Thus it is possible that the values of many practitioners may be in conflict with the traditional empiricist model of science. This was illustrated in Falck’s (1990) account of epistemological differences in research and practice in the field of social work. It was suggested that:
"... theory has little influence on the roles many practitioners perform and the work they do and that many social workers, like most Americans, favour what works over theory ..." (p. 10-11).

Thus the relevance of research findings and theory are questioned by many practitioners. The implication is that practitioners use what works, and do not need to be informed by theoretical sources. Of course, what Falck (1990) refers to as "what works", may form the basis of research questions that may improve the quality of practice. This assertion can also be applied to the conflict resolution movement. The argument that practitioners favour "what works over theory" implies that a focus on more applied, "commonsense" solutions are more highly valued by conflict resolution practitioners. The quotation from Falck also assigns the powerful rhetoric of "commonsense" to social work practice by aligning her assertion with popular culture.

Among the numerous reasons for the tension between research and practice is the fundamental difference in the use of knowledge by these two enterprises. A simplistic analysis would have it that research scientists tend to be interested in the production of knowledge for the sake of the expansion of knowledge, while practitioners tend to be interested in how knowledge can be utilised for some practical purpose. There are also differences in the value ascribed to the task of discovering new knowledge. "Academic freedom" is purported to be the highest value for scientists, whereas "public service" is the value held in highest esteem by practitioners (Stricker, 1992). These differences should not be underestimated. Generalisations and assumptions about research and practice communities have often led to an antagonistic relationship between the two, resulting in ineffective outcomes for psychology and many other fields. It is ironic that
researchers and practitioners, in most cases, come from the same family of psychology and have experienced very similar training.

Bevan (1991) suggested that a sensible approach to the tension between research and practice is to accept that reality is made up of complicated and interrelated parts and that there are no given, cast-in-stone strategies for confronting and understanding these complexities. It is then possible to learn from the findings of both research and practice communities. However, as a result of the positivistic framework that exists in psychology, it has become generally accepted in the rhetoric of psychology that research should drive practice. Over time this assumption has become elevated to the status of an "ethical principle". From this judgemental position, practitioners not informed by research are considered to be offering a poor brand of treatment. Such practitioners clearly violate Meehl's (1993) concept of an "honest clinician", and could be considered "unethical" in their delivery of psychological services (Bloom & Fischer, 1982; Page, 1996; Singer, 1980).

With these fundamental differences and value-based criticisms it is not surprising that there has traditionally been considerable difficulty in establishing fruitful relationships between groups of researchers and practitioners in psychology (Simionato, 1991). In general, due to epistemological differences, the possibility of practice being informed by any form of research is usually rejected by practitioners (Parsons, 1992). However, this has not always been the case, and in some areas of psychology the fields of research and practice seem to be in good relationship. For example, practicing neuropsychologists are apparently well informed by the research findings in neuropsychology (Dennis, 1995). It should be noted, however, that this is an instance where the epistemological
assumptions of the discipline are shared by researchers and practitioners. However, in many other psychological disciplines there is less congruence. In a general sense, psychology is becoming more applied, and with this progression, greater speculation about the relationship between research and practice is likely to emerge.

5.3.4 A shift towards practice in contemporary psychology

During the past 20 years the emphasis has shifted from a focus on “research” towards a focus on “practice” in psychology. Associated with this has been a move away from traditional positivist concepts in psychology, toward a more diverse applied approach. In a recent survey of the fields of interest of Australian Psychological Society (APS) members, the majority nominated professionally orientated fields of interest such as clinical, counselling, educational and organisational psychology, rather than purely scientific research interests (Over, 1991a).

These results are very similar to the findings from surveys of members of the American Psychological Association (APA). Howard (1986) provided a detailed account of this general trend towards professionally orientated psychologies in the APA, proposing that it was due to demographic, social and economic changes. Howard's summary clearly suggested that the focus of the professional associations for psychologists (e.g., APA, APS) has undergone a shift away from “scientist” interests, towards “practitioner” interests.

The effects of this shift in focus are evident in Over's (1991b) finding of a decrease in APS membership among scientists. Over reported that there had been a 20% decrease in APS membership for academic psychologists between the years 1970 and 1987. A
similar trend is reflected in APA membership data (Stapp, Tucker & VandenBos, 1985). Over's (1991b) study also established certain "practice" oriented characteristics in those academics who have APS membership. In short, they were much more likely to identify themselves as scientist-practitioners than just as scientists, to have undertaken work experience outside of universities, and were likely to be licensed to practice psychology. While practice oriented academic psychologists reported an ongoing commitment to the scientist-practitioner model, they are in the minority when compared to most academic psychologists. In fact, Over (1991c) found that most academic psychologists are committed to a "scientist" model rather than a scientist-practitioner model and are not particularly interested in pursuing "practice" oriented research. This may, in part, be attributable to O'Gorman's (1994) finding that growth in status is much easier to achieve for academic psychologists than for professional practitioners.

There has been considerable disagreement about the goals and methods of psychology as a discipline. First there appear to be practitioners who do not necessarily believe that the findings of psychological research are relevant. Second, there are those researchers who as members of a professional body endorse a scientist-practitioner model to psychological practice and training. Third, there are those researchers who reject the notion of the scientist-practitioner model in favour of a more empirically based science approach, and are not at all concerned with issues relevant to practice. It is not difficult for most people involved in psychology to imagine vivid stereotypical examples for each of these three positions.

These differences in position along the research-practice continuum are likely to lead to significant problems for psychology in the future. This is mainly due to the
interdependence of research and practice in the training of future psychologists. The model most frequently cited as being optimal for training continues to be the scientist-practitioner model. An examination of the current status of the scientist-practitioner model, its assumptions, and in particular the way it is used in the training of psychologists, follows.

5.3.5 Current status of the scientist-practitioner model

Despite the clear differences between the aims and values of the research and practice communities in psychology, there is still a firm commitment to the scientist-practitioner model (Nelson-Gray, 1994). Bernstein and Kerr (1993) reported that there is a reaffirmation of the model in all areas of psychology. They cite the 1986 “presidential address” to the APA in which it is asserted that psychology in general, and counselling psychology in particular, should retain its scientific base. Also, the outcome of the Third National Conference for Counselling Psychology (1987) emphasised that “...psychologists, whatever their work, are professionals and their attitude toward their work is scientific ...” (Meara et al., 1988, p. 368). Further, this view has been promoted by the APS Working Group for the National Committee for the Psychology of the Australian Academy of Science (1996). This report outlined a number of recommendations that are intended to strengthen the relationship between research and practice in psychology by emphasising the scientist-practitioner model.

The emphasis on science in training is further supported by results from studies in the USA. For example, O'Sullivan and Quevillon (1992) found that 98% of the directors of Doctoral programs, and 74% of the directors of Masters programs, reported that their programs followed the Boulder model (scientist-practitioner) of training. In addition the
program directors emphasised a strong commitment to the scientist-practitioner model for the next ten years. This is despite the fact that other authors have reported that there is no clear agreement as to the basis of that model of training, its goals, or the methods for the achievement of those goals (e.g., Farr, 1991; Fourie, 1996; Ussher, 1991).

Among the parties that support the scientist-practitioner model are those who call for the need to expand the role of science in the profession of psychology. This is particularly notable in the field of counselling psychology. Reasons espoused for this include the need to maintain a credible public image and professional standing, and the need to create an identity separate from clinical psychology (Bromley, 1990). This is an excellent example of how the scientist-practitioner model is referred to in order to create epistemic authority. Therefore the model can be considered as a social and political tool rather than a code of conduct for the provision of psychological services. Professional credibility is also expected to lead to greater prestige for universities. This is expected to translate into increased resources and course stability for counselling psychology (Holland, 1986). Therefore it is argued that there is good sense in maintaining the scientific base of psychological practice. Many authors fervently defend this position.

For example:

"... A failure to resolve the 'scientist-practitioner crisis' not only would lessen the impact of advances in psychological science on practice but would also endanger the credibility of a psychological profession by dismantling its most substantial foundation ..." (Kanfer, 1990, p. 269).

In summary, there has been very little theoretical or practical development of the scientist-practitioner model since its conception in 1947 (Phillips, 1993). Current understanding of the model is still largely dependent on the recommendations of the Boulder conference. It is therefore possible that the scientist-practitioner model
currently exists more as a “gold standard” for psychology, rather than a practical working model. This gold standard is an idealistic concept that is very difficult, perhaps impossible, to achieve. Furthermore, it is reified by the professional body, and proclaimed as the ideal model for the conduct of psychological practice.

5.4 Problems with the scientist-practitioner model

Despite academic support for the scientist-practitioner model in psychology, many difficulties have been identified. These include the limitations of its positivistic heritage, a mismatch in observations about what is prescribed by the scientist-practitioner model and the actual behaviour of practitioners, and the implications for training future psychologists.

5.4.1 A positivistic heritage

One of the most often criticised aspects of the scientist-practitioner model is its positivist heritage. A scientist-practitioner is assumed to have the same epistemic values and professional detachment as the scientist. However, it is broadly accepted by practitioners of psychology that no professional or intellectual activity can be free of ideological influences (Bickhard, 1992). To insist on the neutrality of the scientist-practitioner would be to define practice as separate from “personal experiences, intentions, values, and world views”. Phillips (1993, p. 30) argues that not only is this impossible, it denies the “fundamental character of science and practice as human activities”.

The heavy reliance on its positivistic heritage also leads to definitional problems for the interpretation of the scientist-practitioner model. For example:
"... the term scientist is so devoid of meaning that for an individual, a training program, or our professional society to profess allegiance to a scientist-practitioner model is gratuitous ..." (Page, 1996, p. 103).

Following this theme, Page (1996) made a good case for the conception of the science-practitioner model as a case of multiple personality disorder. He claimed that the "once coherent" scientist component of the model has personalities that are proliferating at an exponential rate. He reported that "... true to the disorder, the "self" appears unaware of the disintegration of the once coherent self ..." (p. 103). Page used the definitional difficulties associated with the terms of science to demonstrate that the mode of psychological practice adopted by practitioners must be based on some specific philosophy of science, that is not made explicit by the model. For example, the way that a practitioner who is influenced by the philosophy of science prescribed by a Lakatosian view, undertakes psychological intervention and practice, would be very different from a practitioner who follows a positivistic philosophy of practice.

Bernstein and Kerr's (1993) summary outlined the course of the ongoing professional commitment to the scientist-practitioner ideology. They claimed that over the 25 years from its inception at the Boulder conference, through to the 1973 Vail conference, there was considerable concern expressed about a lack of applied knowledge emphasised by the model. It is widely accepted that since the Vail conference there has been growing discontent about this matter, with little improvement (Nelson-Gray, 1994). In short, the scientist-practitioner model appears more scientifically than practically orientated. Further, it is very unlikely that this bias will be corrected while the model remains embedded in a positivist epistemology. In fact, the very use of the word "model", implies that it is synonymous to "scientific theory", (John, 1996).
5.4.2 The behaviour of practitioners

One method proposed to assess whether the scientist-practitioner model is a good account of the way that psychological practice is conducted is to observe how practitioners work. Phillips (1993) claimed that in an examination of how an experienced practitioner thinks and behaves, there is a poor match between what actually happens, and the formal accounts of what should happen according to the scientist-practitioner model. Therefore it is argued that the "canonical script" of science is in opposition to the real life problem solving skills and complex intuitive processes necessary for effective practice.

While evidence has already been presented that suggests practitioners do not actually conduct science (in its traditional conception) in practice, this does not necessarily rule out the possibility that they may think that they do. Another important point is that even if a practitioner believes they have been trained scientifically to undertake objective inquiry, use statistical techniques, and even contribute to the body of psychological knowledge through scientific inquiry; in practice they may perform differently (Sheehan, 1994). Therefore the scientist-practitioner model is another example of the difference between the theories that we espouse, based on our valued beliefs, and the theories that we use unconsciously in practical situations. Further, a large proportion of professional practice is best described as an "opportunistic process" rather than scientific hypothesis testing (Phillips, 1993). Phillips provided a realistic account of the unpredictable nature of practice where often plans do not proceed as intended, and unexpected opportunities for attainment of therapeutic goals emerge. This unpredictability constitutes an approach that is at odds with the controlled variables associated with a positivistic scientific approach.
It is obvious that some problems that are encountered in practice lend themselves to 
theory based computational solutions, to which a logical positivist approach is
conceivable, and others do not (Schön, 1987). When problems are not presented as well
formed structures, as is the case in most real life “practice” problems, Schön proposed
that the practitioner would do well to develop the process of “reflection”. In brief, this
is defined as the ability to entertain a number of different views (at the same time) about
a situation that is uncertain and ill-formed. Clearly this approach is in opposition to the
logical positivist ideal where each hypothesis is individually rigorously tested and
evaluations are based on facts.

Another conception of practice was provided by Dreyfus and Dreyfus (1986). They
identified five stages of practice skills, from novice to expert. In the final two stages of
their account a complex intuitive process is proposed to operate. In a traditional logical
positivist view of science intuitive processes would be characterised as subjective and
therefore anti-scientific. However, there is considerable evidence to suggest that
intuitive processes are those that most practitioners rely on (Dreyfus & Dreyfus, 1986;
Hoshmand & Polkinghorne, 1992; Phillips, 1993). The Dreyfus’ also made the point
that in an epistemology of practice knowledge can be best developed from a study of
expert practitioners (see John (1994) for a summary).

5.4.3 Training of scientists and practitioners in psychology

Another area where critiques have challenged the legitimacy of the scientist-practitioner
model is in the area of training. This is particularly important, as the training of new
psychologists leads to the reinforcement of the philosophies of science and practice that
are promoted by the training body. These epistemological variables are then
perpetuated in the next generation of psychologists. While there continues to be reaffirmation of the value of the scientist-practitioner model by some authors as the most appropriate method to ensure the best training of psychologists (e.g., Bernstein & Kerr, 1993; Martin, 1989), there is also considerable dissatisfaction with this approach to training (Barlow, Hayes & Nelson, 1984).

Psychological training for both researchers and practitioners is currently conducted using the positivistic basis of the discipline. This has the effect of entrenching the assumptions of the scientist-practitioner model. For example, the relationship between the experimenter and their subjects that is conveyed to students, is both alienating and authoritarian. “Docile” and “compliant” subjects are seen to be graciously doing the bidding of the scientist who is in charge (John, 1994). A good example of this is the Milgram (1963) films about conformity and obedience that are shown to most undergraduate psychology students. In these well publicised experiments subjects generally continued to administer electric shocks to confederates under the instruction of the experimenter. This gives the impression of subjects who were passive and easily manipulated. The Asch experiments (1956) where subjects are coerced into agreeing with obviously incorrect propositions about the length of lines is another example. In this case psychology students are likely to conclude that the subject is “passive”, and “easy to convince”.

John (1994) suggested that this sort of relationship conveniently prefigures a model of practice where the “authoritative expert” (scientist-practitioner) has an unequal power balance with the “ignorant lay person”. It is also suggested that a similar association may be made between the “positivist” traits of the neutral experimenter and the
practitioner who is trained to consider their socially and culturally dependent assumptions about reality as neutral (Kanfer, 1990). John (1996) also identified the area of research report writing as evidence for the inappropriateness of a scientific model of training for future practitioners. For example:

"... the avoidance of personal reference, and the narrative convention of representing the report as an account of seemingly disembodied, but purely rational, sequence of thoughts and linked observations leading to an inevitable conclusion, serve to reinforce the dominant logical empiricist paradigm ..." (p. 3).

The use of this style results in a model of training that reinforces "impersonal, detached, seemingly incontrovertible" communication where the speaker is not speaking for themselves. Rather, the speaker is transformed, they are the conduit for the authority of science, and this places them in a position of authority over anyone who is listening, including future clients or patients.

The results of an international survey of the state of training of psychologists in 28 countries indicated that there is an increase in the amount of applied science (compared with basic science) in successive years of psychological study (Nixon, 1994). Further, Peterson (1991) claimed that a science-based model of training simply does not provide people with the necessary skills that they need for practice. This argument is strengthened by the fact that most graduates do in fact work in applied settings, but feel they lack the skills for effective practice (Bernstein & Kerr, 1993; Peterson, 1985; 1991). On the basis of this point, Frank (1984) concluded that the rationale for the scientist-practitioner model is spurious because it attempts to train students in roles that are incompatible with their abilities and interests.
Graduate students who are trainees within the system of the scientist-practitioner model appear to have varying perceptions about this model of training (Aspenson et al., 1993). A possible explanation for this is that some students are suited to certain types of training. For example in Aspenson's study, those students who were positive about the scientist-practitioner model were also interested in pursuing careers in research or academia. Those students who were negative about the scientist-practitioner model of training were most intent on pursuing careers in practice. They reported that the scientist-practitioner model was "not a lot of fun", and "impossible to achieve". In addition, they felt that there should be separate streams of training for researchers and practitioners, and that the investment required for a practitioner to be an active consumer of psychological research would be disproportionate to the gain that they received from their efforts.

5.5 The future relationship between research and practice in psychology

Many authors claim that there is ample evidence to conclude that the scientist-practitioner model has failed (Bernstein & Kerr, 1993). As a result of the various critiques, Sheehan (1994) stated that the traditional model of science informing practice is now not widely acceptable in the psychological community. As a result of this, professional regulatory bodies (e.g., APA, APS) face a serious challenge to the validity of the scientist-practitioner model of training (O'Gorman, 1994). It is likely that such developments have prompted the vigorous promotion of the scientist-practitioner model in recent professional recommendations for the future of psychology (Siddle, 1996).

In recent years, some alternative conceptions of the science-practice relationship have been suggested. It is claimed that these must be based on the ideal goal of science and
practice mutually informing each other (Hoshmand & Polkinghorne, 1992). It is
expected that this would constitute a model where research and practice are unified and
interactive, resulting in "purposeful inquiry and action". Hoshmand and Polkinghorne
proposed a postmodern perspective, rather than a positivistic philosophy of science, for
the achievement of this. They suggest endorsing multiple approaches to knowledge
generation including qualitative methods, while maintaining a disciplined inquiry that is
not simply subjective.

Another concept relevant to understanding the relationship between research and
practice is the recognition of the scientist-practitioner model as social or public
philosophy (Bellah, Madsen, Sullivan, Swindler & Tipton, 1985; Phillips, 1993). These
authors bring our attention to the fact that there must be a spirit of public responsibility
associated with the social goals of psychology. This social responsibility should also be
classified in psychology's aims for research and practice. However, Kanfer (1990)
went that one of the major difficulties in solving this problem is that there is only
minimal support to groups that aim to strengthen the bonds between research and
practice. Abrahamson and Pearlman (1993) further endorsed this notion, suggesting
that future employment settings for psychologists should embrace the need for
cooperation between research and practice, and that a clear employment setting should
be established for "scientist-practitioners". Kanfer argued that the scientist-practitioner
relationship would be best served if a group of psychologists would (1) pose research
questions based on their observations during professional practice, and (2) explore and
continuously test "basic mini-theories" and research findings for possible use in
practice. Of course this approach assumes that practitioners and researchers would be
motivated to undertake such activities.
5.6 Summary

The relationship between research and practice in psychology provides a number of lessons for other fields. The tendency for psychology to attempt to present itself to the public as "scientific" and for its practitioners to be encouraged to embrace a "scientist-practitioner" model has obvious epistemic gains for the profession. There has been significant tension between the communities of research and practice in recent years. This has been associated with a shifting focus towards more applied practical methodologies and a general rejection of the assumptions of logical positivism. Central to these changes is the criticism that idealised accounts of practice simply do not reflect what goes on in practice and are unacceptable to practitioners.

The growing body of practitioners who embrace alternative epistemologies is not limited to the field of psychology. Similar developments are present in the fields of social work, nursing, legal studies and education. This same movement is evident in conflict resolution, particularly as attempts to professionalise the field call for greater conservatism among practitioners. This has led to greater disharmony between researchers and practitioners in the field. The current relationship between researchers and practitioners in the field of conflict resolution, and the possible reasons for any disharmony, will constitute the remainder of this thesis.
CHAPTER 6
RESEARCH AND PRACTICE IN CONFLICT RESOLUTION

6.0 Introduction

This chapter is pivotal in establishing the research direction for this thesis. Therefore the major themes that emerged in Chapters 2 through 5 are briefly reviewed in Section 6.1. Section 6.2 then overviews the polarisation of the relationship between research and practice in the field of conflict resolution. The evidence and need for research about this issue is detailed in Section 6.3. Section 6.4 then outlines the research proposal, incorporating a brief review of existing survey research in the conflict resolution field and some of the methodological considerations in planning the research. Five broad research aims are then proposed in Section 6.5, and the chapter is summarised in Section 6.6.
6.1 Review of previous chapters

The substantive literature reviews undertaken in the previous chapters comprised a critical analysis of the development of the conflict resolution field. In Chapter 2 the multidisciplinary interest in conflict and conflict resolution was reviewed, and it was proposed that the modern conflict resolution movement constituted a new area of academic inquiry. Chapter 3 examined the legal contributions to conflict resolution through alternative dispute resolution, and Chapter 4 reviewed the historical origins, public acceptance and efficacy of mediation. Together, these chapters provide a useful analysis of the factors that have affected the development of conflict resolution, and constitute a socio-historical interpretation of the field. In the latter part of Chapter 4 the pertinent issue of relations between research and practice in conflict resolution was identified. This prompted the need for a deeper understanding of the general issues that are relevant to an understanding of research and practice. Therefore, Chapter 5 provided an account of the research-practice relationship in the discipline of psychology. The current chapter reviews the literature pointing to the need for greater cooperation between research and practice in conflict resolution and proposes an empirical research project into this issue.

6.2 The polarisation of research and practice

There is an emerging literature in conflict resolution to suggest that research and practice, and indeed researchers and practitioners, are best described as being in a state of polarisation. Conflict resolution is a good example of a field where untheorised participation has led the field in practice, with theoreticians and researchers coming later to explain practice. For example Kressel and Pruitt (1985) wrote that "...the enthusiasm and inventiveness of mediators has thus far outdistanced the ability of researchers to
comprehend the mediation process and accurately assess its value..." (p. 196). At a broader level, there is a general consensus that the practice of conflict resolution techniques is more advanced than research and theoretical developments in the field (Folger & Bush, 1996; Kressel & Pruitt, 1989, Pruitt, 1986).

In an effort to keep up with the rise in popularity of conflict resolution techniques, there has been a general increase in the amount of research undertaken in the field. However, most of this research has had relatively little to do with the actual processes or questions of practice. Rather, it has tended to focus on questions of efficacy and success rates. For example, in a review of the last ten years in divorce mediation research, Kelly (1996) argued that while much is now known about outcomes such as settlement rates, client satisfaction, compliance, and cost effectiveness; the next decade of research should attempt to focus on practice issues.

Kressell (1997) claimed that one of the reasons for the poor connection between research and practice is that the literature has tended to focus on “global issues”, such as “does mediation work?” and “what are the correlates of successful and unsuccessful mediation?”. He suggested that while such global issues are clearly important, they are removed from the daily challenges of practice and have little bearing on the actual concerns of practitioners. It is proposed that this has led to the alienation of practitioners. Other authors such as Schellenberg (1996) have identified the fact that there has been relatively little contact between academics and conflict resolution professionals. Therefore his book had the primary aim of bridging the gap between scholarly research and theory, and practical work in conflict resolution. Other academic works of this type typically assume that practitioners are interested in bridging the gap,
and that they are likely to read such books. It is also characteristically true that while many authors have identified the issue of a gap between research and practice, few venture to explain why this gap might exist, and even fewer have posed suggestions for ways in which to address this gap.

Many authors have expressed the need for greater integration between theory, research and practice. For example Raiffa (1991) suggested that theory, research and practice should "mature together" (p. 14). The advantages of greater links between research and practice have been emphasised by some authors (e.g., Carnevale & Pruitt, 1992), and some attempts have been made to establish and capitalise on those linkages (e.g., Test Design Project, 1993). However, such attempts have frequently been met with significant resistance or opposition from practitioners (Menkel-Meadow, 1993; 1995). Some authors argue that the recent rapid growth in practice can aid research by directing the development of research and theory (Littlefield et al., 1993). However, others claim that there is an ever-widening gap in the relevance of advances made in the realm of conflict resolution theory and the application of such knowledge in practice. For example it is suggested that "... too often those in academia become removed from those who work 'out in the real world' ..." (Millen, 1994, p. 283).

In accord with these differing positions, the relationship between the practice of mediation and its scientific justification is becoming an issue of paramount importance for the conflict resolution field. With increased use of conflict resolution techniques in many different areas, there are demands for both accountability of mediators (Gentry, 1994) and evidence of mediation effectiveness (Meierding, 1993). These issues promise to become more intensified as they are driven by the practical demands for evidence to
inform policy decisions, and other pressures associated with the professionalisation of the field. Further, it is apparent that the main assumption underlying calls for increased research into mediation is that a theoretical base will improve practice and legitimise policy decisions made in the area. However, the extent to which research can actually inform the practice of conflict resolution is yet to be established.

It is assumed, particularly in the more scholarly conflict resolution circles, that greater cooperation between research and practice will be good for the field. For example Rothman (1997) asserted that good practice is the main resource for good theory and good theory should be the basis of good practice. Lang (1996) claimed that there is a need to continuously encourage connections between practitioners and researchers because it is positive for the development of the field. He wrote:

"... As practitioners, we are at our best when we integrate the lessons from research, the guideposts from theory, blending them with practice skills that address the concerns and needs of our clients. As researchers we contribute to the understanding of mediation when we have a solid understanding of practice and a foundation in theory. And the relevance and usefulness of theory is best achieved when scholars and academics are familiar with the process of mediation and its impact on disputants and mediators ..." (p. 1).

Similarly, it is proposed that: "... When we stand with one foot in each area, it is abundantly evident that practice informs theory, and vice versa ...” (Millen, 1994, p. 283). Following this assertion, Millen offered an invitation for practitioners to establish a firm understanding of communication theory in order to improve their practice, however, such developments have not been met favourably by the majority of practitioners.
It is likely that many practitioners of conflict resolution have never read "the literature" relevant to the research-practice relationship, do not come into contact with theoretical models and are probably unaware of the implications of such issues for training. Further, it can be argued that many are not interested in becoming informed in this way. The magnitude of the gap between research and practice is highlighted below in Pinzon's comments about practitioners' lack of awareness about research:

"...there is no agreement on what makes up the theory and practice of mediation. In fact, debates between mediation sympathizers are probably fiercer than those they wage against the "enemies" of mediation. Those newly come to the fold tend to ignore these differences of opinion and usually enthusiastically embrace one of the current mediation theories or accounts, blithely believing there are no other options ..." (Pinzon, 1996, p. 3).

This perspective is very important for an inquiry into the relationship between research and practice in conflict resolution. It identifies the fact that conflict resolution is an unsettled field with serious internal difficulties regarding its structure and application. Pinzon (1996) also claimed that the norm in practice is that most practitioners ignore the debate about theory and practice (either purposively, or unknowingly), and "enthusiastically" use whatever techniques they first learn. This suggests that the majority of conflict resolution practitioners are not particularly concerned about the gap between theory and practice in their everyday work and have a different outlook to those who suggest that they should be concerned with such issues, and that conflict exists between interest groups involved in the field.

Despite the resistance from many practice focussed authors, and the information detailed in the following section (Section 6.3: that describes the evidence for the polarisation of research and practice in conflict resolution), there is considerable disagreement about the best way forward for conflict resolution practice. The perceived
need for practitioners to become more informed about research findings and theoretical models continues to pervade the recent literature, and has become standard for those who argue for "professional practice". Therefore there is a suitable basis for the emergence of a "scientist-practitioner" model for conflict resolution. Specifically, this is indicated by the growing emphasis on evidence based practice and pressure for practitioners to also have knowledge of theory.

It was established in Chapter 5 that the scientist-practitioner model is broadly accepted in the discipline of psychology. This was achieved in a deliberate, calculated way, with the specific aim of establishing epistemic authority for the field. While there has been concern about the suitability of the model for psychology, it has certainly been explicitly discussed. However, in the conflict resolution field, the emergence of a scientist-practitioner approach has been more implicit. In fact, to date it has not been overtly expressed that the field of conflict resolution needs a "scientist-practitioner" approach. Rather, the problems resulting from the split between research and practice, and the epistemic gains of a more scientific approach have been emphasised. As previously mentioned, these issues have led to considerable tension in the conflict resolution field and form the basis for this research endeavour. However, before moving specifically into a discussion of the research plan, evidence for the polarisation of research and practice communities in conflict resolution will be detailed.

6.3 Evidence for the polarisation of research and practice

The nature of the research-practice dialectic is an important issue for virtually every applied field. For example some of these issues relevant to the uneasy relationship between research and practice in psychology were outlined in Chapter 5. Similarly
there is a growing recognition that the polarisation of research and practice in conflict resolution requires fuller investigation. The current section aims to explore some of the material that supports the need to review this relationship. Five broad areas of evidence will be discussed: (1) the historical absence of research in the field; (2) rejection of an empiricist approach to scientific explanations of the field; (3) dissatisfaction with attempts to measure or quantify practice; (4) the trend towards explanations of conflict resolution practice that use alternative epistemologies to those normally accepted in traditional accounts of practice; and, (5) trends in the competition between different branches of practice.

It should be noted that the literature tends not to make a direct connection between these key factors and the gap between research and practice. Rather, these five domains are alluded to in accounts that discuss the defining characteristics of the field, or as issues that require clarification for the advancement of the field. To date, no commentary has been made that specifically brings together these issues as core reasons for the dysfunction between research and practice.

6.3.1 The historical absence of research

One of the primary difficulties for the potential links between research and practice in conflict resolution is that conflict resolution techniques became popular without the support of a strong theoretical or research base (refer to Chapters 3 and 4). As many authors have commented, practice has led both research and theory in the conflict resolution field (e.g., Folger & Bush, 1996; Kressel & Pruitt, 1989). It is therefore likely that those involved in practice may feel research is unnecessary and may in fact reject the need for their work to be validated by research.
The conflict resolution field was popularised by strong charismatic leaders and organisations that did not use a research based model. This idea is borrowed from Lancaster (1990) who conducted an inquiry into the relationship between research and practice in the field of family therapy. Lancaster contended that charismatic leaders in family therapy advanced family therapy practice through mechanisms such as prolific writings of a non-theoretical nature and through workshops, attracting large followings of practitioners and developing an industry of family therapy techniques. She reported that many of the leaders in family therapy did not engage in quantitative empirical research, but instead, relied on their personal promotional skills to popularise their models.

The same observation can be made about the field of conflict resolution. For a great many practitioners, perhaps the majority, it has been the influence of popular public figures or organisations that have advanced the adoption of conflict resolution techniques. In most cases this has been in the absence of any traditional empirical research or validation of the techniques. Rather, the viability of conflict resolution techniques has been based on the qualitative reflections of other well known practitioners, or through the stamp of approval from some respected conflict resolution organisation. This has been further facilitated through the successful promotion of ideas or concepts in workshops and the popularity of charismatic, non-theoretical authors (refer to Section 4.4). Therefore, with its roots in non-theoretical and non-research driven ideas, it is not surprising that a divide now exists between research and practice. It is also clear that the institutional base and values of these approaches are fundamentally different (Walker, 1989).
6.3.2 Rejection of scientific methodology and philosophy

Concern about the use of empiricist scientific philosophy and methodology to study conflict resolution practice is perhaps the most fundamental indicator of disjunction between research and practice. This concern has covered a broad range of issues. For example, philosophical opposition has questioned whether scientific approaches that focus on the expansion of purely objective knowledge have made the concept of “wisdom” in mediation obsolete (Kirkup, 1993). More practical criticisms have included how researchers might translate theoretical and conceptual propositions about mediation practice into practical and meaningful resources that practitioners can understand (Millen, 1994). Kressel (1997) claimed that the most significant factor in this issue is that research is not relevant to practitioners. For example:

“... The empirical literature is also based on research models that assign priority to precision, control, and the aggregation of data. This reduces the chance of developing results that have a clear meaning to practitioners whose concerns run to the concrete ...” (Kressel, 1997, pp. 143-144).

A matter that has been raised frequently by practitioners in rejecting traditional empiricist philosophy has been the debate about the “artistic” and “scientific” nature of conflict resolution processes (first mentioned in Section 4.6). Saposnek (1993b) explained that most individuals involved in the practice of mediation do not follow, or value, a scientific approach. He suggested a general rejection of “... systematized knowledge, facts, and principles derived from observation, study and experimentation on what is being studied ...” (p. 5), arguing that in conflict resolution practice it as at least equally important to utilise an intuitive approach. Saposnek defines the word “art” from the Latin meaning “to join, or fit together”, and claims that an artistic approach requires “... an intuitive grasp, a conceptual integration, and emotion-based impressions ...” (p. 5).
It is therefore advocated by Saposnek (1987, 1993b) and others (e.g., Menkel-Meadow, 1993; Raiffa, 1982; Yale, 1993) that explanations of mediation practice be considered from an artist’s, rather than a scientist’s, perspective. This perspective requires a fundamentally different approach to the way in which researchers typically try to evaluate and build theories about practice. For example, Saposnek (1993b) claimed that there are four emerging themes in the practice of mediation that demonstrate the movement from a scientific to an artistic approach. These include shifts in the following perspectives: (1) from an individual perspective to a systems perspective; (2) from a problem-solving perspective to a healing perspective; (3) from a mechanistic perspective to a perspective of compassion; and, (4) from viewing mediation as just one of many equally valued options for resolving family conflicts to a perspective that actively affirms that the mediation process is better than the adversarial process. He further proposes that shifts in the perspectives described above are necessary for fruitful inquiries into conflict resolution practice. This suggests a rejection of traditional empiricist methodology by practice oriented authors.

Another approach emphasised by practice focussed authors, that also rejects the basic assumptions of a scientist-practitioner approach to practice, is Donald Schön’s conception of the “reflective practitioner”. Schön (1983; 1987; 1991) advanced the notion that a systematic understanding of professional practice can be built on the reflective insights of skilled practitioners (see Section 5.4.2 for a full description). This clearly challenges the idealistic conception of practitioner as a “scientific hypothesis tester” (Phillips, 1993). The “reflective practitioner” paradigm is relatively new in the conflict resolution literature, but was approached by Fong (1992) in his article entitled: “New paradigms for mediation: Thinking about our thinking”. This was one of the first
attempts to introduce the concept of reflection into the work of conflict resolution practitioners. In recent years, Schön's principles have been more broadly discussed, and are now accepted as being well suited to mediation research because they "... can be translated into research procedures that have broad applicability to a variety of mediation settings ..." (Kressel, 1997, p. 143). Therefore Schön's seminal ideas are representative of methodological and philosophical approaches that promise more useful explanations of practice than those offered by traditional (empiricist) scientific approaches (Keller, 1997).

6.3.3 Rejection of measurement and evaluation

In addition to rejections of the assumptions of a traditional scientific approach, there have been specific concerns about the use of empirically based, quantitative methodologies to measure the effectiveness of conflict resolution practice. Attempts to measure conflict resolution processes have been inextricably linked to the professionalisation of the conflict resolution field, and are a response to the desire of purchasers of conflict resolution services (e.g., the courts) and professional associations to establish training standards and ensure quality assurance (Rolph & Moller, 1994; Test Design Project, 1993; 1995). Therefore, it has been considered important to support the measurement of conflict resolution techniques and establish standards for the advancement of the field (e.g., Gentry, 1994), but there has been concern about the ability of those measurement techniques to fairly represent practice (e.g., Kressel, 1997; Menkel-Meadow, 1993). It has also been argued that the underlying epistemological bases of both practitioners and the conflict resolution process itself, are inconsistent with the assumptions of the traditional empiricist model that is used by researchers to
evaluate conflict resolution practice (Kressel, 1997). Consequently this issue has been a key point of tension between practitioners and researchers in conflict resolution.

Folger and Bush (1996) argued that the outcome measures used in traditional attempts to evaluate conflict resolution practice are insufficient. Essentially they claim that measuring "if a settlement was achieved" is not enough. As an alternative, they propose what they have called 'Transformative Practice', a model of practice that focuses on 'empowerment' and 'recognition' as the key principles that underlie effective mediator attitudes, values and behaviours. They proposed that performance criteria should not only focus on the rates of 'settlement production' (as is the sole principle guiding of most evaluation studies), but should include measures of 'empowerment' and 'recognition' which they feel are the key indicators of successful outcomes.

Menkel-Meadow (1993), wrote that she is very sceptical of the attempts of the measurement enterprise to present a realistic account of mediation effectiveness. For example, she argued that while such endeavours may facilitate efforts to "... create a 'science' of mediation by providing the articulation of specific principles, criteria, and hypotheses' of practice that can be tested by observation and evaluation ...", the more 'artistic' qualities of mediation may not be "... rigorously and fairly ... measured in test-like procedures ..." (pp. 323-324).

Attention is also drawn to the fact that realistic practice conditions are very difficult to replicate in experimental inquires. Menkel-Meadow (1993) discussed the typical use of fixed-fact roleplays in studies of mediator behaviour as an example of how evaluation studies may fail to provide an accurate interpretation of mediator skill. She also claimed
that, in general, the “culture of evaluative criteria” is likely to be biased against, or at least ignorant or disdainful of, other “artful” components of mediation. This is well stated in the following account:

“... Yet, no matter how much we try to develop ‘scientific’ standards, it is difficult to quantify or even specify sometimes that je ne sais quoi that is the “art” of mediation - a particularly tactful intervention, a serendipitous orchestration of possible solutions or communication patterns, a cheerful outlook that keeps the parties working (or the contrary slightly ominous presence that keeps the parties working). All of these are less easy to characterize but often make all the difference to the success of a mediation ...” (p. 324).

In a later article, Menkel-Meadow (1995) argued that the increasing orientation towards evaluation and associated scrutinies could, in fact, result in attempts by practitioners to transform the character’s of disputants (and their dispute), to fit the preferred model of intervention. Clearly this kind of distortion would be as unsatisfactory as practice that could not be adequately measured.

In summary, there is evidence that many practitioners do not want to have standards or specific rules of practice for fear that it would limit the flexibility and creativity of their work. There is also growing opinion to suggest that the methods used by researchers to evaluate the effectiveness of conflict resolution processes are unacceptable to many practitioners, and there are major concerns about whether traditional empiricist approaches can hope to accurately and fairly measure practice. It is nevertheless broadly accepted that it is difficult to avoid some kind of measurement as the field becomes increasingly professionalised.
6.3.4 Alternative models for conflict resolution practice

In the practice community it is widely felt that the principles associated with traditional empirical conceptions of practice are inherently reductionist (see quotation from Kressel (1997) above). The majority of practitioners reject such notions, preferring to embrace a more holistic approach to their work (Kirkup, 1993; Millen, 1994). As a result of this, and in addition to the broad debate about the art and science of conflict resolution, a number of alternative conceptions of conflict resolution practice have emerged in recent literature. While these issues were first mentioned briefly in Section 4.6, the current section will provide a broader discussion of the range and implications of alternative approaches to explaining practice. The assumption underlying this section is that alternative epistemologies represent dissent from traditional models of practice, and is further evidence of the need for investigation into the relationship between research and practice.

One of the major ideas that has been used in the interpretation of conflict resolution practice has been that of the “narrative” approach. Winslade and Cotter (1997) claimed that this constitutes a move away from the problem solving heritage of conflict resolution, which is a hangover of experimental models, to a more social constructionist approach. It is argued that a narrative approach introduces a different way of conceptualising the practice of mediation and that a social constructionist position is more congruent with conflict resolution workers’ values. Winslade, Monk and Cotter (1998) described the differences between mainstream conceptions of conflict resolution practice and a social constructionist approach, and argued that a narrative approach is a suitable guide for practice in a wide variety of mediation situations. There are also references in the literature to the associated narrative techniques of script analysis.
(Halpern, 1997), and transactional approaches to the framing and reframing processes in conflict resolution practice (Bodtker & Jameson, 1997).

Another area of emerging literature regarding conflict resolution practice is that which promotes philosophical and activist tendencies in practitioners (Della Noce, 1997; Severens, 1997). For example, McCormick (1997) asserted that mediators should confront social injustice in their work. In this article the issue of mediator “neutrality”, a concept that is another remnant of a traditional empirical approach to practice, was discussed. An assumption that has guided mediation practice in the past has been the notion that the mediator can, and should, be an impartial or neutral facilitator of conflict resolution. In contrast, McCormick suggested that:

“... the ethic of impartiality be joined by other guiding principles such as transformation, equality, relationship, and justice. Mediators ... need to challenge power imbalances, appeal to moral authority, and encourage disputants to exercise self-actualizing and cooperative forms of power ...” (p. 293).

Such an approach necessarily implies a revision of the concept of impartiality that is a cornerstone of the scientific approach to practice. Similarly, Umbreit (1997) proposed a humanistic model of mediation that opposes the concept of a disengaged, impartial, or neutral approach to practice. He advocated a model of practice that allows practitioners to “... more intentionally and consistently tap into the intrinsic transformative and healing potential of mediation ...” (p. 201). He argued that current models of conflict resolution practice are based on the dominant Western model of achieving settlements through problem solving, and contrasts this with a nondirective style of mediation that he describes as the “dialogue-driven humanistic approach”. Umbreit claims that conflict resolution practice is best conceived as a “paradigm of healing”, and that “... Humanistic
mediation practice offers a transformative journey of peacemaking that is grounded in compassion, strength, and a common humanity ...” (p. 201). A similar proposal is made by Joyce (1995), in his promotion of a Rogerian based “client-centred” approach to conflict resolution. This is further evidence of an emerging value base in conflict resolution practice that opposes the values and philosophical assumptions of traditional empiricist accounts of practice.

There has also been a tendency in the literature to compare the conflict resolution process to other paradigms that are opposed to the traditional empiricist approaches to practice. For example, Keller (1997) made the analogy of conflict resolution practice as being akin to “alchemy”, Saposnek (1987) compared conflict resolution to the Japanese martial art of “Aikido”, Peterson (1992) suggested a new construction of mediation practice in line with “ecological epistemology”, and Benjamin (1990) wrote about the “physics of mediation”, drawing comparisons with recent advances in quantum mechanics theory. Benjamin’s perspective is particularly noteworthy. The premise for his argument was that while scientists traditionally believed that they could accurately ascertain and predict things about the world, the advent of quantum physics demonstrated the inadequacy of that approach because phenomena are much more complex and unpredictable than scientists originally thought. Benjamin argued that the paradigm shift in scientific theory corresponds directly with the language, skills and approach mediators use in conflict resolution practice. While it is clear that the revision of the scientific paradigm is not complete, Benjamin’s comparison with conflict resolution practice is further evidence of a general rejection of a traditional empiricist approach to practice.
It is quite clear that among many practitioners there is a desire to consider more holistic approaches to mediation (Cloke, 1993; Gold, 1993; Rothman, 1996; Yale, 1993; Zumeta, 1993). This includes the aim of an increased focus on the values and attitudes of mediators rather than simply on outcome measures of success (Kirkup, 1993; Zehr, 1995). Rothman (1996) claimed that there is a need to look at the values and motivations of practitioners even when simply evaluating whether their approach to mediation works or not. Other authors have called for a complete review of the ethics and values of conflict resolution practice to encompass a more holistic approach (e.g., Christian & Traber, 1997; Grebe, 1992).

As previously discussed, “transformative” practice also presents an alternative to traditional scientist-practitioner conceptions of practice (Bush & Folger, 1994; Folger & Bush, 1996). While there has been some controversy in the literature about the broad application and knowledge claims of this model (Menkel-Meadow, 1995), it is quite typical of models that support a more holistic approach to practice. Through the “transformative approach” the authors emphasised the social change possibilities of mediation. Their approach centred on issues of “empowerment” and “recognition” rather than problem solving, and incorporates acknowledgment of the effect of mediators’ attitudes about disputants, the need for mediators to explore the motivation of disputants, and the willingness of mediators to address emotions. These concepts challenge the notion of the detached, neutral practitioner that is perpetuated in a traditional empiricist approach to practice.

An increased focus on transcultural issues in the mediation literature is further evidence that the field is seeking new paradigms, ideologies and philosophies to inform practice.
Such articles either explain the conflict resolution practices of other non-western cultures, or study the limitations of western conflict resolution processes in other cultures. Studies of alternative approaches to conflict resolution practice have been diverse, ranging across many cultures including: Samoan, Laotian, and Filipino (Barnes, 1994); Hawaiian (Wall & Callister, 1995a); African and Native American Indian (Cooks, 1995); Australian Aboriginal (Grose, 1995; Hazlehurst, 1988); and many other indigenous traditions (Umbreit, 1997). The pursuit of different cultural approaches to conflict resolution has been accompanied by attempts to integrate such ideas with conventional practice. This is suggestive of new paradigm seeking and philosophical change among practitioners. To understand the implications of this, it is useful to consider the parallels of alternative paradigm seeking in other disciplines. For example, consider how traditional medical practitioners regard those in their profession who seek remedies or paradigms from non-western approaches to medicine.

Other articles about culture that have tended to focus on the inadequacies of western models of conflict resolution also stress the need to broaden the conceptions of conflict resolution practice. For example, Wong (1995) described biases that are likely to occur using a western based model of mediation in divorce settlements with Asian Americans. Further, Callister and Wall (1997) described the need for using "non-assertive" techniques (as compared to western approaches) in conflict resolution practices with Japanese disputants. Some authors have proposed common ethical principles and values that can guide conflict resolution practice across cultures (e.g., Christians & Traber, 1997), while others describe the limitations of a western approach. For example, Benjamin (1997) described how western religious and moral teachings have established a deeply ingrained cultural resistance to the resolution of conflict, and Kydd
(1996) explained that the English language does not provide adequate variability for conflict resolution practice with other cultures.

In describing the search for other paradigms to guide and explain conflict resolution practice, the comments of Saposnek (1993a) are pertinent. He claimed that mediators are looking beyond techniques, and are motivated by a higher level of meaning in their work that is not offered in traditional empirical conceptions of practice. For example:

"... wisdom that cannot be taught as techniques but that must be absorbed between techniques and from patterns of historical and personal experience. Its content is about what is unwritten, unspoken, and perhaps in certain ways unteachable - instincts, intuition, tendencies, emotions, attitudes, beliefs, values - and how they play a central role in our work, whether acknowledged or not ..." (p. 1).

The view that practitioners are dissatisfied with current models of practice and the advocacy of broader paradigms is now widespread in conflict resolution circles. It is clear that this is driven by the rejection of the traditional empiricist scientific principles, and looks to differing paradigms for research and practice. Disputes over paradigms are generally couched in terms of epistemology but center also around differences in values (Liu & Liu, 1997). Therefore, it can be argued that it is the values, attitudes, philosophies and beliefs of researchers and practitioners that are worthy of investigation.

6.3.5 Competition between branches of practice

Further evidence of the need for investigation into conflict resolution practice comes from the emerging difficulties in the field that result from the multidisciplinary basis of conflict resolution research, theory and practice. As was described in earlier chapters, the modern conflict resolution movement has its origins in many disciplines and professions. This fact, in itself, has caused significant difficulty for the field with many
researchers and practitioners embracing models or theories from their “profession of origin” that may not be valued or understood by people from other backgrounds. With increasing pressure to professionalise and validate conflict resolution services, and to evaluate practice (refer to Section 6.3.2) there have been attempts to standardise the operational characteristics of conflict resolution procedures. This has put added strain on practitioners to conform with emerging professional standards, so as to present their practice in a favourable light. The result has been growing competition between different practice groups, that typically come from different discipline backgrounds, with varying levels of training (Neilson, 1994).

As so many disciplines have contributed to the modern conflict resolution movement, it is very difficult to integrate all of the data (Littlefield et al., 1993). While attempts have been made to synthesise the offerings of psychology, politics, sociology and history with “generic theories of conflict resolution”, (e.g., Burton, 1990; Burton & Sandole, 1987) such broad concepts have been difficult to apply at a practical level. This has prompted some authors to query the multidisciplinary nature of the conflict resolution field. For example:

"... Is it possible for mediation to be interdisciplinary? Can specific theories, models, and clinical practices from the mental health, legal, and education professions, and from such academic disciplines as psychology, sociology, social psychology, political science, economics, and anthropology, along with management theories and practices, for that matter, be incorporated into a body of theory and practice called mediation?...” (Maida, 1992, p. 1).

There are a variety of responses to such a question. Some authors support such a proposition, arguing that it is possible, and preferable, to maintain such diversity in conflict resolution theory and practice. Typically such authors believe that a diverse discipline base is good for the field and cite many examples of how ideas, theories, and
practice strategies borrowed from other disciplines can be used in conflict resolution. For example, Haynes (1992) contended that mediation is very much like family therapy practice and therefore systems theory can be used appropriately in mediation.

In contrast, other authors report concern about the involvement of so many disciplines and broad approaches. For example, it is commonly argued that such diversity has had a negative effect on the relationship between researchers and practitioners, and also between groups of researchers and/or practitioners who have different interests in the field. An example of the tension between different interest groups is offered by Bohmer and Ray (1993):

"... Attorney-mediators in Georgia, who were anxious to distance themselves from the more 'touchy-feely' aspects of mediation. As one of them put it, 'I'm not a therapist, I'm a lawyer' ..." (p. 116).

Different groups involved in the field have different uses for conflict resolution processes, and different opinions about what conflict resolution theory and practice should emphasise. However, there is a lack of distinction in the field about these issues, and the distinction being made above about what a "lawyer" does in mediation and what a "therapist" does in mediation, is evidence of that. Bohmer and Ray (1993) made another important point, that is: "... When mediators are lawyers, not only is mediation more like the practice of law, but the practice of law is more like mediation ..." (p. 120). This is evidence for a general regression towards the mean in conflict resolution practice. The professional orientation of the mediator affects the practice of mediation, suggesting that the structure of mediation practice is in need of greater definition independent of the field of the mediator (Neilson, 1994).
Bohmer and Ray (1993) also reported that there is a lack of allegiance to any particular school of mediation among most practitioners. Further, it was found that even if practitioners were aware of different approaches, they tended to amalgamate these to form their own method. This is similar to Pinzon's (1996) comments about the lack of agreement about what makes up theory and practice in conflict resolution, and is supportive of his notion that the greatest troubles in this area come from advocates of different approaches within the field. It is not difficult to imagine, for example, how a lawyer and a family therapist might disagree about the goals, techniques and results of conflict resolution practice.

This issue has become increasingly important as mediation becomes professionalised. Attempts to impose theoretical structure and measurement on conflict resolution practice (refer to Sections 6.3.1 and 6.3.2) are also laden with the values of the traditional positivist approach that is being used to validate the field. While positivist philosophy is rejected by many practitioners of conflict resolution, some interest groups within the field may be more naturally aligned with that approach to practice. For example, the underlying philosophy of a positivist approach to practice is more closely aligned with the philosophy of the law and order model used by many lawyers, than it is to the models of practice traditionally used by social workers and community workers. Therefore some groups involved in conflict resolution are advantaged by movements in the field toward professionalisation and more rigorous standards, while others are not (Gentry, 1994). While this specific issue has not yet appeared in the literature, it has been alluded to in recent discussions about values and ethics in the field. For example, Grebe (1992) compared the value base of family mediation with the primary principles of the professional mediation ethics that are emerging in the field, and identified a high
degree of tension. Grebe concluded that there needs to be greater agreement about values based issues between professional groups within the field. This supports the need for inquiry into the nature of the relationship between research and practice in conflict resolution, not only on the basis of whether one is a researcher or a practitioner, but also on the basis of one's membership to different interest groups.

6.4 Proposal for research

The following section explains the specific aim of this thesis to undertake research about the relationship between research and practice in conflict resolution. Section 6.4.1 summarises the need for this research. Section 6.4.2 identifies some methodological considerations to guide the nature of the inquiry and proposes a survey of the field and qualitative interviews. Finally, Section 6.4.3 briefly reviews the literature about other surveys that have been conducted in the conflict resolution field.

6.4.1 The need for research

A scientist-practitioner model seems to be emerging for conflict resolution practice. This is problematic for a number of reasons. Practitioners are not aware of most conflict resolution research, they rarely publish, and those that do are likely to be publishing for the purpose of reinforcing the professionalisation of the field (Pinzon, 1996). It is also clear that very few researchers are ever involved in practice (Millen, 1994). In general, research has only a minimal influence on practice, with practitioners preferring to rely on their own experience or alternative epistemologies than the findings or models of research (Saposnek, 1993b). Further, it is proposed that there is an epistemological gap between research and practitioners in the area. This is demonstrated in the literature about values and philosophical differences, and the alternative models of practice that
have been proposed. It is also clear that this gap is further increased by conflict between interest groups within the field that are in competition because of the pressure associated with the professionalisation of conflict resolution.

The disaccord between research and practice is well documented. While there are numerous authors who have reflected on this, and a few have proposed possible explanations (see Section 6.3), no attempts have been made to systematically undertake an inquiry into the differences between the research and practice communities.

6.4.2 Methodological considerations

Many authors have commented on the methodological difficulties associated with conflict resolution research. For example, Pruitt and Kressel (1985) wrote that research must be "firmly rooted in the practical and the concrete", and that "conceptual and methodological problems ... defy easy solution" (p. 196). This implies that research needs to be designed to be practical enough for practitioners to be interested, while trying to observe certain methodological conventions. It was therefore decided that attempts would be made to include representatives of the field in the planning of this research endeavour. The aim was to ensure that the research program would be considered suitably practical by potential participants and other practitioners. It was also noted that if practitioners reject traditional approaches to science (as detailed above), they may also reject the scientific methodology required for this investigation. Therefore it was determined to conduct the current inquiry using both quantitative and qualitative approaches; quantitative analysis of survey material supplemented by material from a series of qualitative interviews about the relationship between research and practice.
6.4.3 Other conflict resolution surveys

Before proceeding to the research aims of the thesis, a brief review of other survey research in the conflict resolution field follows. This is in order to demonstrate how little research has been undertaken into the research-practice dilemma in conflict resolution, and how the specific approach of the current thesis is novel. Four broad categories of survey literature that exist in this area will be described below. These incorporate the areas of: (1) evaluation of mediation/mediator effectiveness; (2) general attitudes of clients toward conflict resolution; (3) mediator attitudes toward different conflict resolution techniques; and, (4) individual characteristics of conflict resolution workers. The first two categories will be described in brief, while the third and fourth categories, being more directly relevant to the current thesis, are discussed in detail.

In the first category are those surveys that aim to evaluate mediator effectiveness by surveying disputants (post-mediation) about their satisfaction with mediation techniques and mediator behaviours (e.g., Carnevale et al., 1991; Depner, Cannata & Ricci, 1994; Slater, Shaw & Duquesnel, 1992; Sullivan, Schwebel & Lind, 1997; Williams, 1997). This category constitutes the majority of survey work in the conflict resolution field.

The second, much smaller, area of literature includes surveys of users of conflict resolution services that seek general attitudes towards mediation and conflict resolution processes. These are not specifically formulated to evaluate conflict resolution processes, but rather, aim to determine how clients generally feel about conflict resolution processes (e.g., Krislow & Mead, 1972; Vanayan, 1997).

The third category of literature describes surveys of conflict resolution professionals’ attitudes or preferences toward different conflict resolution techniques. The seminal
work in this area was the book by Kolb (1983), ‘The Mediators’, that provided a series of case-studies about different types of mediator. While this is a thoughtful and unique contribution to the literature, it does not specifically relate to recent issues in research and practice. Musty and Crago (1984) provided another example of literature about mediator attitudes that is more relevant to current issues. They surveyed 52 mental health professionals, from a variety of backgrounds (including psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers and family counsellors), about their use of, and attitudes toward, different mediation techniques. Similarly, Carnevale et al. (1991) surveyed 34 community mediators about the tactics and strategies that they would use in different types of mediation cases and their attitudes to mediation. Another kind of survey was the nation-wide (USA) project that surveyed 900 judges about their preferences for different mediation techniques and the effectiveness of those techniques (Wall & Rude, 1991).

This segment of the literature has also involved formal reviews of conflict resolution programs and the opinions of practitioners in the field. For example, Hughes and Schneider (1989) conducted a survey based review of the victim-offender mediation services available in the USA. The aim of this review was to gain a better understanding of the design and implementation of such programs, and the activities of the practitioners and administrators involved. They identified and evaluated 7 major characteristics of mediation programs: purposes and goals, target population, organisation/administration, mediator/mediation characteristics, the final contract, program support, and role of evaluation. Similar surveys about the dynamics of the mediation process and the attitudes of practitioners involved have also been conducted about the use of mediation for resolving disputes in schools (Metis Associates Inc.,
1990), and for determining due process procedures in disputes about special education issues (Ahearn, 1994).

Finally, the fourth category of surveys includes those that have sought to establish a profile of practitioners of conflict resolution services. These incorporate studies into attitudes and values that are contingent not only on conflict resolution activities, but on the individual themselves. This category of survey research is closest to the aims of the current inquiry. In the first study of this type Weschler (1950) attempted to determine what he called the “collective personality” of labour mediators. His aim was to determine “good” mediators from “poor” mediators on the basis of various personality variables. The “good” and “poor” groups were given an intelligence test, personality test, information and attitude inventory, and biographical questionnaire. Weschler reported that the variables that consistently discriminated between the groups were age, religious preference, intelligence, and impartiality.

Very little other research of this kind was conducted until the mid 1980s when modern conflict resolution techniques like mediation became more popular. At this time research into the values and attitudes of mediators tended to be centred on either attitudes towards various conflict resolution techniques (see above) or values about an issue pertinent to the field. One such issue has been that of “neutrality”. This has been one of the most contentious issues for the developing field of conflict resolution and has received a variety of responses (e.g., Marshall, 1990; Rifkin et al., 1991 Silbey, 1993). Exploration of the concept of neutrality has led to an inevitable examination of the values of mediators in their decisions associated with the question of neutrality. For example, Bernard, Folger, Weingarten and Zumeta (1984) investigated the value
dilemmas confronting mediators associated with the issue of neutrality. It was proposed that mediators must choose to act as either a neutral, facilitative third party; a proponent of a just and fair settlement; a protector of the weak party; or a combination of these roles. The values underlying these different positions were subsequently explored. While this did not comprise a formal investigation into the value differences between different practitioner groups, it is typical of research in the area that tends to be descriptive rather than comparative. Further, it is illustrative of a movement toward the exploration of individual differences in mediators. Similar inquiries have been made about the values base of the family mediation profession and ethical standards (Grebe, 1992), and various differences in values regarding issues of social injustice (McCormick, 1997).

In more recent years, Nye (1995) explored the attitudinal characteristics of members of the National Academy of Arbitrators (USA). He conducted a survey of alternative labor dispute resolution attitudes and incorporated issues of professional orientation and social attitudes. While this research was conducted from an organisational, rather than a psychological perspective (although these boundaries are blurred), it is also illustrative of surveys in the field of conflict resolution that seek to establish some position about the attitudes of its members.

In summary, the first two categories, including mediator effectiveness and client attitudes toward conflict resolution, constitute the majority of survey research that has been conducted in conflict resolution. The second two categories, that are more directly relevant to the current thesis, incorporating the attitudes of conflict resolution workers to different conflict resolution processes and the individual characteristics of those
involved in the field, have been investigated to a much lesser extent. The current program of research aims to extend these investigations by conducting a comprehensive study of the activities, values, attitudes and epistemological characteristics of both researchers and practitioners in conflict resolution. In addition the data will be examined to identify differences between various interest groups that might exist within the field.

6.5 Research aims of the current thesis

Based on the literature reviewed above, and the considerations detailed in previous chapters, the following five broad aims were developed to guide the investigations for the current program of research.

Research Aim 1

Establish the perceived state of the relationship between research and practice in the field of conflict resolution, and allow this input to guide the nature of the current inquiry. This is to be achieved by undertaking consultations with researchers and practitioners who had substantial experience in the field. The aim of this was to gain reliable data to inform the development of a survey instrument.

Research Aim 2

Develop an instrument that would effectively measure the differences that are proposed to exist between researchers and practitioners. It was determined that this instrument should include sections that sought information about: conflict resolution activities; attitudes toward various developments in the conflict resolution field; general values; and, epistemological and philosophical orientation. However, it was decided that the
exact nature of the survey should remain open until the findings of research aim 1 could be incorporated.

**Research Aim 3**

Undertake a survey of the field using the instrument described above, and analyse the results of the survey to determine the nature and extent of differences between researchers and practitioners involved in the conflict resolution field.

**Research Aim 4**

Determine the nature and composition of any distinct professional subgroups that can be identified from the survey data. The survey results will then be analysed in accord with these categories. This will allow for the exploration of the comments made in Section 6.3.5 that dysfunction in the conflict resolution field is fuelled not only by the broad differences that exist between research and practice, but also by the interests of various professional interest groups.

**Research Aim 5**

Undertake qualitative research using semi-structured interviews to determine the nature and extent of differences between both researchers and practitioners, and the interest groups proposed in research aim 4. The goal was to acquire an additional form of data with which to interpret and extend the results of research aims 3 and 4. Further details about this aim will be described in Chapter 11.
6.6 Summary

Chapter 6 summarised the need for greater links between research and practice in conflict resolution, and provided a framework for reviewing the extensive evidence of dissatisfaction with current relations. Historical factors, rejection of empiricist conceptions of practice and measurement of that practice, were proposed as evidence for the dysfunction between research and practice. It was acknowledged that many of these difficulties had their origins in the reactions of practitioners to attempts to professionalise the conflict resolution field. In addition, various alternative models or epistemologies for practice were described, and the potential for dysfunction between interest groups in the field was discussed. On the basis of these issues the dysfunctional relationship between research and practice in conflict resolution was determined to be an area suitable for investigation. Relevant methodological issues and previous surveys of the field were then discussed. Finally, the research aims of the current thesis were listed. These comprised a series of empirical investigations based on extensive consultation with members of the field, survey research and interview research.
CHAPTER 7
CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF
THE SURVEY INSTRUMENT

7.0 Introduction

This chapter addresses research aims 1 and 2 that emphasised the need for consultation in the development of the survey instrument. Section 7.1 describes the conduct of a focus group and a number of interviews with experienced members of the conflict resolution field. Section 7.2 then summarises the findings of these consultative processes, and Section 7.3 describes the recommendations for research that emerged from the focus group.

Section 7.4 describes the development of the survey questionnaire from results of the consultation process and the existing literature. This is summarised in four tables that provide a series of hypotheses about the differences between researchers and practitioners. Finally, Section 7.5 reports on the piloting of the survey instrument. These processes were considered essential for the development of an effective
instrument to investigate the differences between researchers and practitioners involved in the conflict resolution field, and are therefore described fully.

7.1 Focus group and interviews

The input of both researchers and practitioners was sought during the development of the survey instrument. The aim was to allow those involved in the field to guide the nature of the inquiry and assist in developing an effective questionnaire. This consultative approach was conducted in the spirit of the ‘Delphi’ technique. This involved consulting a group of people with a high degree of experience in the field of interest to guide the nature of the inquiry.

The objectives for any Delphi exercise are: to explore assumptions that lead to differing judgments; to seek information that generates a consensus of judgment across a respondent group; and to bring together informed judgments on a topic spanning a wide range of disciplines (Rowe, Wright & Bolger, 1991). The concept of approaching an expert group to gain direction for studies in the social sciences has been beneficial in the development of effective tools for inquiry into the needs and attitudes of opposing groups (Jeffery, Hache & Lehr, 1995) and for investigating the differences in the attitudes of researchers and practitioners in other areas of psychology (Speight, Thomas, Kennel & Anderson, 1995). Further, studies that adopt Delphi techniques have been useful in investigations of emerging areas of practice such as constructivism, language-based (narrative) therapy, and solution-based therapy (Jenkins & Smith, 1994).

In this study the ‘nominal group process’ method (Grbich, 1999) was adopted. This process is not the complete Delphi technique, but rather, is the procedure often used in
the early stages of a Delphi technique exercise. While the Delphi technique involves an 
extended process of several rounds of questionnaires and feedback loops, the nominal 
group process is a strategy used to simply gauge the opinions of ‘experts’. It is the 
focus on ‘experts’, or those highly experienced in a particular area, which distinguishes 
nominal group process from other focus groups (Stewart & Shamdasani, 1990). This 
process characteristically involves the pooling of diverse judgements of five to nine 
‘experts’ who are invited to deliberate on an issue where disagreement is known to exist 
(Grbich, 1999). This approach was used to facilitate a discussion of the issues facing 
research and practice in conflict resolution and to provide insight into the appropriate 
variables to include in the survey. The specific procedural issues of the nominal group 
process are outlined in Section 7.1.2. While it is acknowledged that subtle differences 
exist between ‘focus groups’ and ‘nominal group processes’, for the sake of simplicity, 
the term ‘focus group’ will be used throughout this thesis.

A second consultative process to obtain ‘expert’ input was used in the current program 
of research. One-to-one interviews were conducted with suitably experienced 
researchers and practitioners. It should be noted that no researcher or practitioner 
participated in both the focus group and the interviews. The interviews provided an 
opportunity for the investigator to explore some of the issues that arose in the focus 
group at a deeper level, thereby clarifying the nature of the variables to include in the 
survey.

7.1.1 Participants

Selection of participants for the focus group was conducted following the rationale of 
‘purposive sampling’ (Patton, 1990). This requires that the researcher must sample
where the phenomenon is known to already exist. Eight individuals, who had been involved in the conflict resolution field for a minimum of three years, and were well known to the investigator as having broad and differing views about the nature of the relationship between research and practice in conflict resolution, were invited to attend a meeting (focus group). It was explained that the aim of the meeting was to discuss the nature of the relationship between research and practice in conflict resolution, and that the investigator was seeking information upon which to base a research study.

Five participants attended the group including: an academic involved in conflict resolution research; a community mediator; a lawyer who practiced alternative dispute resolution; a social worker who practiced mediation; and, a counsellor who used mediation in their work with family therapy. In addition to the focus group, three one-to-one interviews were conducted. These were undertaken with two other academic researchers and the director of a mediation centre. The same questions were used in the interviews as had been posed in the focus group, but the one-to-one nature of this inquiry enabled more specific discussion of the relevant issues. Responses from both the focus group and the interviews were integrated and are reported in Section 7.2.

7.1.2 Procedure

The investigator met with the group and gave a brief overview of the aims of the research. It was explained that the investigator was interested in being informed by those present about what they thought were the current issues in the relationship between research and practice, and ways to proceed with the proposed investigation.
It was explained to participants that there were no right or wrong answers and that the purpose of the group was not to produce consensus answers. Rather, the group was encouraged to present a variety of opinions. The discussion was conducted in accordance with Section E of the Australian Psychological Society rules for professional conduct (1994), that outline the principles relating to ethical research with human participants. Further, it was explained that information gained from the exercise would be held in confidence, and that no individual’s opinions would be identifiable in later publications. No tape recording of the discussions was conducted, however the participants agreed that the researcher could take notes.

The implementation of the ‘nominal group process’ strategy for the focus group included the four steps outlined by Grbich (1999). First, participants were presented with five written questions as listed in Table 7.1. These questions were presented as ‘stimulus’ questions aimed at facilitating discussion rather than constituting a rigid framework for the process. Second, participants were invited to make notes about each of the questions, and then present their general opinions with justification and/or explanation to the other members of the group. The third step involved lengthy group discussion about the opinions presented. This was to provide clarification and generate different perspectives about the nature of the relationship between research and practice in conflict resolution. Fourth, participants were asked to rank the most important issues generated from the discussions, and deliberate on them to establish some conclusive principles to guide the research.
Table 7.1  Focus group and interview stimulus questions

1. How do you believe the conflict resolution field is progressing?
2. Do you think the multidisciplinary interests in conflict resolution work well together?
3. Is there a good relationship between the different parties involved in the research and practice of conflict resolution?
4. If there are difficulties, why do you think they arise?
5. If there are difficulties, how do you think they should be investigated?

In the focus group there was a collaborative, enthusiastic discussion of all of the questions over a three hour session. While opinions differed, the discussion was facilitated to encourage differing points of view so that the study would be best informed. In addition to this, as professionals involved in conflict resolution, the focus group participants were well versed in the skills for communicating about potentially conflictual issues.

The one-to-one interviews were conducted as traditional semi-structured 'open-ended' interviews (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994), and utilised the same set of stimulus questions as the focus group (refer to Table 7.1). Further discussion of the principles identified by the focus group was possible during the one-to-one interviews and these findings are included with the results detailed in Section 7.2.
7.2 Results of focus group and interviews

The major findings from the focus group and interviews are summarised below. First, general observations about the relationship between researchers and practitioners are summarised. Second, on the basis of the suggestions from the focus group and interviews, some likely sources of difficulty in this relationship are postulated.

7.2.1 The relationship between researchers and practitioners

There was a general consensus among participants regarding the presence of difficulties in the relationship between research and practice in the conflict resolution field. Participants claimed that there was very little communication between research and practice, and also among the different occupational groups involved in the field. Further, concern was expressed about the future impact of this poor communication as the field becomes more “professionalised”.

There were numerous reports of a general lack of appreciation of the specific skills and talents possessed by researchers and practitioners. Examples were given to suggest that there was a lack of understanding and knowledge about the roles of each group. This was particularly notable in discussions regarding the role of academic research. Practitioners reported that in their opinion, most researchers had very little experience of the issues pertinent to conflict resolution practice, and most academic research was “too theoretical”, and “irrelevant to everyday practice”.

Practitioners acknowledged that some researchers did attempt to undertake applied research that could be useful to them, but that this research was usually discipline specific (e.g., applied legal research that was only relevant to lawyers). In general
practitioners expressed negative views about theoretical research, but were more positive about the researchers who had some applied experience. Practitioners also argued that the “complex” and “creative” skills they used in conflict resolution were “oversimplified” and “undervalued” by researchers.

Researchers generally argued that practitioners did not understand the nature of research, nor the importance of research, and that they were not up-to-date with recent applied research findings. Researchers also held the opinion that practitioners did not use “rigorous” methodologies and “should be receptive” to the findings of research.

7.2.2 Sources of difficulty

While participants in the focus group and interviews identified many issues that could possibly account for difficulties between researchers and practitioners, most difficulties appeared to originate from two distinct, but related, domains. The first concerns differences in values and attitudes, and the second concerns differences in practical and operational interests.

A substantive part of focus group and interview discussions involved the different attitudes and values that participants thought were “commonly” held by researchers and practitioners. In the focus group particularly, this was postulated as the most probable source of differences between groups. Generalised and stereotypical models of the values and attitudes of researchers and practitioners respectively were espoused, with both groups tending to offer positive interpretations of their own roles, and somewhat critical summaries of the other. It was claimed that different philosophical and educational backgrounds were likely to be the source of these differences. It was further
suggested that the way researchers and practitioners viewed the "meaning" of their work in conflict resolution could be clearly distinguished, and that they held divergent views about "how the world worked". The possibility that people with different "personality types" would be differentially attracted to careers in either research or practice was also suggested.

Other substantial differences between researchers and practitioners as proposed by participants included operational or practical dimensions. These can be summarised as: ways of doing conflict resolution; motivations for using conflict resolution and for being involved in the conflict resolution field; understandings of the goals of conflict resolution; and models for the effective application of conflict resolution principles. Participants expected that these wide differences existed primarily due to functional roles and different sources of information.

It was also highlighted that both value and attitudinal differences, and practical and operational differences, existed not only between researchers and practitioners, but also between different professional groups involved in the conflict resolution field (e.g., lawyers and social workers). This final point supports the proposition made in research aim 4 that the difficulties associated with an applied field like conflict resolution may be associated not only with the research - practice dialectic, but also with the specific interests of occupational or professional groups.
7.3 Suggestions for research

Participants made numerous suggestions for a research inquiry into the relationship between research and practice in the field of conflict resolution. These can be summarised as encompassing methodological considerations and the target population.

7.3.1 Methodological considerations

It was suggested that any attempts at research would require very specific goals and effective presentation in order to enlist the involvement of participants because most practitioners were viewed as being rather negative or ambivalent about research. Therefore, the recruitment of practitioners would be difficult if they did not support the purpose of the research, or if they were not satisfied of its utility. For these reasons the format of the proposed inquiry was discussed in considerable detail.

Participants expressed their dislike about research that incorporated an experimental model (intervention based), and/or evaluations of their practice abilities. The investigator explained that the overall aim of the study was to improve the understanding of differences between researchers and practitioners, rather than to evaluate effectiveness, and that the information provided by the focus group would be utilised to develop a survey for that inquiry. Participants agreed that a survey was the most efficient method of inquiry, but also emphasised the importance of qualitative interviews for a deeper understanding of the issues. The suggestion of qualitative methods supports the proposition made in research aim 5 for a qualitative inquiry into the findings of the survey. It was further suggested that a personal approach to participants, rather than a “mail-out”, would be preferable.
7.3.2 Target population

Important information about the potential sample for the study was provided by participants in the focus group and interviews. It was learned that those involved in the conflict resolution field, and in particular practitioners, were often voluntary workers who were involved in the field on a part-time basis, and that this would make finding a suitable sample difficult. It also became apparent that there would not be enough experienced practitioners locally to participate in a survey. When the possibility of an Australia wide survey was proposed, the group felt that while there were more suitable participants in other capital cities, most would have had less than three years experience in the field. Participants suggested that conflict resolution was much more advanced in the United Kingdom (UK) and the United States of America (USA), and that large, more appropriately qualified participants could be more easily identified in those countries. It was therefore decided, following further confirmatory investigations, to collect data in the UK.

7.4 Development of the survey instrument

The survey attempted to include issues that addressed the expressed views of participants in the focus group and interviews. Further consideration of the two major areas of difference suggested by participants (i.e., values and attitudes, and practical and operational interests), allowed four domains to be identified. The themes that emerged from the focus group and interviews could be organised around these four domains and thereby guide the construction of the survey instrument. Specifically, differences were postulated to exist between researchers and practitioners in the following areas: (1) activities and attitudes relevant to the conflict resolution field; (2) issues relevant to the scientist-practitioner debate in the conflict resolution field; (3) general values
systems; and, (4) general personality issues. It should be noted that while the
construction of the survey instrument was based on the consideration of these four
domains, many of these issues have also been alluded to (but not necessarily formally
discussed) in recent conflict resolution literature (refer to Tables 7.2 to 7.5).

The domain “activities and attitudes relevant to the conflict resolution field” was
assessed by including the work activities, professional activities, information sources
used by researchers and practitioners in the survey instrument, and questions about their
attitudes towards the field and its development. The second domain concerning
researcher and practitioner differences regarding “the scientist-practitioner debate in the
conflict resolution field” was assessed by including measures of their attitudes towards
science, scientists, the way science should be conducted, and their social value systems
regarding scientific endeavour. The third domain, that proposed differences in “general
values systems”, was considered by participants in the focus group and interviews to be
important in addition to any value differences that might exist because of the scientist-
practitioner debate. This was assessed by including measures of world view, interest in
social equality and personal values. Finally, the fourth domain, that proposed
differences between researchers and practitioners in “general personality issues” was
investigated by including measures of general personality characteristics and creativity.

An extensive review of the personality/individual differences and philosophy of science
literature identified a number of existing scales that were appropriate for exploring the
domains described above. In addition, some specific instruments were developed as
part of this study. Tables 7.2 through 7.5 summarise the four domains that formed the
basis of the survey instrument. Included for each domain are: the original themes that
emerged from the focus group and interviews that are relevant to that domain; literature that supports or implies the importance of each theme for conflict resolution; and, the questions and/or scales used in the survey to quantify each theme, and the section of the questionnaire that contains those items. The themes can be considered as hypotheses about the differences that are proposed to exist between researchers and practitioners. Further information about the survey instrument, including an overview of the psychometric qualities and administrative procedures of individual scales, is described in Section 8.4. The complete instrument is included in Appendix A.

7.5 Pilot Study

The following section describes the piloting of the questionnaire and a summary of the changes made to it on the basis of the pilot study. This assumes a familiarity with the survey instrument which is not fully described until the following chapter. However, it is logical to include a report of the pilot study in this chapter about the development of the survey instrument. It should be noted therefore, that reference is made to sections and questions in the order that they now appear in the final version of the instrument (available in Appendix A). The main purpose of the pilot study was to examine the wording and relevance of the questionnaire. This was necessary for two related reasons. First, a number of the questionnaires were originally created for use with psychologists and therefore there was some concern about whether the language was potentially difficult for participants. Second, due to the multidisciplinary nature of conflict resolution practice it was important to ensure that the questions, particularly in the sections that sought to identify definitional and operational differences, covered the range of possible participant experiences. Overall the aim was to encourage the collection of reliable survey information and minimise the potential for missing data.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus group / interview theme</th>
<th>Supporting literature</th>
<th>Instrument and Questionnaire Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Practitioners and researchers differ with respect to:  
  - work activities,  
  - conflict resolution models  
  - training  
  - work settings  
  - work areas | anecdotal evidence | Various questions relating to work activities  
  (Section 2: What do you do in conflict resolution?) |
| Practitioners and researchers differ with respect to:  
  - reliance on qualitative and quantitative data  
  - use of different information sources  
  - assessment of advantages of conflict resolution  
  - influences in conflict resolution  
  - value judgements about each other | Folger and Bush (1996)  
Pinzon (1996)  
Saposnek (1993a) | Various questions relating to information sources and professional activities  
(Section 3: Conflict resolution information sources & professional activities) |
| Practitioners and researchers have different beliefs about mediation and the development of the conflict resolution field | Pinzon (1996)  
Rothman (1996)  
Bush and Folger (1994)  
Gentry (1994)  
Millen (1994)  
Harrington (1991) | Attitudes toward a number of the current issues for conflict resolution in the area of mediation  
(Section 4: Beliefs about mediation) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus group / interview theme</th>
<th>Supporting literature</th>
<th>Instrument and Questionnaire Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Researchers and practitioners have different views about science, scientists and how science should be conducted</td>
<td>Williams (1997)</td>
<td>Theoretical Orientation Survey and the Epistemological Style Questionnaire (Section 6: Attitudes toward theory and method in science)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kirkup (1993)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Menkel-Meadow (1993)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saposnek (1993b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practitioners and researchers have different social values regarding science</td>
<td>Saposnek (1993b)</td>
<td>Krasner and Houts Values Survey (Section 10: Social values)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Banks (1986)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus group / interview theme</td>
<td>Supporting literature</td>
<td>Instrument and Questionnaire Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practitioners and researchers have different basic world views</td>
<td>Rothman (1996)</td>
<td>The World Assumptions Scale (Section 7: Your world view)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cloke (1993)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gold (1993)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yale (1993)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zumeta (1993)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fong (1992)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saposnek (1987)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practitioners are more empathic and more interested in social equality than researchers.</td>
<td>Della Noce (1997)</td>
<td>Social Interest Scale (Section 8: Personal characteristics that you value)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Severens (1997)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bush and Folger (1984)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practitioners and researchers have different values</td>
<td>Rothman (1996)</td>
<td>Schwartz Values Survey (Section 9: Guiding principles in your life)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cooks (1995)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saposnek (1993b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walker (1989)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus group / interview theme</td>
<td>Supporting literature</td>
<td>Instrument and Questionnaire Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practitioners are more creative than researchers</td>
<td>Saposnek (1993b)</td>
<td>Creative Personality Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acland (1990)</td>
<td>(Section 5: How creative do you think you are?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bolton (1987)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practitioners and researchers have different</td>
<td>Menkel-Meadow (1993)</td>
<td>Big Five Personality Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personality characteristics</td>
<td>Saposnek (1993b)</td>
<td>(Section 11: How accurately can you describe yourself?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.5.1 Participants and procedure

Twenty people were recruited to be involved in the piloting of the questionnaire. The sample was opportunistic in that individuals from a wide variety of occupations that are traditionally involved in the conflict resolution field were included. It was not possible to include individuals who were all exclusively involved in conflict resolution as a sufficient number were not available. However, it was reasoned that if an appropriate mix of participants could be achieved then the findings from the survey should be quite robust. The fact that a suitable sample of participants who were closely involved in conflict resolution could not be accessed locally further emphasised the need to gather data in the UK.

The investigator invited individuals to complete the questionnaire, make a note of sections that they felt were difficult to follow, and highlight questions that they felt were either ambiguous or redundant. Following this, the investigator undertook a debriefing session with each participant, and made notes regarding specific problem areas and suggestions for changes to the questionnaire.

7.5.2 Results of piloting

The debriefing sessions with participants in the pilot study elicited information regarding structural and organisational changes to the first three sections of the questionnaire which aimed to gather information about the demographic, activities and information sources of the participants. The remaining parts of the questionnaire only required minor changes to the presentation and instructions. It is likely that this was because these scales had already been broadly utilised.
In Section 1 changes to the questions seeking information about educational background were required. Originally this item took the form of a table requiring participants to identify their degree type, year completed and institution. Participants reported that they found the table difficult to interpret and complete. It was decided that the detail sought from this approach was unnecessary, therefore the table was replaced with more straight-forward questions about educational background (refer to Section 1: items 6 and 7). The same issue was raised regarding Section 2 where participants were asked about specific training they had undertaken, or were currently taking, in conflict resolution. Similar changes were applied (refer to Section 2: items 6 and 7).

Another question that required substantial modification in Section 2, was item 1, that asked participants to nominate themselves as either researchers or practitioners. In general the pilot study participants reported that they thought it was very important to allow for the possibility of a participant who considered themselves both a researcher and a practitioner. They also suggested broader options for participants to nominate as professional titles (refer to Section 2: item 5), and the inclusion of "Other" categories in a variety of items. Discussions with pilot study participants also resulted in the development of items 8 and 9, that asked participants to nominate respectively their "work setting" and "specific area of work in the field". These questions replaced a single item that asked participants to nominate what they do in conflict resolution. It was decided that the new items enabled more meaningful information to be collected.

In Section 3, participants suggested the detailed clarification of the terms used in questions 1 to 7. In discussions with the pilot study participants, the investigator raised specific concerns about the length and detail of items 5 to 7. These questions sought
responses about the information sources utilised by respondents, and the respondent’s view of the information sources used by “typical researchers” and “typical practitioners” respectively. In general, the participants reported that they found the categories easy to follow, and that the questions made “inherent” sense to them. Similar questions were raised by the investigator about the necessity of items 17 and 18 that asked respondents to nominate both the major advantages of a conflict resolution approach, and the people who had been major influences on their work in the field. Again, participants reported that they felt the questions prompted them to consider important domains of their interest in the area. Therefore it was decided to retain these questions.

Section 4 of the questionnaire is comprised of a scale that was developed specifically for this study and therefore it was of prime interest during the piloting. Significant changes were made to the wording and direction of questions as a result of the feedback received from participants. Some repetitive items were removed, reducing the scale from 30 items to 26 items.

The other substantial area of interest was the scales used in Sections 6 and 10. These scales were originally developed for use with psychologists, and the investigator was concerned that respondents may find the sections confusing or irrelevant. Participants did identify a few words with which they were unfamiliar, but when questioned about the appropriateness of the scale to people involved in conflict resolution, they agreed that most people would be able to understand it. Interestingly, when questioned if they noticed that the scales were designed to be used in a study of psychologists, none of the participants stated that they had realised this. Therefore, it was concluded that the items
could be used as they were, rather than altering the wording of questions, that may have created unknown effects on the reliability and validity of the scales.

7.5.3 Clarification of changes made to the survey instrument

A revised version of the survey instrument, incorporating the changes outlined above, was used in the second stage of piloting. A further ten people completed the final version of the survey instrument. The participants in this stage comprised six individuals who were working in the conflict resolution field and four who were familiar with the area.

In this second stage, participants were given the questionnaire to complete under more standardised conditions and were not invited to offer suggestions for changes. The aim was to determine whether participants could understand the questions and successfully complete the questionnaire. However, at the conclusion of each questionnaire, the investigator did discuss issues of questionnaire clarity and sequence with participants. Following the second stage of piloting, minor changes were made in the presentation and format of the questionnaire. It was found that the questionnaire took on average ninety minutes to complete, and it was suggested that participants be advised that they may take breaks while completing it. Therefore this note was included in the instructions.
7.6 Summary

The procedure for the development of the survey instrument was described in this chapter. Emphasis was placed on consultation with people involved in the field in order to develop an instrument that included valid areas of inquiry, and that participants would be prepared to answer. Further, this approach sought to capitalise on the advantages of the "Delphi" method of inquiry that were highlighted earlier in this chapter. These investigations guided the determination of relevant variables and enabled a draft survey instrument to be constructed that, when piloted, resulted in few concerns being expressed by participants. A modest number of changes were made which improved the readability, wording, and presentation of the survey instrument. In conclusion, the process described in this chapter resulted in the development of the final instrument as described in Chapter 8.
CHAPTER 8
SURVEY METHODOLOGY

8.0 Introduction

Chapter 8 describes the expanded methodology for the quantitative investigation including a detailed account of the instruments used. Section 8.1 describes the experimental design of the study. Section 8.2 describes the participants and procedure used in the study, including a detailed account of the methods utilised for recruiting respondents, the response rates for various sampling methods, and the demographic characteristics of the final sample. Section 8.3 provides a detailed review of the survey instrument. Each section of the survey is described in full detail, including the construct being measured, and the origin and historical development of each published scale. Finally, Section 8.4 summarises the chapter.
8.1 Study Design

This study comprises what is commonly called a ‘one-shot case study’ or ‘survey’ (Campbell & Stanley, 1963). It is acknowledged that the extent to which conclusions can be drawn from such a design are limited. However, it was clear from the findings of the focus group and interviews (summarised in Section 7.3.1), that potential respondents would be unwilling to participate in the study if a more complex design was used. In fact, many rejected the notion of a more experimentally controlled inquiry.

8.2 Participants and procedure

Due to the low numbers of suitable participants in Australia, participants for the survey were sought from organisations involved in the conflict resolution field in the UK. They were selected from a systematic review of the Forum for Initiatives in Reparation and Mediation (FIRM) Directory of Mediation Projects and Conflict Resolution Services (1991). This directory represented the most current listing of the individuals, community organisations, legal firms, and university departments involved in the conflict resolution field in the UK. Some of the contacts listed in the FIRM directory were not approached because they were either unable to be contacted, or they were based in Ireland or Scotland and could not be visited by the author.

During a ten week data collection period, the author telephoned contacts (individuals and organisations) listed in the directory to explain the nature of the study and invite suitable people to participate in the survey. In approximately 80% of cases the representative of the organisation or individual concerned responded positively to the invitation. However, almost 30% of the contacts were unable to fulfil the criterion of a minimum of 18 months involvement in the field.
When a positive response was received, an appointment was made to visit the contact
during which the investigator personally introduced potential participants to the survey.
When it was not possible for the author to arrange a suitable time to visit the
organisation or individuals concerned, the survey was sent to the potential participants
by mail. This was not the preferred approach because of concerns about response rate,
however the instructions for the survey (refer to Appendix A) were written to allow for
the possibility of participants being sent surveys by mail.

The survey was essentially self administered, but when it was possible to visit
organisations the author was available during the survey to answer any questions or
provide assistance as required. In most cases it was possible for the participants to
complete the survey in the allotted time and the author was able to collect the surveys
before leaving. On occasions where it was not possible to complete the surveys in time,
participants were asked to return completed surveys by mail at their earliest
convenience. However, due to financial limitations, it was not possible to pay the
participants’ expenses for return mailing of the completed questionnaires. This
inconvenience was expected to have an adverse effect on response rate. Therefore,
every effort was made by the investigator to collect completed questionnaires from
participants.

In order to recruit participants for the study, 23 organisations and 26 individuals were
visited over a period of ten weeks. From this direct method 97 surveys were given out,
resulting in 83 completed questionnaires. This represents an 86.5% response rate. The
discrepancy from a perfect return rate was due to the fact that some of the questionnaires
that were expected to be returned by mail were not, and 3 of the completed
questionnaires did not meet the 18 month experience inclusion criterion. Telephone conversations with organisations or individuals sometimes occurred where an appropriate visit time could not be arranged. In these instances a suitable number of questionnaires were sent to the potential respondents by mail. This method resulted in the distribution of 85 questionnaires, with 38 completed questionnaires being returned, and of these 34 satisfying the inclusion requirements. The response rate was 40%. The total number of returned questionnaires from these two methods amounted to 117.

In an attempt to increase sample size, a further 65 questionnaires were sent (with a covering letter) to other conflict resolution organisations in the UK that were not able to be contacted directly by the investigator. This resulted in a further 19 questionnaires that could be included in the sample, and represented a 29.2% response rate. Table 8.1 presents a summary of these different methods of contact and the resulting response rates. Clearly, the direct method was most successful. The two ‘mail’ methods were susceptible to two major difficulties that could not be avoided. The first was the issue of return mailing mentioned above, and the second involved a lack of real knowledge about the extent to which the number of questionnaires that were sent to organisations were actually distributed to potential respondents. Therefore the response rates achieved for the mailed questionnaires may not reflect the true rate of uptake.

The final sample consisted of 136 people who nominated themselves as having at least 18 months experience in the conflict resolution field. The age of respondents ranged from 21 to 61 years ($M = 37.8$ years, $SD = 9.0$ years). There were 63 male respondents (46.3%) and 73 female respondents (57.3%). The majority of the sample were either married or living in a de facto relationship ($n = 107, 78.7$%). A further 25 (18.4%) were
### Table 8.1 Method of contact and response rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method of contact</th>
<th>Surveys sent</th>
<th>Useable surveys received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct contact</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>86.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone contact and mailed</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter contact and mailed</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>247</strong></td>
<td><strong>136</strong></td>
<td><strong>55.1%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 8.2 Religious affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None specified</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quaker</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious (no further detail)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Valid N</strong></td>
<td>136</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
single, while 4 (2.9%) were divorced. All respondents were resident in the United Kingdom, with 125 (91.9%) identifying themselves as British, 7 (5.1%) identifying themselves as Irish, and 4 (2.9%) identifying themselves as European.

The respondents' religious affiliation is shown in Table 8.2. A majority of respondents (greater than 50%) identified themselves as having a religious affiliation, with most of these simply indicating that they were Christian. Table 8.3 displays the highest level of education that the respondents had completed. Almost three quarters of the sample (73.6%) had attained at least a four year university qualification. The main area of study undertaken by those who had completed a university degree is presented in Table 8.4.

8.3 Instruments

The 'Conflict Resolution Survey' (refer to Appendix A) comprised 11 distinct sections. Sections 1 to 3 sought demographics, activities and information sources. Section 4 was used to investigate beliefs about mediation. Sections 5 through 11 incorporated a series of established scales. These were the Creative Personality Scale (Thalbourne & Delin, 1994), the Theoretical Orientation Survey (Coan, 1979), the Epistemological Style Questionnaire (Krasner & Houts, 1984), the World Assumptions Scale (Janoff-Bulman, 1989), the Social Interest Scale (Crandall, 1975a; 1975b), Schwartz Value Survey (Schwartz, 1992a), the Krasner and Houts Values Survey (Krasner & Houts, 1984), and The Big Five Personality Questionnaire (Costa & McCrae, 1988). Detailed accounts of the sections follow.
### Table 8.3  Education level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed secondary school</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor degree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor degree with fourth year</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters degree</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Valid N</strong></td>
<td>136</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 8.4  Main area of study in tertiary degree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of study</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social work</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Valid N</strong></td>
<td>118</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.3.1 Section 1: Background information

In this section sociodemographic information was requested from respondents. This was achieved via questions about age, gender, religious affiliation, nationality, and educational background (refer to Section 1: Conflict Resolution Survey in Appendix A for details).

8.3.2 Section 2: What do you do in conflict resolution?

This section sought to obtain information about the respondent’s involvement in the conflict resolution field. The aim was to identify the work activities, conflict resolution models used, occupation, training and work settings of respondents. From these variables it was planned to categorise respondents into subgroups of different types of researchers and practitioners as explained in research aim 4 (refer to Section 6.5).

Item 1 asked respondents to nominate their primary orientation either as a ‘researcher’ or a ‘practitioner’. It was acknowledged that some respondents may have considered themselves to be both researchers and practitioners, but they were encouraged to choose between the two options. Failing this, respondents were given the option of choosing “both” researcher and practitioner.

In item 2, respondents were asked to report on the professional activities they undertook through their involvement in conflict resolution. They were asked to identify whether they were involved in ‘Practice’, ‘Academic teaching’, ‘Training’, ‘Research’, ‘Consultancies’, ‘Administration’, or some ‘Other’ activity. Respondents were then asked to state ‘how many hours per week’ were devoted to each activity that they had nominated. Further definition of activities was attempted in item 3 by asking
respondents to nominate from a list of possible conflict resolution processes the terms that best described the activities they were involved in. Respondents chose from the following list of conflict resolution processes/terms: ‘Conflict Resolution’, ‘Mediation’, ‘Conciliation’, ‘Dispute Settlement’, ‘Alternative Dispute Resolution’, ‘Arbitration’, ‘Negotiation’; and were invited to also add ‘Other’ terms that described their work. In the same section, respondents were asked to write the name of any ‘specific (well known) model’ that they used in relation to any of the terms they identified.

Respondents were also asked to state how long they had been involved in the conflict resolution field (item 4), and to specify their ‘professional title’ or occupation with respect to their involvement in the field (item 5). Information was also sought about the extent to which respondents had previously undertaken (item 6), or were currently undertaking (item 7), relevant training for their work in the field. The level of such training was measured using the categories identified by representatives of the field during the focus group stage of the study. The levels used were: ‘Workshops’, ‘A one week long training course’, ‘A four week long training course’, ‘A professional training course (greater than 4 weeks in duration)’, or ‘A university qualification’.

Respondents were also asked to describe their ‘work setting’ (e.g., community mediation centre: item 8) and the ‘specific area’ (e.g., family mediation: item 9) of their work in conflict resolution. Finally, respondents were asked to list their membership(s) in ‘Professional Associations’(item 10).
8.3.3 Section 3: Conflict resolution information sources

This section aimed to gain insight into the information sources that respondents utilise and contribute to, and their opinions about the usefulness of such information. In item 1 respondents were asked to rate how often they read articles containing ‘quantitative’ data. This was rated on a scale of 1 to 5 where ‘1’ indicated ‘never’, ‘2’ indicated ‘one / year’, ‘3’ indicated ‘one / month’, ‘4’ indicated ‘one / week’, and ‘5’ indicated ‘one/day’. This process was repeated in item 3 that asked how often respondents read articles that contained ‘qualitative’ data. For these purposes, quantitative articles were defined as containing ‘research based on statistical data, outcome studies, evaluation of practices, theoretical papers’, and qualitative articles were defined as containing ‘research that is not based on statistics such as case-studies and personal accounts’.

After respondents had reported how often they read these articles, they were asked to rate ‘how important’ they thought both quantitative (item 2) and qualitative(item 4) research were to ‘the development of this (conflict resolution) field’. This was measured using a seven point rating scale where ‘1’ indicated ‘not at all relevant’ and ‘7’ indicated ‘extremely relevant’.

In item 5 respondents were asked to rate how useful they found a number of other sources of information about conflict resolution. For this purpose a series of 14 information sources used by both researchers and practitioners was provided. Respondents were asked to rate ‘how useful’ they found the sources of information on a 7 point scale, where ‘1’ indicated ‘not at all useful’, ‘4’ indicated ‘useful’, and ‘7’ indicated ‘extremely useful’. If respondents had not used an information source listed, they were asked to rate how useful they would ‘expect it to be’ for them. The 14
information sources that respondents were asked to rate were: ‘Articles about the theory of conflict & conflict resolution’; ‘Books about the theory of conflict & conflict resolution’; ‘Empirical research books (e.g., containing the results of outcome studies)’; ‘Empirical research articles (e.g., containing the results of outcome studies)’; ‘Non-research books’; ‘Non-research articles’; ‘Discussion with colleagues about theoretical issues’; ‘Discussion with colleagues about practice issues’; ‘Practical (How to) books on research’; ‘Practical (How to) books on practice’; ‘Workshops’; ‘Seminars/Presentations’; ‘Conferences’; and, ‘Your own experiences’.

Once respondents had rated how useful they found the various sources of information, they were invited to repeat the same rating process two more times. In item 6, respondents were asked to rate each of the 14 information sources according to how useful they would expect a ‘typical researcher’ to find them, and in item 7 on how useful they would expect a ‘typical practitioner’ to rate the information sources. Overall this procedure involved respondents rating each of the 14 information sources a total of 3 times; (1) for themselves, (2) for their conception of a ‘typical researcher’, and (3) for their conception of a ‘typical practitioner’.

Respondents were also asked to report the number of ‘book chapters’ (item 8), and ‘articles’ (item 9) they had published, and the number of ‘conference papers’ they had given (item 10). Respondents were also asked to list the journals related to conflict resolution that they read regularly (item 11). Respondents who had published journal articles were asked to report on their three most recently published articles. Information requested included the type of article (i.e., ‘Theoretical’, ‘Theoretical and empirical’, ‘Methodological’, ‘Evaluation of a practice’, ‘Professional’, ‘Descriptive case study/s’,
or some 'Other' kind of article: item 12) and the name of the journal in which the article was published (item 13).

In item 14 respondents were asked to rate the degree to which they felt conflict resolution is best characterised as an 'art' or as a 'science'. For these purposes an art was defined as 'a creative ability', and a science was defined as 'the application of standard techniques'. A ten point scale was used, where '1' referred to 'Pure Art' and '10' referred to 'Pure Science'. Respondents were then asked to rate the same scale two more times; first, in the way that they thought a 'typical researcher' would respond (item 15); and, second, as they thought a 'typical practitioner' would respond (item 16).

Respondents were then asked to nominate, in order of importance, up to five advantages that they believed 'conflict resolution or alternative dispute resolution has over traditional forms of dispute settlement' (item 17). Following this, respondents were asked to list in order of importance up to five people, other than friends and family, who had 'influenced their work' in the conflict resolution field (item 18).

8.3.4 Section 4: Beliefs about mediation

In this section the opinions of respondents regarding a number of the current issues for conflict resolution in the area of mediation were requested. Respondents were asked to rate the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with a series of 26 statements, on a 7 point scale where '1' indicated 'strongly disagree', '2' indicated 'disagree', '3' indicated 'slightly disagree', '4' indicated 'neither agree nor disagree', '5' indicated 'slightly agree', '6' indicated 'agree', and '7' indicated 'strongly agree'. The topics covered in this section and sample items are described in the following paragraph.
Respondents were asked to express an opinion about the following eight topics: (1) the theoretical base of mediation, (e.g., item 1: ‘Mediation has a sound theoretical base’); (2) issues about the practical application of mediation, (e.g., item 6: ‘The field of mediation would benefit from more practical development’); (3) the training needs of mediators, (e.g., item 9: ‘The quality of a mediator depends on innate skills rather than on training’); (4) the effects of mediation (e.g., item 14: ‘At times mediation may be unsuccessful, but it is never damaging’); (5) mediator behaviour (e.g., item 16: ‘A mediator should endeavour to balance power in a situation’); (6) the development of the mediation field (e.g., item 19: ‘The fields of mediation and alternative dispute resolution have expanded so quickly that their destination is unclear’); (7) professional issues (e.g., item 23: ‘There should be a professional code of ethics for mediators which is independent of the ethical code of the mediator’s original field’); and, (8) the professional responsibilities of mediators (e.g., item 25: ‘Any information given to a mediator in the course of his/her work should be confidential’).

8.3.5 Section 5: How creative do you think you are?

Creativity was assessed using the Creative Personality Scale. This scale was developed by Thalbourne and Delin (1994) as a measure of creativity, during their study of belief in psychic phenomena and mystical experience. The scale consists of nine items that were originally drawn from three sources. The first four items were developed by Thalbourne and Delin (1994). Items five to eight were taken from Torrance’s (1971a; 1971b) studies of creativity. The final item was borrowed from the MMPI, item 564, which loaded on Social Introversion (Dahlstrom, Welsh & Dahlstrom, 1972). Subjects were asked to respond to each of the 9 items with a true or false response. Thalbourne and Delin’s (1994) study involved 219 adult subjects and produced a range of scores
from 0 to 9. The mean score was 5.97 with a standard deviation of 1.94. The Cronbach’s alpha for reliability was .60.

8.3.6 Section 6: Attitudes toward theory and method in science

It should be noted that Section 6 comprised two scales: the Theoretical Orientation Survey and the Epistemological Style Questionnaire; both were utilised to sample participants’ attitudes towards science, scientists, and the theory and method of scientific inquiry. The scales were able to be presented together as they required the same instructions and utilised the same rating scale.

The Theoretical Orientation Survey was developed by Coan (1979, 1987). It is comprised of 8 factors with 4 items for each factor, resulting in a 32 item scale (Section 6: items 1 to 32). The factors were named (1) Factual versus theoretical orientation, (2) Impersonal causality versus personal will, (3) Behavioural versus experiential content emphasis, (4) Elementarism versus holism, (5) Biological determinism, (6) Environmental determinism, (7) Physicalism, and (8) Quantitative versus qualitative orientation.

The inventory was scored on a 5 point scale (strongly disagree, disagree, cannot say, agree, strongly agree) and high factor scores indicate a high level of agreement with each of the factor domains. Table 8.5 lists each of the eight factors, gives the score ranges for each factor, provides Cronbach’s alpha reliability for internal consistency, test retest reliability and sample items. Krasner and Houts (1984) also demonstrated the reliability of the scale reporting Cronbach’s alpha’s ranging from .85 to .57.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Score range</th>
<th>Alpha (α)</th>
<th>Test re-test alpha (α)</th>
<th>Sample item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factual orientation</td>
<td>4 - 20</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>Item 9 (reversed): It is just as important for psychological researchers to formulate theoretical interpretations as it is to accumulate specific facts about behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal causality</td>
<td>4 - 20</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>Item 18: Human actions are just as strictly determined by whatever causes are operating as all other physical events are.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour content emphasis</td>
<td>4 - 20</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>Item 12 (reversed): The individual subject's personal account of his/her private conscious experience is one of the most valuable sources of psychological data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementarism</td>
<td>4 - 20</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>Item 21: In the long run researchers can achieve most if they devote each individual study to a very specific, circumscribed problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological determinism</td>
<td>4 - 20</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>Item 6: Individual differences in personality are governed to a high degree by heredity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental determinism</td>
<td>4 - 20</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>Item 3: All behavior, except for simple reflexes, is learned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physicalism</td>
<td>4 - 20</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>Item 7: All concepts used in psychological theory should be explicitly definable in terms of observed physical events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative orientation</td>
<td>4 - 20</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>Item 32: A good indicator of the maturity of a science is the extent to which its explanatory principles are stated in a precise quantitative form.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Epistemological Style Questionnaire was developed by Krasner and Houts (1984). In the current study it comprised the second part of Section 6 in the Conflict Resolution Survey (items 33 to 56). The questionnaire was originally developed from the conceptual work of Royce (1975) and Mitroff (1974). It was constructed to assess the constructs of empiricism, rationalism, and metamorphism, which were commonly accepted as the three basic epistemological assumptions about science by authors in the field of the philosophy of science.

Krasner and Houts (1984) developed these concepts, and after factor analysis found that four factors could be identified. These were labelled: (1) Metamorphism, defined as belief in an intuitive approach to science; (2) Rationalism, defined as the use of deductive rather than inductive methods; (3) Reductionism, defined as belief in reductionism; and, (4) Antiempiricism, defined as being in opposition to traditional empiricism.

Krasner and Houts (1984) proposed that each factor measures a specific dimension of epistemological style. Items in the 24 item inventory were rated on a 5 point scale (strongly disagree, disagree, cannot say, agree, strongly agree) with high factor scores indicating a high level of agreement with each of the factor domains. Table 8.6 lists each of the four factors, details the number of items for each scale, gives possible score ranges, provides Cronbach’s alpha reliability and gives sample items.
Table 8.6  Epistemological Style Questionnaire (Krasner & Houts, 1984)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>score range</th>
<th>Alpha (α)</th>
<th>Sample item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metamorphism</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8 - 40</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>Item 37* (5): Intuition is central to good science and scientific method.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationalism</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7 - 35</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>Item 38* (6): Scientific theories can only be true in a probabilistic sense.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reductionism</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 - 15</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>Item 48* (16) (reversed): Determinism is a correct assumption; all events have a cause.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiempiricism</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6 - 30</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>Item 51* (19): Scientists are so engrossed in procedural detail that they lose track of the basic meaning of their subject.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The item numbers given in this table relate to the item as it was presented in Section 6 of this study. The item numbers from Krasner and Houts (1984) are italicised and in brackets.
8.3.7 Section 7: Your world view

Basic assumptions about the world were measured in Section 7 using The World Assumptions Scale as developed by Janoff-Bulman (1989). This is based on a heuristic model that specifies the content of a person’s assumptive world. That is the ‘... unchallenged, unquestioned assumptions about themselves and the world ...’ (p. 113).

Eight basic assumptions were proposed in the Janoff-Bulman (1989) model:


Eight items for each assumption were combined to produce a 64 item scale. Janoff-Bulman reported that further analysis revealed the scale could be reduced to 32 items in length, leaving four items per assumption, and maintaining a good reliability estimate (between .67 and .78) for each subscale.

Janoff-Bulman (1989) therefore argued that the 8 factor World Assumptions Scale can be used as a heuristic tool because of the high face validity of items and the reliabilities of the subscales. The current study used the 32 item questionnaire in which respondents are asked to rate their level of agreement or disagreement on a 6-point scale with end points ‘strongly agree’ and ‘strongly disagree’. Scores are obtained by summing responses across the items. A high score for a factor is taken to indicate that the participant’s assumptive world is highly guided by that factor. Sample items and possible score ranges for each of the subscales are given in Table 8.7.
Table 8.7  World Assumptions Scale (Janoff-Bulman, 1989)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>score range</th>
<th>Sample item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benevolence of the world</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 - 24</td>
<td>Item 5: The good things that happen in this world far outnumber the bad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevolence of people</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 - 24</td>
<td>Item 2 (reversed): People are naturally unfriendly and unkind.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 - 24</td>
<td>Item 14: People will experience good fortune if they themselves are good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controllability</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 - 24</td>
<td>Item 11: People’s misfortunes result from the mistakes they have made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randomness</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 - 24</td>
<td>Item 15: Life is too full of uncertainties that are determined by chance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-worth</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 - 24</td>
<td>Item 28: I am very satisfied with the kind of person I am.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-controllability</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 - 24</td>
<td>Item 17: I almost always make an effort to prevent bad things from happening to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luck</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 - 24</td>
<td>Item 16: When I think about it, I consider myself very lucky.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.3.8 Section 8: Personal characteristics that you value

The construct of Social Interest was first proposed by Adler (1959). It was defined as "... striving toward confronting real problems and contributing to the welfare of mankind whereas without it the individual will seek a personal, self-centred superiority ..." (Ansbacher & Ansbacher, 1958, p. 154-155), and an "interest in the interests of mankind" (p. 148).

In the current study Social Interest was measured using Crandall's (1975a, 1975b), Social Interest Scale. The scale included 24 pairs of words, made up of 15 "real" items, and 9 "buffer" items. For each pair, participants were asked to underline the trait that they valued more highly. The range of possible scores for the Social Interest Scale is 0 to 15 (from the 15 "real" items). Crandall (1977) tested the 'social interest scale' on a variety of groups and reported a mean score of 8.43, with a standard deviation of 3.57. Split-half reliability for three samples was reported as .77 using the Spearman Brown formula, and test-retest reliability (over a five week period) of .82. Crandall (1975b) provided data about the validity of the Social Interest Scale. He reported significant correlations with the Rokeach Value Survey (Rokeach, 1973), the Multiple Affect Adjective Check List (Zuckerman & Lubin, 1965), the Philosophy of Human Nature Test (Wrightman, 1964), and the Purpose in Life Test (Crumbaugh & Maholick, 1964).

8.3.9 Section 9: Guiding principles in your life

The general values of the participant group were measured in Section 9 using the Schwartz Values Survey. Schwartz and Bilsky (1987) constructed a theory of human values by considering the work of Rokeach (1973) about the cognitive representations of three 'universal requirements': (1) biological needs, (2) interactional requirements for
interpersonal coordination, and (3) societal demands for group welfare and survival. These three requirements were used by Schwartz (1992a, 1994) to construct 10 values domains. The values domain name and its definition follows: (1) Power - social status and prestige, control or dominance over people and resources; (2) Achievement - personal success through demonstrating competence according to social standards; (3) Hedonism - pleasure and sensuous gratification for oneself; (4) Stimulation - excitement, novelty, and challenge in life; (5) Self-direction - independent thought and action-choosing, creating, exploring; (6) Universalism - understanding, appreciation, tolerance and protection for the welfare of all; (7) Benevolence - preservation and enhancement of the welfare of people with whom one is in frequent personal contact; (8) Tradition - respect, commitment and acceptance of the customs and ideas that traditional culture or religion provide the self; (9) Conformity - restraint of actions, inclinations, and impulses likely to upset or harm others and violate social expectations or norms; (10) Security - safety, harmony and stability of society, of relationships, and of self. These domains have been confirmed by the work of Feather (1992, 1995, 1996).

The domains are measured using 56 value statements and a short definition of what each value means. The items were divided into two lists. Values list 1 included 30 terminal values, and values list 2 included 26 instrumental values. For each list, respondents were asked to begin by reading the values and then rate the value of 'supreme importance as a guiding principle', with a 7. They were then asked to rate the value which is most opposed to (or least important) to their values with -1. Once these two extremes or end points had been established, respondents were asked to rate the rest of the values on the scale labelled 7 (of supreme importance), 6 (very important), 3 (important), 0 (not important), -1 (opposed to my values). Table 8.8 outlines the value
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Domain</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Alpha (α)</th>
<th>Values included</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>Social power, wealth, authority, preserving my public image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>Successful, ambitious, capable, influential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedonism</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>Pleasure, enjoying life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>Varied life, daring, an exciting life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-direction</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>Creativity, freedom, independent, curious, choosing own goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universalism</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>Broadminded, wisdom, a world of beauty, equality, unity with nature, a world at peace, social justice, protecting the environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevolence</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>Honest, loyal, helpful, forgiving, responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tradition</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>Respect for tradition, humble, accepting my portion in life, devout, moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>Self-discipline, obedient, politeness, honouring of parents or elders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>Family security, national security, reciprocation of favours, social order, clean</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
domains, the number of items, possible score limits, reliability coefficients (from Feather, 1996), and sample items. Following Feather’s (1996) instructions, scores for each value domain were obtained by summing the scores across the items included in each domain and then calculating the means.

8.3.10 Section 10: Social values

Personal and social values were measured in Section 10 using the Krasner and Houts Values Survey (Krasner & Houts, 1984). This instrument was originally developed with the specific intention of investigating the ‘value systems’ of psychologists. A pool of 150 statements that expressed values across a wide array of topics were collected from the vast literature on values. A panel of philosophers and scientists then categorised 67 items into 15 domains of value systems. Reliability analysis showed that 43 of the original items reliably predicted the following 8 subscales: (1) Science/Ethics - measuring the value neutral versus value laden dimension; (2) Scientist's Social Responsibility - measuring social involvement versus social isolation; (3) Science/Theism - measuring theism versus atheism; (4) Social Philosophy - measuring social Darwinism versus social altruism; (5) Political Philosophy - measuring conservation versus liberalism; (6) Health care delivery - measuring market control versus government control; (7) Environmentalism - measuring industrialism versus environmentalism; and, (8) Research/Ethics - measuring ethical constraint versus freedom of inquiry. The 43 item survey used in the current survey was scored on a 5 point scale (strongly disagree, disagree, cannot say, agree, strongly agree). Table 8.9 lists each of the eight subscales, details the number of items for each scale and possible score ranges, provides Cronbach’s alpha reliability and gives sample items.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>score range</th>
<th>Alpha (α)</th>
<th>Sample item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science/Ethics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 - 20</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>Item 24: The acquisition of new knowledge is an ultimate criterion for carrying out research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientist's Social Responsibility</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5 - 25</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>Item 42: Scientists should not pursue their scientific work if it clearly endangers the general welfare of humanity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science/Theism</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5 - 25</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>Item 43. The lawfulness of nature reflects the existence of an original creator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Philosophy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7 - 35</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>Item 4. All things considered, competition is the best relationship between people in a society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Philosophy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6 - 30</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>Item 20: Goods and services are best provided by private corporations as opposed to government agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care delivery</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 - 20</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>Item 6: Quality will suffer if the government intrudes into the health care delivery system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmentalism</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5 - 25</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>Item 31: There should be laws protecting all aspects of the environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research/Ethics</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7 - 35</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>Item 35: Scientific research should have a clear social utility as defined by a majority of people.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.3.11 Section 11: How accurately can you describe yourself?

Personality was measured in Section 11 using The Big Five Personality Questionnaire (Costa & McCrae, 1988). The notion of a five factor model of personality has had a considerable history in psychology. McDougall (1932, cited in Digman, 1990) speculated that the organisation of the language of personality into a coherent structure would give rise to five distinguishable but separable factors. Norman (1963) suggested that the realm of discourse about the characteristics of personality could be reduced to an 'adequate taxonomy' which incorporates five broad dimensions. These have been derived from various factor analytic studies over the past 40 years (Digman, 1989; 1990). The five factors are: Introversion-Extroversion; Pleasantness or Agreeableness; Conscientiousness or Dependability; Emotional Stability; and, Intellect or Sophistication.

These five factors have proven to be quite robust (Costa & McCrae, 1988; McCrae & Costa 1989; Goldberg 1981). They have been observed in ratings and questionnaire data across languages and cultures (Digman, 1989). It is also reported that the five factors that arise from questionnaire and rating studies have strong links with behaviour (Small, Zeldin & Savin-Williams, 1983). An excellent review of this area can be found in John, Angleitner and Ostendorf (1988). The factors, a range of alpha reliability coefficients (from Goldberg, 1990; Smith & Snell, 1996), score ranges, and sample variable pairs are provided in Table 8.10. Goldberg expressed concern about the high reliability values as it is important that their occurrence is not at the price of attenuated discriminant validities. He reported that most of the intercorrelations among the scales were quite low. A complete psychometrics of 'The Big Five' can be found in Goldberg (1990).
Table 8.10  The Big Five Personality Questionnaire (Costa & McCrae, 1988)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Factor</th>
<th>items</th>
<th>score range</th>
<th>Alpha (α) range</th>
<th>Example variable pairs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introversion - Extroversion</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10 - 90</td>
<td>.90 to .92</td>
<td>introverted - extroverted; silent - talkative; unsociable - sociable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasantness or Agreeableness</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10 - 90</td>
<td>.84 to .97</td>
<td>uncooperative - cooperative; unfair - fair; disagreeable - agreeable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness or Dependability</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10 - 90</td>
<td>.88 to .94</td>
<td>disorganised - organised; frivolous - serious; undependable - reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Stability</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10 - 90</td>
<td>.82 to .88</td>
<td>tense - relaxed; temperamental - even-tempered; unstable - stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellect or Sophistication</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10 - 90</td>
<td>.82 to .94</td>
<td>unintelligent - intelligent; uncreative - creative; unreflective - reflective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Alpha reliability coefficients for internal consistency of scales from Goldberg (1990) based on analyses of each scale across six data sets.
In the current study the Big Five is used as a self rating scale where subjects are asked to describe themselves on various personality traits or attributes. The five factors were separated and each factor was presented as a subscale consisting of 10 variable pairs in nine point scales. For example, subjects were asked to rate how ‘intelligent’ they considered themselves to be. At one end of the scale with a value of 1 (‘very’) the word ‘unintelligent’, whilst at the other end the word ‘intelligent’ with a value of 9 (‘very’). A mid point of 5 indicated a ‘neither’ response. At points 3 and 7, ‘moderately’ was used to signify either moderately unintelligent or moderately intelligent respectively.

8.4 Summary

Chapter 8 outlined the design of the survey and provided a detailed description of the procedure employed to obtain the sample. The participant group was briefly described according to standard demographic variables. Following this, the survey instrument was summarised. Sections 2 through 4 of the questionnaire that were devised as an initiative of this research program were described in considerable detail. In the remaining sections the existing scales that were used in the survey instrument were then outlined, with attention being given to the history, structure, and aims of each scale. The resulting ‘Conflict Resolution Survey’ (Appendix A), presents as a robust tool to investigate the four domains of difference that are proposed to exist between researchers and practitioners in the field of conflict resolution.
CHAPTER 9

RESULTS OF RESEARCHER-PRACTITIONER ANALYSES

9.0 Introduction

Quantitative data were collected from 136 people active in the field of conflict resolution. An overview of the demographic characteristics of the sample was provided in Section 8.2. Results will be presented in three stages. Section 9.1 will report on the professional status of the whole sample. This is in order to present a general overview of the sample with respect to professional roles, activities and training. The subsequent analyses will comprise two different approaches to the data, as was proposed in research aims 3 and 4. First, this chapter describes analyses of the data by splitting the sample into researcher and practitioner groups. This is conducted to gain an appreciation of the broad differences that exist between researchers and practitioners (Research Aim 3). In the following chapter (Chapter 10), the data is analysed across interest groups (Research Aim 4). This is in order to explore the differences that exist across such groups in more specific detail.
Therefore the primary aim of this chapter is to report the results of data analyses on the basis of the research and practice distinction. Section 9.2 provides an overview of the general characteristics of Practitioners and Researchers. Following this, the data are presented in relation to the four domains that were used to organise the survey instrument. Section 9.3 describes the findings of the first three sections of the survey instrument that sought information about the activities and attitudes relevant to the conflict resolution field. Section 9.4 describes the issues relevant to the scientist-practitioner debate in the conflict resolution field. Sections 9.5 and 9.6 report the results of questions about general values systems and general personality issues respectively. Finally, Section 9.7 summarises the findings.

9.0.1 Technical notes on the analysis and presentation of results

Data management and analysis were conducted using SPSS for Windows, Release 6 (Norusis, 1993). In all tables presented in Sections 9.2 through 9.6, sample sizes are 92 for Practitioners and 44 for Researchers, unless otherwise specified. It will be appreciated that in these sections, a substantial number of statistical tests have been applied to the available data. Two strategies have therefore been used to try to avoid Type I errors arising from this multiple testing. First, where appropriate, multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) is used as the first step in analysis. Second, while results are reported as significant at all of the conventional $\alpha$ levels of .05, .01, and .001, only those attaining at least $p < .01$ will be emphasised and discussed further. When Student’s $t$ tests are performed, Levene’s test for the equality of variance was routinely applied and, if necessary, the unequal variance model is reported (including adjusted degrees of freedom).
9.1 General professional characteristics of the sample

When asked to specify their primary professional orientation towards either research or practice, 92 (67.6%) participants stated that they were “Practitioners” and 44 (32.4%) stated that they were “Researchers”. No participants suggested that their professional orientation was equally towards practice and research. The sample included a broad selection of occupational groups, identified by the participants who nominated their professional affiliation. There were 26 (19.1%) lawyers, 20 (14.7%) mediators, 20 (14.7%) researchers, 19 (14.0%) social workers, 16 (11.8%) psychologists, 14 (10.3%) volunteer workers, 9 (6.6%) community workers, 7 (5.1%) probation officers, and 5 (3.7%) who responded “other”. The length of time participants had been involved in the field ranged between 1.5 years and 29.5 years, with a mean of 7.3 years ($SD = 5.6$ years).

When questioned about the type of professional activities engaged in during a typical week, 97 (71.3%) participants reported some involvement in “the practice of conflict resolution”, 60 (44.1%) reported involvement in “administrative activities”, 54 (39.7%) reported involvement in some form of “research”, 47 (34.6%) reported time spent giving “training”, 32 (23.5%) reported time spent undertaking “consultancies”, and 31 (22.8%) reported time spent in an “academic teaching role”.

The majority of participants ($n = 127$, 93.4%) commonly used the term “mediation” to describe their work in conflict resolution, 89 (65.4%) used the term “conflict resolution”, and 68 (50.0%) used the term “alternative dispute resolution”. Participants were also asked to list any “specific (well known) model” associated with the terms they had listed. So few participants (less than 20) actually specified a model name that
further analysis was precluded. With respect to training to assist their work in conflict resolution, it is notable that 28 (20.6%) reported “no specific training” in the field, 85 (62.5%) reported having taken “a one week training course” (or less), and that only 9 (6.6%) reported having a “University degree”.

9.2 General characteristics of Practitioners and Researchers

Practitioners ranged in age from 21 years to 61 years, with a mean of 38.1 years ($SD = 9.4$), while researchers ranged in age from 23 years to 57 years, with a mean of 37.0 years ($SD = 8.1$). These ages were found not to be significantly different ($t_{134} = 0.63, p > .05$). There was a significant gender difference between the Practice and Research groups ($\chi^2_{(1)} = 5.92, p < .05$), with a greater number of females in the Practitioner group (60.9%) than in the researcher group (38.6%). There were 58 Practitioners (63.0%) and 17 Researchers (38.6%) who indicated that they had some form of religious affiliation. These proportions were significantly different ($\chi^2_{(1)} = 7.17, p < .01$).

The educational backgrounds of participants who identified themselves as either Practitioners or Researchers are presented in Table 9.1. Although these data do not lend themselves to statistical analysis, it is clear that Practitioners are more likely to report not having a university degree than Researchers. Table 9.2 describes the relevant courses that participants reported having taken in the past in order to assist with their work in conflict resolution, while Table 9.3 presents the current courses being undertaken. For the data in each table, a $\chi^2$ test for linear trend (Mantel-Haenszel $\chi^2$; Armitage & Berry (1994)) demonstrated no relationship between types of training and whether or not participants were Practitioners or Researchers ($\chi^2_{(1)} = 1.51, p > .05$; $\chi^2_{(1)} = 2.21, p > .05$ respectively).
### Table 9.1 Educational background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of degree</th>
<th>Practitioners</th>
<th>Researchers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No degree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 9.2 Previous relevant courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of course</th>
<th>Practitioners</th>
<th>Researchers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 week training</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 week training</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional course</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University qualification</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9.3  Current relevant courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of course</th>
<th>Practitioners</th>
<th></th>
<th>Researchers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>79.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 week training</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 week training</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional course</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University qualification</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Practitioners reported being involved in the field of conflict resolution for between 1.5 and 25.0 years, with a mean length of involvement of 7.0 years ($SD = 5.5$). Researchers reported length of involvement ranging from 2.0 to 29.5 years, with a mean length of involvement of 5.9 years ($SD = 10.7$). On the basis of these data it was concluded that Practitioners and Researchers had been involved in the conflict resolution field for an equivalent length of time ($t_{(134)} = 0.91, p > .05$).

The specific activities that comprised the participants' typical working weeks are detailed in Table 9.4. Results of MANOVA analysis indicated a overall difference between the respondent groups for these data ($F_{(6,129)} = 280.01, p < .001$). Univariate test results are included in Table 9.4. As might be expected, Practitioners did significantly more "practice" and "training", and less "academic teaching" and "research", than Researchers. Other work activities such as hours spent undertaking "consultancies" and "administration" did not differ between the two groups.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Practitioners</th>
<th>Researchers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$F_{(1,134)}$</td>
<td>$p$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice</td>
<td>0 - 40</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>0 - 8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>236.87</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic teaching</td>
<td>0 - 14</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0 - 25</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>46.01</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>0 - 30</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0 - 12</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>7.31</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>10 - 40</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>1158.29</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultancies</td>
<td>0 - 35</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>0 - 20</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>0 - 35</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0 - 15</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The key term(s) nominated by Practitioners and Researchers to describe the process of conflict resolution employed in their work setting are presented in Table 9.5. As multiple responses were encouraged, each key term has been analysed independently. “Conflict resolution” and “alternative dispute resolution” were nominated more frequently by Researchers. No other significant differences were noted.

The professional descriptors used by participants are shown in Table 9.6. These data did not lend themselves to statistical analysis, but as also demonstrated by the results in Table 9.1, Practitioners were more likely to report specific professional roles (e.g., mediator, lawyer, social worker) than Researchers who were more likely to label themselves as academics. Although there was a preponderance of psychologists among Researchers, this is to be expected given that the majority of conflict resolution researchers have a background in academic psychology. The main work settings of participants (Table 9.7) and the specific area of work of participants (Table 9.8) further describe the nature of involvement in conflict resolution by Practitioners and Researchers. In general, Researchers are more likely to work in university departments and to conduct mediation research, whereas Practitioners reported a wider range of work settings and areas of application of their skills. More detailed statistical analysis of these data was considered inappropriate.

Finally, participants were classified as either belonging to some form of professional association(s) or not. A $\chi^2$ analysis was then used to compare Practitioners and Researchers indicating no significant difference between these groups ($\chi^2 (1) = 1.31, p > .05$): 67 Practitioners (72.8%) and 36 Researchers (81.8%) belonged to some professional association.
Table 9.5  Terms used to describe type of conflict resolution involved in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Practitioners</th>
<th>Researchers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>$%$</td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>$%$</td>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Resolution</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediation</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>95.5</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conciliation</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispute Settlement</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Dispute Resolution</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>6.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbitration</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB. Responses do not sum to 92 and 44 respectively as multiple responses were encouraged from participants.

In two instances (*) Fisher's Exact Probability test was used due to low expected cell frequencies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Practitioners</th>
<th></th>
<th>Researchers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Worker</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychologist</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediator</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Worker</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Worker</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation Officer</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work setting</td>
<td>Practitioners</td>
<td>Researchers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>$%$</td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>$%$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Mediation Centre</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Department</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Firm</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Agency</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Social Service</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim - Offender Mediation Service</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Centre</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freelance - self employed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Aid Centre</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Outreach Service</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quaker Mediation Centre</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Mediation Centre</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Mediation Centre</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Sector</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Dispute Centre</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Prevention Agency</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison System</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work area</td>
<td>Practitioners</td>
<td>Researchers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Mediation</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediation Research</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim - Offender Mediation</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Mediation</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Dispute Resolution</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Mediation</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispute Settlement</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Dispute Resolution</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Law</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace Research</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Resolution</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorce Settlement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediation Training</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Counselling</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Offenders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Research</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation Research</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Disputes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.3 Activities and attitudes relevant to the conflict resolution field

This section reports the results from analyses of information sources and professional activities, and beliefs about mediation.

9.3.1 Information sources and professional activities

Table 9.9 tabulates the frequency with which participants reported reading quantitative articles. A $\chi^2$ analysis for linear trend demonstrated that, in general, Researchers read more quantitative articles than Practitioners ($\chi^2_{(1)} = 60.80, p < .001$). Furthermore, Researchers ($M = 5.9, SD = 1.3$) considered quantitative research to be significantly more relevant than Practitioners ($M = 4.3, SD = 1.4$) ($t_{(134)} = 6.60, p < .001$). The frequency with which participants reported reading qualitative articles is shown in Table 9.10. In this instance there was no difference between Practitioners and Researchers ($\chi^2_{(1)} = 2.61, p > .05$). Similarly, there was no significant difference in the perceived relevance of qualitative articles ($t_{(63)} = 1.40, p > .05$), with mean ratings of 5.4 ($SD = 1.6$) for Researchers and 5.8 ($SD = 1.1$) for Practitioners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Practitioners</th>
<th>Researchers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 per 6 months</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 per month</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 per week</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 per day</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9.10  Frequency of reading qualitative articles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Practitioners</th>
<th>Researchers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 per 6 months</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 per month</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 per week</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 per day</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants were asked to comment on the usefulness of 14 potential information sources. Each source was rated three times: (1) based on their own experience, (2) based on their expectation of how “typical researchers” would respond, and (3) based on their expectation of how “typical practitioners” would respond. Two forms of statistical analysis were conducted for each information source. First, all ratings (self, “typical researcher”, “typical practitioner”) of Practitioners and Researchers were compared using independent samples t tests. Second, paired samples t tests were used to compare Practitioners’ ratings of self with typical practitioners, and Researchers’ ratings of self with typical researchers. Tables 9.11 through 9.24 present these data.

Significant differences were found between Researchers and Practitioners on all but four of the fourteen information sources. Researchers rated the usefulness of “articles and books”, about both “conflict theory” (Tables 9.11 and 9.12) and “empirical research into conflict resolution” (Tables 9.13 and 9.14), higher than Practitioners did. At the same time they underestimated the extent to which the “typical practitioner” might value
these information sources, when compared to Practitioner’s ratings of the “typical practitioner”. Researchers also rated “non-research articles” (Table 9.16), “how to’ books about research” (Table 9.19), and “discussions with colleagues about theoretical issues” (Table 9.17) significantly higher than Practitioners. Practitioners rated “how to’ books about practice” (Table 9.20), “workshops” (Table 9.21), and “seminars/presentations” (Table 9.22) as more useful than Researchers. However, Researchers overestimated the extent to which they thought “typical practitioners” would find these information sources useful. Researchers also overestimated the extent to which they felt both “typical practitioners” and “typical researchers” would rate the usefulness of “conferences” (Table 9.23) and “their own experiences” (Table 9.24).

Significant differences were also found when Researchers’ self-ratings were compared to their conception of “typical researchers”. Researchers reported that “typical researchers” would rate “articles and books”, about both “conflict theory and empirical research into conflict resolution”, and “non-research books” more highly than they would personally (Tables 9.11 through 9.15). Conversely they predicted that “typical researchers” would rate “discussions with colleagues about practice issues” (Table 9.18), “how to’ books on practice” (Table 9.20), “workshops” (Table 9.21), and “their own experiences” (Table 9.24) as less useful than they would personally. There was little difference between Practitioners’ assessments of themselves and their predictions about “typical practitioners”. However, significant differences were found for “discussions with colleagues about theory” (Table 9.17) and the usefulness of “conferences” (Table 9.23). In both instances, Practitioners reported that they would personally rate these information sources as more useful than would a “typical practitioner”.
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Table 9.11  Rating of usefulness of “articles about the theory of conflict and conflict resolution”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Practitioners</th>
<th></th>
<th>Researchers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Typical researcher”</td>
<td>2 - 7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4 - 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Typical practitioner”</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1 - 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB. Practitioners ratings of usefulness, for self and “typical practitioners”, were not significantly different ($t_{(91)} = 0.23, p > .05$). Researchers ratings of usefulness, for self and “typical researchers”, differed significantly ($t_{(43)} = 4.07, p < .001$).
Table 9.12  Rating of usefulness of “books about the theory of conflict and conflict resolution”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Practitioners</th>
<th>Researchers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>7.47</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Typical researcher”</td>
<td>2 - 7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4 - 7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Typical practitioner”</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB. Practitioners ratings of usefulness, for self and “typical practitioners”, were not significantly different ($t_{(91)} = 0.30$, $p > .05$). Researchers ratings of usefulness, for self and “typical researchers”, differed significantly ($t_{(43)} = 5.19$, $p < .001$).
Table 9.13  Rating of usefulness of “empirical research books” (e.g., containing the results of outcome studies)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>7.55</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Typical researcher”</td>
<td>2 - 7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4 - 7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Typical practitioner”</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1 - 4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB. Practitioners ratings of usefulness, for self and “typical practitioners”, were not significantly different ($t_{(91)} = 0.59, p > .05$). Researchers ratings of usefulness, for self and “typical researchers”, differed significantly ($t_{(43)} = 5.66, p < .001$).
Table 9.14  Rating of usefulness of “empirical research articles” (e.g., containing the results of outcome studies)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Practitioners</th>
<th></th>
<th>Researchers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2 - 7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>9.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Typical researcher”</td>
<td>2 - 7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3 - 7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Typical practitioner”</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1 - 6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB.  Practitioners ratings of usefulness, for self and “typical practitioners”, were not significantly different \( (t_{(91)} = 0.47, p > .05) \). Researchers ratings of usefulness, for self and “typical researchers”, differed significantly \( (t_{(43)} = 2.34, p < .05) \).
Table 9.15  Rating of usefulness of “non-research books”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Practitioners</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Researchers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2 - 6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Typical researcher”</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Typical practitioner”</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1 - 6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB. Practitioners ratings of usefulness, for self and “typical practitioners”, were not significantly different ($t_{(91)} = 0.82, p > .05$). Researchers ratings of usefulness, for self and “typical researchers”, differed significantly ($t_{(43)} = 2.01, p < .05$).
Table 9.16  Rating of usefulness of “non-research articles”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Practitioners</th>
<th></th>
<th>Researchers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Typical researcher”</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Typical practitioner”</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB. Practitioners ratings of usefulness, for self and “typical practitioners”, were not significantly different ($t_{(91)} = 1.52, p > .05$). Researchers ratings of usefulness, for self and “typical researchers”, were not significantly different ($t_{(43)} = 1.37, p > .05$).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Practitioners</th>
<th>Researchers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3 - 7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Typical researcher&quot;</td>
<td>2 - 7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2 - 7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Typical practitioner&quot;</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB. Practitioners ratings of usefulness, for self and “typical practitioners”, differed significantly ($t_{(10)} = 2.15, p < .05$).
Researchers ratings of usefulness, for self and “typical researchers”, were not significantly different ($t_{(43)} = 0.36, p > .05$).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Practitioners</th>
<th></th>
<th>Researchers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Self”</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4 - 7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Typical researcher”</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2 - 7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Typical practitioner”</td>
<td>2 - 7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB. Practitioners ratings of usefulness, for self and “typical practitioners”, were not significantly different ($t_{(91)} = 0.08, p > .05$). Researchers ratings of usefulness, for self and “typical researchers”, differed significantly ($t_{(43)} = 3.62, p < .001$).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Practitioners</th>
<th>Researchers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2 - 7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>10.12</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Typical researcher&quot;</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3 - 7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Typical practitioner&quot;</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB. Practitioners ratings of usefulness, for self and "typical practitioners", were not significantly different ($t_{(91)} = 1.91, p > .05$). Researchers ratings of usefulness, for self and "typical researchers", were not significantly different ($t_{(43)} = 1.87, p > .05$).
Table 9.20  Rating of usefulness of “practical (how to) books on practice”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Practitioners</th>
<th></th>
<th>Practitioners</th>
<th></th>
<th>Researchers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$t$</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>$p$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2-7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Typical researcher”</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Typical practitioner”</td>
<td>2-7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>5-7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB. Practitioners ratings of usefulness, for self and “typical practitioners”, were not significantly different ($t_{(91)} = 1.56, p > .05$). Researchers ratings of usefulness, for self and “typical researchers”, differed significantly ($t_{(43)} = 3.74, p < .001$).
Table 9.21  Rating of usefulness of “workshops”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Practitioners</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Researchers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>2 - 7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2 - 7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Typical researcher”</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Typical practitioner”</td>
<td>2 - 7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4 - 7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB. Practitioners ratings of usefulness, for self and “typical practitioners”, were not significantly different ($t_{(91)} = 0.90, p > .05$). Researchers ratings of usefulness, for self and “typical researchers”, differed significantly ($t_{(43)} = 2.16, p < .05$).
Table 9.22  Rating of usefulness of “seminars/presentations”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Practitioners</th>
<th></th>
<th>Researchers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>2 - 7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3 - 7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Typical researcher”</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Typical practitioner”</td>
<td>2 - 7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4 - 7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB. Practitioners ratings of usefulness, for self and “typical practitioners”, were not significantly different ($t_{91} = 0.28, p > .05$). Researchers ratings of usefulness, for self and “typical researchers”, were not significantly different ($t_{43} = 0.30, p > .05$).
Table 9.23  Rating of usefulness of “conferences”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Practitioners</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Researchers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$t$</td>
<td>$df$</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4 - 7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Typical researcher”</td>
<td>2 - 7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3 - 7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Typical practitioner”</td>
<td>2 - 7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3 - 7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB. Practitioners ratings of usefulness, for self and “typical practitioners”, differed significantly ($t_{(91)} = 2.68$, $p < .01$). Researchers ratings of usefulness, for self and “typical researchers”, were not significantly different ($t_{(43)} = 1.30$, $p > .05$).
### Table 9.24  Rating of usefulness of “your own experiences”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Practitioners</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Researchers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>4 - 7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2 - 7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Typical researcher”</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Typical practitioner”</td>
<td>3 - 7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5 - 7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NB.** Practitioners ratings of usefulness, for self and “typical practitioners”, were not significantly different ($t_{(91)} = 0.78, p > .05$). Researchers ratings of usefulness, for self and “typical researchers”, differed significantly ($t_{(43)} = 2.24, p < .05$).
Professional activities, in terms of “publications” and “conference presentations”, are summarised in Table 9.25. A MANOVA was used to determine whether any overall differences were evident between the two respondent groups, with a significant result being obtained ($F_{(3,132)} = 9.81, p < .001$). Univariate F tests indicated that, on average, Researchers had published more “book chapters” and “journal articles” than Practitioners.

Tables 9.26 lists the journals read regularly by participants, ordered in terms of decreasing frequency. These data do not lend themselves to statistical comparison. The number of participants who indicated that they did not read any journals regularly is also included in Table 9.26. These proportions were compared using McNemar’s test of the difference between two independent proportions, which has an (approximate) normal distribution and is hence reported as ‘$z$’ (McNemar, 1969). Significantly more Practitioners were not regular journal readers ($z = 4.30, p < .001$).

Participants were asked to state the types of article they published (e.g., “theoretical”, “professional”, etc.). This information was limited to the three most recent publications. Data are shown in Table 9.27. Each entry indicates that at least one article of that type had been published. Only 8 Practitioners (8.7%) and 21 Researchers (47.7%) indicated that they had published at all. These proportions were found to be significantly different ($z = 4.30, p < .001$). Table 9.28 further displays the specific journals in which participants had published their three most recent publications. Journals are ordered in terms of decreasing frequency. No statistical analysis of these data was undertaken.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Practitioners</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Researchers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>F(1,134)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of book chapters published</td>
<td>0 - 8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0 - 6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>7.86</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of journal articles published</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0 - 41</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>26.80</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of conference papers given</td>
<td>0 - 100</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>0 - 50</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 9.26  Journals read regularly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Practitioners</th>
<th>Researchers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mediation</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediation Quarterly</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Conflict Resolution</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugter's Conflict Resolution Notes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Peace Research</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conciliation Quarterly</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Peace Studies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Divorce</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation Journal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of Sociology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Law Publications</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-refereed Journals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Social Issues</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Law Journal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Dispute Resolution</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Mediation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of Conflict Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue and Resistance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not read any journals regularly</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NB.** Responses do not sum to 92 and 44 respectively as multiple responses were encouraged from participants.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of article</th>
<th>Practitioners</th>
<th>Researchers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical/Empirical</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodological</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice evaluation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case studies</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB. Responses do not sum to 8 and 21 respectively as more than one type of article may have been published.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Practitioners</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Researchers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mediation Quarterly</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Conflict Resolution</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Social Issues</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Peace Research</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Law Publications</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers Conflict Resolution Notes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Dispute Resolution</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Mediation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-refereed Journals</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Law Journal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAPO Journal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Peace Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Counselling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Valid N</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>57</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participants were asked to rate whether conflict resolution was an “art” or a “science”. Three ratings were obtained: (1) what they themselves thought, (2) how they thought “typical researchers” would respond, and (3) how they thought “typical practitioners” would respond.

Following an initial multivariate examination, which proved to be significant \( F(3,132) = 13.66, p < .001 \), two forms of statistical analysis were conducted. First, all ratings (self, typical researcher, typical practitioner) of Practitioners and Researchers were compared using independent samples t tests. Second, paired samples t tests were used to compare Practitioners’ ratings of self with typical practitioners, and Researchers’ ratings of self with typical researchers. Table 9.29 contains these data.

Researchers and Practitioners differed significantly with respect to their ratings of conflict resolution as an art or a science. Practitioners tended to describe conflict resolution more as an art, while Researchers tended to describe conflict resolution more as a science. Both groups rated the responses of “typical researchers” and “typical practitioners” equally, but these ratings were generally more extreme than their self-ratings of Researchers and Practitioners respectively.

Participants were asked to nominate the major advantages of “conflict resolution” or “alternative dispute resolution”. Responses were subjected to a content analysis in order to identify the domains being tapped by participants when considering this question. The final domains, and the responses associated with each, are shown in Table 9.30.
The number of Practitioners and Researchers who mentioned each domain is then presented in Table 9.31. The test of the difference of two independent proportions was used to compare the responses of Researchers and Practitioners. For only one domain ("cost") a significant difference was found: a higher proportion of Researchers mentioned "cost" as a major advantage. For two domains ("simplicity" and "social benefits"), there were too few responses to allow a statistical comparison to be made.

Finally in this section, participants were asked whether there were any "people, other than family or friends, who had influenced their work in the field of conflict resolution". Table 9.32 details the extensive list of influences mentioned. For those influences for which there were enough responses to allow a statistical comparison, the test of the difference between two independent proportions was used to compare the responses of Researchers and Practitioners.

Significantly more Researchers mentioned "Roger Fisher" ($z = 2.59, p < .01$), "John Burton" ($z = 4.06, p < .001$), and "Tajfel" ($z = 5.17, p < .001$), while significantly more Practitioners mentioned "Ury" ($z = 2.17, p < .05$), "Ghandi" ($z = 2.87, p < .01$), and "Jesus Christ" ($z = 2.09, p < .05$). No significant difference was noted for "Adam Curle" ($z = 1.29, p > .05$) or "Edward deBono" ($z = 1.54, p < .05$).
Table 9.29  Rating of conflict resolution as an art or science

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Practitioners</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Researchers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>1 - 10</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3 - 9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>6.49</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Typical researcher”</td>
<td>3 - 10</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1 - 10</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Typical practitioner”</td>
<td>1 - 10</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1 - 9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB. Practitioners considered that “typical practitioners” would rate conflict resolution as more of an art than they did themselves ($t_{(91)} = 3.96, p < .001$). Researchers considered that “typical researchers” would rate conflict resolution as more of a science than they did themselves ($t_{(43)} = 4.72, p < .001$).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>speed/faster/quicker&lt;br&gt;no preparation time necessary&lt;br&gt;saves court time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>low cost/cheaper&lt;br&gt;free&lt;br&gt;cost is accessible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Win-win</td>
<td>win-win&lt;br&gt;both sides benefit&lt;br&gt;more constructive/cooperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-adversarial</td>
<td>non-adversarial/Peaceful process&lt;br&gt;non-violent&lt;br&gt;no conflict involved&lt;br&gt;no death&lt;br&gt;avoids increasing conflict&lt;br&gt;safe for disputants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowering</td>
<td>empowering&lt;br&gt;gives disputants responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves relationships</td>
<td>preserves relationships&lt;br&gt;maintains goodwill&lt;br&gt;improves relationships&lt;br&gt;no loss of face&lt;br&gt;preserves/encourages communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of process</td>
<td>deals with all the issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>it works best</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>flexible process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>open ended process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>private/confidential process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>individual/personalised process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional benefits</td>
<td>addresses the feelings of disputants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>healing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>therapeutic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>catharsis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>self learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>separates people from problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of settlement</td>
<td>high quality of settlements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>stays settled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>quality solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>creates better options for settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disputant involvement</td>
<td>direct contact between disputants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>disputants are involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>agreed settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>voluntary settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simplicity</td>
<td>simple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>easier for participants to understand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>commonsense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social benefits</td>
<td>good for society/restores social fabric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>involves volunteers in the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>prevents crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>involves community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>creates tolerance of differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advantage</td>
<td>Practitioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Win-win</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-adversarial</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowering</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves relationships</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of process</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional benefits</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of settlement</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disputant involvement</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simplicity</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social benefits</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB. Responses do not sum to 92 and 44 respectively as multiple responses were encouraged from participants.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence</th>
<th>Practitioners</th>
<th>Researchers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Fisher</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Burton</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ury</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Curle</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghandi</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acland Floyer</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajfel</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward deBono</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus Christ</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deutsch</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Quaker movement</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornelius (unspecified)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pruitt</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Leindorfer</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Bolton</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Argyle</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Beer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Folberg</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Marshall</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billig</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Faire</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Woodhouse</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Luther King</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raiffa</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Schonholtz</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Zehr</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Kolb</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnevale</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The peace movement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Fraley</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherrie Brown</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brig. Michael Harbottle</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 9.32 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence</th>
<th>Practitioners</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Researchers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greta Brooks</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Bailey</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham Browne</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion Leibman</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Crum</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Jung</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Moore</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Kraybill</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meridith Yates</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Sites</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Harding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldberg</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilles Launay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Bagshaw</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. J. Muste</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s movement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Paul Lederach</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnathan Gosling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Bowers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Dickson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kahlil Quinn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Starr</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Christie</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Gibbons</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Abel</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Blackburn</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Gillie</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB. Responses do not sum to 92 and 44 respectively as multiple responses were encouraged from participants.
9.3.2 Beliefs About Mediation

The 26 items from Section 4 of the survey, Beliefs About Mediation, were subjected to a principal components factor analysis followed by varimax rotation. This is the commonly used Little Jiffy procedure (Kaiser, 1970; Nunnally, 1978). The number of components to retain for rotation was determined using the parallel analysis criteria presented by Lautenschlager (1989). Parallel analysis is a more conservative approach to the determination of non-random factors than the more familiar "eigenvalues greater than one rule" (Kaiser, 1960). It is also preferable because it takes account of both sample size and number of items analysed in the evaluation of factors to be retained. Extrapolating from the parallel analysis critical values table for 25 items and 150 subjects, three factors were supported as non-random. Together these factors accounted for 44.5% of the variance.

Items achieving a factor loading of at least .45 were further examined for possible inclusion in subscales to be derived from the identified factors. The strategy underlying scale construction was to maximise the number of items retained, while also achieving a satisfactory level of internal consistency (α; Cronbach, 1951). The α coefficient provides a conservative, lower-bound estimate of the reliability of a scale (Carmines & Zeller, 1979). Summary statistics for both the initial factors, and the resultant scales, are presented in Table 9.33.

The scale derived from Factor 1 was termed "Liberal/intuitive practice". It addressed the extent to which respondents supported a non-theoretical or liberal approach to the practice of mediation, with particular reference to the use of practice skills based on intuitive rather than theoretical constructs. Illustrative items for this scale include: "The
extent to which mediation has been successful can be determined intuitively by the
mediator”, “The quality of a mediator depends on innate skills rather than on training”,
and “It is not necessary for mediation to have a sound theoretical base”. The scale
obtained from Factor 2 was termed “Conceptual revision”. Issues covered by this scale
included the extent to which respondents believed that the field of mediation requires
greater conceptual development and planning. Illustrative items are: “The fields of
mediation and alternative dispute resolution have expanded so quickly that their
destination is unclear”, and “The field of mediation would benefit from more theoretical
exploration”. The final scale was termed “Anti-professionalisation” as it embraces
issues such as resistance to the establishment of professional standards and
responsibilities. Examples of illustrative items (scored in the negative) include: “The
extent to which mediation has been successful can be determined using objective
criteria”, and “The practice of mediation should be restricted to professionals”.

The means for Researchers and Practitioners on the three belief subscales are shown in
Table 9.34. Results of a MANOVA demonstrated that there was an overall significant
difference between the groups in their beliefs about mediation ($F_{(3,132)} = 42.22, p <
.001$). Analysis of the subscales separately (the results of which are included in Table
9.34), also produced significant results. Practitioners were significantly more
supportive of a liberal/intuitive practice of mediation ($F_{(1,134)} = 44.82, p < .001$),
Researchers were significantly more supportive of a conceptual revision of the field
($F_{(1,134)} = 87.36, p < .001$), and Practitioners were significantly more likely to believe
that mediation should not be professionalised ($F_{(1,134)} = 7.71, p < .001$).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor / Scale Name</th>
<th>Eigen value</th>
<th>% variance</th>
<th>No. of items</th>
<th>( \alpha )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liberal/intuitive practice</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual revision</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-professionalisation</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale</td>
<td>Practitioners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Researchers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal/intuitive practice</td>
<td>16 - 58</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>17 - 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual revision</td>
<td>19 - 46</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>20 - 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-professionalisation</td>
<td>9 - 28</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>10 - 25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.4 Issues relevant to the scientist-practitioner debate

This section reports the results of analyses for the Theoretical Orientation, Epistemological Style, and Social Values scales.

9.4.1 Theoretical Orientation

A MANOVA demonstrated a significant result for the Theoretical Orientation subscales \((F_{(8,127)} = 16.66, p < .001)\) which encouraged the further analysis of each of the eight subscales separately. Results are presented in Table 9.35. All subscales yielded statistically significant differences with the exception of Factual orientation and Environmental determinism. For all other subscales, Researchers had a significantly higher mean than Practitioners.

9.4.2 Epistemological Style

The four Epistemological Style subscales were first analysed using MANOVA, which provided a significant result \((F_{(4,131)} = 10.01, p < .001)\). Further univariate analyses, and descriptive statistics, are shown in Table 9.36. Researchers had a significantly higher mean for Rationalism. Practitioners had significantly higher means for Metamorphism and Antiempiricism. There was no significant difference between the two groups for Reductionism.

9.4.3 Social Values

The eight value domains measured were first subjected to a MANOVA analysis, which yielded a significant result \((F_{(8,127)} = 9.32, p < .001)\). Further univariate analyses, and descriptive statistics, are shown in Table 9.37. In summary, Researchers had significantly higher means for Science/ethics, Social philosophy, Political philosophy,
and Environmentalism. Practitioners had significantly higher means for Scientist’s social responsibility and Science/theism. There was no significant difference between the two groups for Health care delivery or Research/ethics.

9.5 General values systems

This section reports the results of analyses for the World Assumptions, Social Interest and Personal Values scales.

9.5.1 World Assumptions

A MANOVA analysis revealed a significant result ($F_{(8,127)} = 4.18, p < .001$) and provided support for the further univariate analysis of the eight World Assumptions dimensions. Practitioners were found to have a significantly higher mean score for Self-worth, while Researchers had a significantly higher mean score for Controllability (see Table 9.38). There were no further significant differences.

9.5.2 Social Interest

Scores for Practitioners on the Social Interest Scale ranged from 2 to 15 ($M = 10.0, SD = 3.2$), while for Researchers scores ranged from 1 to 14 ($M = 7.1, SD = 3.0$). An independent samples t test indicated that, on average, Practitioners scored significantly higher than Researchers ($t_{(134)} = 4.93, p < .001$).

9.5.3 Personal Values

Only the ten first-order values were analysed. A significant multivariate MANOVA result ($F_{(10,125)} = 2.72, p < .01$) was obtained, allowing further univariate analyses. Results are shown in Table 9.39. Only two personal values differed significantly
between Researchers and Practitioners. Researchers had a significantly higher mean score for Achievement, while Practitioners had a significantly higher mean score for Stimulation.

### 9.6 General personality issues

This section reports the results of analyses for the Creative Personality Scale and the Big Five Personality Questionnaire.

#### 9.6.1 Creative Personality Scale

The creativity scores for Practitioners had a mean of 6.0 (range = 1-9, SD = 1.6). An independent samples t test indicated that this was a significantly higher level of Creativity ($t_{(134)} = 3.22, p < .01$) than that reported by Researchers ($M = 5.0, SD = 1.7$, range = 2-8).

#### 9.6.2 Big Five Personality Questionnaire

A MANOVA analysis indicated significant findings ($F_{(5,130)} = 6.82, p < .001$) and provided support for the further univariate analysis of the five personality dimensions assessed. Results are presented in Table 9.40. Practitioners were found to have significantly higher mean scores for Extroversion and Pleasantness/agreeableness, while Researchers reported a significantly higher mean for Conscientiousness/dependability. There was no significant difference for either Emotional stability or Intellect/sophistication.
### Table 9.35  Theoretical Orientation Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Practitioners</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Researchers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>F_{(1,134)}</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factual orientation</td>
<td>4 - 20</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>6 - 20</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal causality</td>
<td>5 - 19</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>6 - 20</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>76.10</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour content emphasis</td>
<td>4 - 20</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>6 - 19</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>11.82</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementarism</td>
<td>4 - 15</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>8 - 15</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>24.01</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological determinism</td>
<td>4 - 17</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4 - 19</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>53.30</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental determinism</td>
<td>7 - 20</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>8 - 19</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physicalism</td>
<td>4 - 18</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>8 - 20</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>70.80</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative orientation</td>
<td>6 - 20</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>6 - 19</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>25.45</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9.36  Epistemological Style Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Practitioners</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Researchers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>F_{(1,134)}</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metamorphism</td>
<td>11 - 37</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>12 - 30</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>32.54</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationalism</td>
<td>16 - 35</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>19 - 30</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>7.85</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reductionism</td>
<td>3 - 15</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4 - 14</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiempiricism</td>
<td>7 - 29</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>8 - 23</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>20.22</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale</td>
<td>Practitioners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Researchers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$F_{(1,134)}$</td>
<td>$p$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science/Ethics</td>
<td>4 - 18</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>8 - 20</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>32.36</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientist's Social Responsibility</td>
<td>13 - 25</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>8 - 22</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>33.76</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science/Theism</td>
<td>7 - 25</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>6 - 25</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Philosophy</td>
<td>7 - 32</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>9 - 35</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>33.75</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Philosophy</td>
<td>6 - 27</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>7 - 28</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care delivery</td>
<td>4 - 19</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5 - 19</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmentalism</td>
<td>5 - 25</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>11 - 25</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>10.62</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research/Ethics</td>
<td>7 - 33</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>11 - 30</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale</td>
<td>Practitioners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Researchers</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></td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>$F_{(1,134)}$</td>
<td>$p$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevolence of the world</td>
<td>8 - 24</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>11 - 24</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevolence of people</td>
<td>10 - 24</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>10 - 24</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>4 - 24</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6 - 23</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controllability</td>
<td>4 - 22</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>7 - 23</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>14.18</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randomness</td>
<td>4 - 23</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4 - 23</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-worth</td>
<td>12 - 24</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>10 - 23</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-controllability</td>
<td>5 - 23</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>7 - 23</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luck</td>
<td>5 - 22</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4 - 24</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale</td>
<td>Practitioners</td>
<td>Researchers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>$F_{(1,134)}$</td>
<td>$p$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>0 - 29</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>3 - 29</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>3 - 32</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>12 - 31</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedonism</td>
<td>2 - 12</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3 - 13</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulation</td>
<td>4 - 18</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3 - 18</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-direction</td>
<td>16 - 37</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>16 - 34</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universalism</td>
<td>28 - 55</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>25 - 51</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevolence</td>
<td>23 - 55</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>21 - 52</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tradition</td>
<td>3 - 30</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1 - 26</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity</td>
<td>2 - 21</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5 - 20</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>11 - 43</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>16 - 32</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 9.40  The Big Five Personality Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Practitioners</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Researchers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>$F_{(1,134)}$</td>
<td>$p$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extroversion</td>
<td>36 - 83</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>38 - 82</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>16.71</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasantness/Agreeableness</td>
<td>50 - 90</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>47 - 79</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>19.10</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness/Dependability</td>
<td>27 - 85</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>49 - 83</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>10.51</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Stability</td>
<td>37 - 86</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>42 - 78</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellect/Sophistication</td>
<td>48 - 85</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>52 - 81</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.7 Summary

This section provides a brief overview of the major results of the analyses comparing Researchers with Practitioners. No attempt will be made to discuss or interpret results at this time.

Significant differences were found between Researchers and Practitioners in many of their activities and attitudes relevant to the conflict resolution field. For example, with respect to information sources and professional activities, groups differed on the number of quantitative articles that they read, and the relevance of such articles. Differences were also found for most of the information sources that might be used by Researchers and/or Practitioners, with some interesting results being noted about Researchers’ expectations regarding “typical researchers” and “typical practitioners”.

A similar pattern of differences were found for both Practitioners’ and Researchers’ ratings of conflict resolution as an “art” or a “science”, and again for their assessment of “typical researchers” and “typical practitioners”. Researchers and Practitioners also differed with respect to their involvement in different types of professional activities. For example, hours spent undertaking certain job related activities, journal reading and publication rates. No real differences existed regarding the perceived advantages of conflict resolution, but some interesting results were observed regarding Researchers’ and Practitioners’ sense of who had influenced them in their conflict resolution work.

Differences were recorded for all three factors derived from the Beliefs About Mediation Scale. Practitioners tended to support a liberal and intuitive approach to the practice of mediation, reportedly being reasonably satisfied with the current state of the
mediation field, and against the further professionalisation of the field. On the other hand, Researchers wanted more objective based practice, supported the revision of the concepts and standards underlying the mediation field, and supported the need for professionalisation of the field.

Differences between Researchers and Practitioners were also apparent from the instruments used to assess the second domain: issues relevant to the scientist-practitioner debate in the conflict resolution field. Researchers scored higher than Practitioners on most subscales of the Theoretical Orientation Survey. This suggests that Researchers believe in impersonal causality, emphasise behavioural events, focus on elementarism and are quantitatively oriented; while Practitioners believe in personal will, emphasise experiential content, are more holistically focussed and qualitatively orientated. Furthermore, the findings suggest that Researchers have higher levels of belief in biological determinism and physicalism than Practitioners.

For the Epistemological Style Questionnaire, Practitioners scored higher than Researchers on the Metamorphism and Anti-empiricism subscales, implying that they support a more intuitive approach to science and are more opposed to traditional empiricism than are Researchers. Researchers scored higher than Practitioners on the rationalism subscale, indicating that they prefer deductive methods in science while Practitioners prefer inductive methods.

Researchers and Practitioners differed on most of the Krasner and Houts Values Survey subscales. This suggests that Researchers tend to be more value neutral with respect to their evaluation of ethics in science, have more support for the concepts of Social
Darwinism, have a liberal focus to political philosophy and are slightly more environmentally focussed than Practitioners. Alternatively, Practitioners are more value laden in their evaluations of ethics in science, have more support for the concepts of social altruism, have a more conservative approach to political philosophy and are slightly more industrially focussed than Researchers. Further, Practitioners exhibit higher levels of concern for the social responsibility of scientists and have a higher degree of belief in theism than do Researchers, who emphasise lower levels of social responsibility and are more likely to be atheistic.

The third domain that aimed to measure issues of general values elicited a modest number of differences between Researchers and Practitioners. Practitioners scored higher than Researchers on the Social Interest Scale, suggesting that they have an optimistic attitude towards life in general, and a more empathic understanding and positive attitude towards others than Researchers. There were, however, very few differences between the groups on the World Assumptions Scale. The notable exceptions were that Researchers scored higher on the Controllability subscale and Practitioners scored higher on the Self-worth subscale. This suggests that Researchers have a higher degree of belief in the assumption that they live in a world where one has control over what happens to them, and Practitioners have a higher degree of belief in the value of their own self worth.

Researcher and Practitioner groups differed minimally on the Schwartz Values Survey, indicating that the personal values held in the groups were similar. Exceptions were that Researchers scored higher than Practitioners in the Achievement domain, indicating that they value personal success through demonstrating competence according to social
standards more than Practitioners; and that Practitioners scored higher on the Stimulation domain, indicating that they value excitement, novelty, and challenge in life more than Researchers.

Finally, the fourth domain that proposed differences between Researchers and Practitioners around general personality issues produced a number of notable results. Practitioners scored significantly higher than Researchers on the Creative Personality Scale, suggesting that they are more creative. The Big Five Personality Questionnaire provided evidence that Researchers were more conscientiousness than Practitioners, while Practitioners reported being more extroverted and more pleasant than Researchers. Practitioners and Researchers reported equal levels of emotional stability and intellect or sophistication.

In summary, differences between Researchers and Practitioners were apparent in terms of the types of information sources utilised and the professional activities in which they engaged. They also differed markedly in their views about the state of conflict resolution and mediation and in their responses to the issues relevant to the scientist-practitioner debate in the conflict resolution field. Researchers and Practitioners also differed with respect to the personality domains measured in the survey, to a lesser extent, in their general value systems.
CHAPTER 10
RESULTS OF SUBGROUP ANALYSES

10.0 Introduction

Many previous studies have inquired into the nature of the relationship between research and practice in various sub-specialties of applied psychology, such as counselling psychology (e.g., Bernstein & Kerr, 1993), clinical psychology (e.g., Stricker, 1992), psychoanalysis (e.g., Parsons, 1992) and social work (e.g., Falck, 1990). These studies have provided important information regarding the broad dichotomy of "research" and "practice". However a more detailed analysis of types of researchers and types of practitioners may further advance the understanding of the relationship between research and practice. As the field of conflict resolution is relatively new, and it involves a wide range of disciplines with a variety of approaches to practice and research, it is particularly susceptible to a lack of clarity about the functions and goals of research and practice (see Chapter 6).

Therefore, in accordance with Research Aim 4 that proposed to explore the data in terms of specific interest groups, data will be reanalysed in this chapter. Chapter 9 described
the broad differences between Researchers and Practitioners on many variables. It is expected that this second series of analyses will clarify some of these effects and identify more specific differences to provide a deeper understanding of the research-practice dialectic in conflict resolution.

Section 10.1 describes the rationale and process for the formation of subgroups within the Researcher and Practitioner groups. Following this the general characteristics of subgroups are described in Section 10.2. The data is then reanalysed in terms of these subgroups. Rather than a complete reanalysis of the data, only issues that are expected to be clarified by analysis across subgroups were selected. As in Chapter 9, results are reported in the context of the four domains used to construct the survey instrument. This includes a selection of the attitudes and activities used by respondents (Section 10.3), the issues relevant to the scientist-practitioner debate in the conflict resolution field (Section 10.4), the general values systems (Section 10.5) and personality issues (Section 10.6). Finally, Section 10.7 summarises the findings of interest group analyses.

10.1 Group formation

The first guiding principle of subgroup formation was that respondents already identified as Researchers or Practitioners in the broader grouping, maintained that distinction. Therefore the two groups were further divided into researcher subgroups and practitioner subgroups. The second guiding principle was that the formation of subgroups should be data driven. Appropriate data were available from the focus group and interviews (Section 7.2.2), from literature in the conflict resolution field (see
Chapters 2, 3, and 4), and from the results of the survey used in the current thesis (see Chapter 9).

The survey variables considered to determine subgroup membership included "occupational group", the "area of conflict resolution work engaged in", and "work setting". In the event of difficulty categorising cases on this basis, the hours that individuals spent doing different work activities was used to finalise subgroup membership. The variables used to establish subgroups and the defining characteristics of each subgroup is briefly described below.

10.1.1 Research subgroups

The focus group alluded to the existence of two types of researchers, applied or theoretical (Section 7.2.1). This distinction was used to form the basis of research subgroups. Theoretical Researchers were described as those who identified solely with the research role, worked in universities or equivalent institutions, and studied conflict resolution in order to understand processes. Applied Researchers were defined as those who identified with some professional role other than that of "researcher", worked in a field setting at least part of the time, and conducted research related to the direct application of conflict resolution practice.

The Applied Research subgroup consisted of 24 researchers who nominated themselves as having some kind of professional base other than academic. This included those researchers who identified themselves either as psychologists, lawyers or social workers. Applied Researchers nominated many different research interests and a variety of different work environments. It was expected that the applied approach that they
used in research would be significantly different from that employed by the Theoretical Research subgroup. The Theoretical Research subgroup comprised the remaining 20 researchers who identified themselves as academics who worked primarily in university settings and consistently described their work as mediation research or conflict resolution research.

10.1.2 Practice subgroups

An examination of the survey variables nominated in Section 10.1 suggested that practitioners could be described in three different subgroups: those who used conflict resolution for therapeutic initiatives, for community work, or for legal interests. Additional support for this type of division comes from the conflict resolution literature which consistently highlights the differences between these three groups of practitioners in conflict resolution (see Chapters 2, 3 and 4). These different types of practitioners were also identified during the exploratory discussions with the focus group.

The Therapeutic subgroup consisted of 26 practitioners who would be expected to approach conflict resolution from a therapeutic or counselling model. This group included practitioners who were social workers, psychologists or mediators who worked in specific areas of conflict resolution that are known to emphasise a therapeutic model (e.g., victim offender mediation, family mediation, relationship counselling, etc.). The work settings for the Therapeutic subgroup included victim offender mediation centres, government social services and community mediation centres.

The Community subgroup included 36 practitioners who primarily identified themselves professionally as mediators, community workers or volunteer workers.
They nominated a community setting (e.g., community mediation centre, community agency, etc.) as their primary work setting and described their work areas as clearly involving a community focus (e.g., community mediation, neighbourhood dispute settlement, etc.). Based on these characteristics it was proposed that these people would take a community based focus or model for their work in conflict resolution.

The legal subgroup consisted of 30 practitioners, including 22 lawyers and the remainder working in related legal professions. The majority of these practitioners worked in legal firms or legal aid centres and described their work areas as dispute settlement, family law or victim offender reparation. It was expected that this group would take a legalistic approach to the conflict resolution field.

10.1.3 Summary of subgroups

In summary, the Practitioner subgroups were named Therapeutic, Community, and Legal respectively, and the Researcher interest subgroups were named Applied Research, Theoretical Research respectively. Table 10.1 provides a summary of the size of each subgroup and the proportion of the sample included in each subgroup. It was expected that each of the five subgroups identified would have different interests in the conflict resolution field.

10.2 General characteristics of the five subgroups

Prior to reporting the results of analyses it is necessary to outline some conventions used for the determination and presentation of results, and describe the sample. First, data management and analyses were conducted using SPSS for Windows, Release 6 (Norusis, 1993). Second, in all tables, sample sizes are 26 for the Therapeutic subgroup,
36 for the Community subgroup, 30 for the Legal subgroup, 24 for the Applied Research subgroup, and 20 for the Theoretical Research subgroup. Any variations from these figures will be specified. Third, in all multivariate analyses (MANOVA) the statistic reported is the $F$ ratio estimated using Wilks' Lambda as recommended by Tabachnick and Fidell (1996). And finally, Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference has been used as the post hoc test of choice following the recommendation of Norman and Streiner (1994).

The age distributions of the five subgroups are shown in Table 10.2. The mean ages were statistically equivalent across the subgroups ($F_{(4,131)} = 1.95, p > .05$). The number and percentage of participants who indicated that they held a religious affiliation is shown in Table 10.3. These proportions were significantly different ($\chi^2_{(4)} = 17.85, p < .001$). There was a greater proportion of religious participants in the Therapeutic and Community subgroups, and a lesser proportion in the Theoretical Research subgroup. There was no significant difference in the length of time the members of the five subgroups had spent working in the conflict resolution field ($F_{(4,131)} = 0.57, p > .05$). Means for this analysis are shown in Table 10.4.

There was a differential distribution of gender between subgroups ($\chi^2_{(4)} = 9.50, p < .05$). There was a greater proportion of females in the Therapeutic (73.1% female: 26.9% male) and Community subgroups (61.9% female: 39.1% male), and a greater number of males in the Applied Research subgroup (33.3% female: 66.7% male). Gender proportions did not differ in either the Legal subgroup (50% female: 50% male) or the Theoretical Research subgroup (45% female: 55% male).
Table 10.1  Conflict resolution orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Therapeutic</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Research</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical Research</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10.2  Age in years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Therapeutic</td>
<td>24 - 61</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>21 - 61</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>21 - 52</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Research</td>
<td>26 - 56</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical Research</td>
<td>23 - 57</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10.3  Religious affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Therapeutic</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>73.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Research</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical Research</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10.4  Length of time involved in the conflict resolution field

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Therapeutic</td>
<td>1.5 - 22.0</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>1.5 - 25.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>1.5 - 20.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Research</td>
<td>3.0 - 25.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical Research</td>
<td>2.0 - 29.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The activities that commonly comprised participants’ working weeks are detailed in Table 10.5. A MANOVA indicated that there was an overall difference between the five subgroups for these data \((F_{(24,441)} = 25.47, p < .001)\). Univariate test results are included in Table 10.5. Each of the significant univariate results was followed by Tukey’s Honestly Significant Difference post hoc test to determine the precise nature of the subgroup differences. For “hours spent in practice”, the Therapeutic, Community and Legal subgroups all had significantly higher means than the Applied Research and Theoretical Research subgroups. For “hours spent in academic teaching”, this result was reversed. That is, the Applied Research and Theoretical Research subgroups had significantly higher means than the Therapeutic, Community and Legal subgroups. A similar pattern occurred for the “hours spent conducting research”, except that the mean number of hours for Theoretical Researchers was also higher than the mean for Applied Researchers. Results of an ANOVA were significant for “time spent on consultancies”, indicating a marginal difference, but no two subgroups could be specifically identified as being significantly different from each other.

The key term(s) nominated by participants to describe the process of conflict resolution employed in their work setting are presented in Table 10.6. As multiple responses were encouraged, each key term was analysed independently. There was a significant difference in the use of the term “conflict resolution”. This was predominantly due to the low proportion of the Legal subgroup who used the term. The term “alternative dispute resolution” was used significantly more by the Applied Research subgroup and the Theoretical Research subgroup than by other participants. The term “arbitration” was only used by the Legal subgroup and the Applied Research subgroup. Finally, “negotiation” enjoyed significantly higher use among members of the Legal subgroup.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Therapeutic</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Applied Research</th>
<th></th>
<th>Theoretical Research</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$F_{(4,131)}$</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>61.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic teaching</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultancies</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10.6  Terms used to describe type of conflict resolution involved in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Therapeutic</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Legal</th>
<th>Applied Research</th>
<th>Theoretical Research</th>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Resolution</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediation</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conciliation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispute Settlement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Dispute Resolution</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbitration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB.  Responses do not sum to 26, 36, 30, 24, and 20 respectively as multiple responses were encouraged from participants.
10.3 Activities and attitudes relevant to the conflict resolution field

This section reports the results from analyses of information sources and professional activities, and beliefs about mediation.

10.3.1 Information sources and professional activities

The frequency with which participants read quantitative articles is displayed in Table 10.7. These data were analysed using the Lambda coefficient, that tests the degree to which group membership can be predicted from a dependent variable which is ranked (Meddis, 1984). A significant coefficient (Lambda = .27, $p < .001$) was obtained indicating that responses were non-random. Responses from the Therapeutic and Community subgroups tended toward the lower end of the scale. For example, approximately 70% of these subgroups read a quantitative article once every six months or less. Conversely, more than 75% of the Applied Research and Theoretical Research subgroups read a quantitative article at least once every week. Among the Legal subgroup, less than 15% read a quantitative article once every week. The perceived relevance of quantitative research is shown in Table 10.8. An ANOVA ($F_{(4,131)} = 11.03$, $p < .001$) indicated that there were statistically significant differences between the groups. Tukey's HSD post hoc test demonstrated that the Therapeutic, Community and Legal subgroups all considered quantitative research to be significantly less relevant than the Applied Research and Theoretical Research subgroups.

The frequency with which qualitative articles were read was analysed using Lambda. However, for these data (see Table 10.9) the level of association between group membership and frequency of reading could not be predicted above chance (Lambda = .08, $p > .05$). The perceived relevance of qualitative research is shown in Table 10.10.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Therapeutic</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Legal</th>
<th>Applied Research</th>
<th>Theoretical Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>n</em></td>
<td>%</td>
<td><em>n</em></td>
<td>%</td>
<td><em>n</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 per 6 months</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 per month</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 per week</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 per day</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Therapeutic</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>Applied Research</td>
<td>Theoretical Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>$%$</td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>$%$</td>
<td>$n$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 per 6 months</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 per month</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 per week</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 per day</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 10.8  Perceived relevance of quantitative articles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Therapeutic</td>
<td>2 - 7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>2 - 7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Research</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical Research</td>
<td>4 - 7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 10.10  Perceived relevance of qualitative articles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Therapeutic</td>
<td>4 - 7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>3 - 7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>4 - 7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Research</td>
<td>2 - 7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical Research</td>
<td>2 - 7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An ANOVA ($F_{(4,131)} = 2.90, p < .05$) followed by Tukey’s HSD post hoc test indicated that the Therapeutic and Legal subgroups both had significantly higher mean scores than the Theoretical Research subgroup.

As was the case in the previous analyses, the 14 potential information sources were rated three times: (1) based on the participant’s own experience, (2) based on the participant’s expectation of how typical researchers would respond, and (3) based on the participant’s expectation of how typical practitioners would respond. In this section, only between subjects analyses were conducted. That is, comparisons were made between the mean responses of each of the five subgroups. It was considered that a within subjects analysis would not provide additional useful information beyond that already reported in Section 9.3.2.

Descriptive and analytical data are shown in Tables 10.11 through 10.24. The results of the post hoc analyses associated with these data have been summarised for self ratings, ratings for “typical researchers”, and ratings for “typical practitioners”, and are presented in Tables 10.25 to 10.27 respectively.

In the self ratings (Table 10.25), post hoc analyses demonstrated significant differences for the usefulness of all information sources except “non-research books and articles”, “discussion with colleagues about practice”, and “conferences”. These differences varied. As expected, the Therapeutic, Community and Legal subgroups had lower means when compared to the Applied and Theoretical Research subgroups for “research books” (Table 10.13), “research articles” (Table 10.14) and “practical books about research” (Table 10.19).
The same situation was apparent in the case of "theory books" (Table 10.12), however the Theoretical Research subgroup was also higher than the Applied Research subgroup. Alternatively the Legal subgroup responded in a similar manner to the Applied and Theoretical Research subgroups, having higher means than the Therapeutic and Community subgroups for their rating of the usefulness of "theory articles" (Table 10.11). For most other information sources the Theoretical Research subgroup tended to have consistently lower means than the other subgroups.

Assessments of the "typical researcher" (Table 10.26), resulted in few significant differences suggesting that all subgroups had similar preconceptions of the way that a typical researcher would respond. However, in some cases significant differences were apparent. The Community subgroup gave a significantly lower estimate than the Theoretical Research subgroup for "theory books" (Table 10.12). The Therapeutic subgroup rated "practical books about practice" significantly higher than the Community subgroup (Table 10.20). The Applied and Theoretical Research subgroups estimated higher than the Therapeutic subgroup, and the Applied Research subgroup estimated higher than the Legal subgroup for "discussion with colleagues about practice issues" (Table 10.18). In the case of the "typical researcher's" "own experiences" the Therapeutic subgroup's ratings were significantly lower than all other subgroups, and the Legal subgroup was also significantly lower than the Applied Research subgroup (Table 10.24).

Comparison of each subgroup's assessments of the "typical practitioner" (Table 10.27), gave rise to differences for half of the information sources. The ratings of the Community subgroup were significantly higher than the Legal, Applied Research and
Theoretical Research subgroups for “theory articles” (Table 10.11) and “theory books” (Table 10.12). The Community subgroup were also significantly higher than both Applied and Theoretical Research subgroups in their rating of “research books” (Table 10.13), and higher than Theoretical Research subgroups for “research articles” (Table 10.14). Conversely, the Community subgroup was significantly lower than both Applied and Theoretical Research subgroups in their ratings of “seminars/presentations” (Table 10.22), and lower than the Theoretical Research subgroup in their ratings of “typical practitioner’s” “own experiences” (Table 10.24). Finally, Theoretical Research subgroups expected typical practitioners to find “conferences” more useful than did the Therapeutic and Community subgroups (Table 10.23).

The professional output of participants (“book chapters”, “journal articles” and “conference presentations”) is summarised in Table 10.28. Results of a MANOVA were significant for these data ($F_{(12,342)} = 3.21, p < .001$), leading to further univariate testing. The Applied Research subgroup reported the highest output of “book chapters”. This result was significantly higher than results for both the Community subgroup and the Legal subgroup. The Applied Research and Theoretical Research subgroups reported a significantly higher output of “journal articles”, than the Therapeutic, Community and Legal subgroups. Subgroups did not differ significantly for the average number of “conference presentations” reported. It should be noted that the standard deviations were particularly large for the Community and Theoretical Research subgroups suggesting a wide variety of responses in these subgroups.
Table 10.11 Rating of usefulness of “articles about the theory of conflict and conflict resolution”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Therapeutic</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Legal</th>
<th>Applied Research</th>
<th>Theoretical Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Typical researcher”</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Typical practitioner”</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Therapeutic</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>Applied Research</td>
<td>Theoretical Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>M</em></td>
<td><em>SD</em></td>
<td><em>M</em></td>
<td><em>SD</em></td>
<td><em>M</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Typical researcher”</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Typical practitioner”</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Therapeutic</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>Applied Research</td>
<td>Theoretical Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Typical researcher&quot;</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Typical practitioner&quot;</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10.14  Rating of usefulness of “empirical research articles” (e.g., containing the results of outcome studies)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Therapeutic</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Legal</th>
<th>Applied Research</th>
<th>Theoretical Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Typical researcher”</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Typical practitioner”</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10.15  Rating of usefulness of “non-research books”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Therapeutic</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Legal</th>
<th>Applied Research</th>
<th>Theoretical Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Typical researcher”</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Typical practitioner”</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Therapeutic</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>Applied Research</td>
<td>Theoretical Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Typical researcher”</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Typical practitioner”</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10.17  Rating of usefulness of "discussion with colleagues about theoretical issues"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Therapeutic</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Legal</th>
<th>Applied Research</th>
<th>Theoretical Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Typical researcher”</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Typical practitioner”</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$F_{(1,138)}$, $p$
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Therapeutic</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>M</strong></td>
<td><strong>SD</strong></td>
<td><strong>M</strong></td>
<td><strong>SD</strong></td>
<td><strong>M</strong></td>
<td><strong>SD</strong></td>
<td><strong>M</strong></td>
<td><strong>SD</strong></td>
<td><strong>F</strong>&lt;sub&gt;(t,130)&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Typical researcher”</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Typical practitioner”</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Therapeutic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Applied Research</td>
<td></td>
<td>Theoretical Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Typical researcher”</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Typical practitioner”</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10.19  Rating of usefulness of “practical (how to) books on research”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Therapeutic</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Legal</th>
<th>Applied Research</th>
<th>Theoretical Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Typical researcher”</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Typical practitioner”</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Therapeutic</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>Applied Research</td>
<td>Theoretical Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Typical researcher”</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Typical practitioner”</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10.22  Rating of usefulness of "seminars/presentations"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Therapeutic</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Legal</th>
<th>Applied Research</th>
<th>Theoretical Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Typical researcher&quot;</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Typical practitioner&quot;</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Therapeutic</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>Applied Research</td>
<td>Theoretical Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Typical researcher”</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Typical practitioner”</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Therapeutic</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>Applied Research</td>
<td>Theoretical Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Typical researcher”</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Typical practitioner”</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source / Rating</td>
<td>Therapeutic (1)</td>
<td>Community (2)</td>
<td>Legal (3)</td>
<td>Applied Research (4)</td>
<td>Theoretical Research (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory articles</td>
<td>&lt; 4, 5</td>
<td>&lt; 4, 5</td>
<td>&gt; 1, 2</td>
<td>&gt; 1, 2</td>
<td>&gt; 1, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory books</td>
<td>&lt; 4, 5</td>
<td>&lt; 4, 5</td>
<td>&lt; 4, 5</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>&gt; 1, 2, 3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research books</td>
<td>&lt; 4, 5</td>
<td>&lt; 4, 5</td>
<td>&lt; 4, 5</td>
<td>&gt; 1, 2, 3</td>
<td>&gt; 1, 2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research articles</td>
<td>&lt; 4, 5</td>
<td>&lt; 4, 5</td>
<td>&lt; 4, 5</td>
<td>&gt; 1, 2, 3</td>
<td>&gt; 1, 2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-research books</td>
<td>analysis of variance was not significant, no post hoc analyses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-research articles</td>
<td>analysis of variance was not significant, no post hoc analyses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion re theory</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>&lt; 4, 5</td>
<td>&gt; 3</td>
<td>&gt; 1, 2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion re practice</td>
<td>analysis of variance was not significant, no post hoc analyses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical books: research</td>
<td>&lt; 4, 5</td>
<td>&lt; 4, 5</td>
<td>&lt; 4, 5</td>
<td>&gt; 1, 2, 3</td>
<td>&gt; 1, 2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical books: practice</td>
<td>&gt; 4, 5</td>
<td>&gt; 5</td>
<td>&gt; 5</td>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
<td>&lt; 1, 2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>&gt; 5</td>
<td>&gt; 5</td>
<td>&gt; 5</td>
<td>&gt; 5</td>
<td>&lt; 1, 2, 3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminars/presentations</td>
<td>&gt; 5</td>
<td>&gt; 5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&lt; 1, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences</td>
<td>analysis of variance was not significant, no post hoc analyses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own experiences</td>
<td>&gt; 5</td>
<td>&gt; 5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&gt; 5</td>
<td>&lt; 1, 2, 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB Interest groups are denoted by numbers (i.e., Therapeutic = 1, Community = 2, Legal = 3, Applied Research = 4, Theoretical Research = 5)

"-" denotes no significant differences in post hoc analyses relevant to that group

For each information source, pairwise significant differences between interest groups are listed in columns ("<" denotes less useful; ">" denotes more useful). For example, "theory articles" are rated as significantly less useful by the Therapeutic group than by either the Applied or Theoretical Research groups (i.e., < 4, 5).
Table 10.26  Summary of post hoc analyses of ratings of information sources
Ratings for “Typical researchers”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source / Rating</th>
<th>Therapeutic (1)</th>
<th>Community (2)</th>
<th>Legal (3)</th>
<th>Applied Research (4)</th>
<th>Theoretical Research (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theory articles</td>
<td>analysis of variance was not significant, no post hoc analyses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory books</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&gt; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research books</td>
<td>analysis of variance was not significant, no post hoc analyses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research articles</td>
<td>analysis of variance was not significant, no post hoc analyses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-research books</td>
<td>analysis of variance was not significant, no post hoc analyses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-research articles</td>
<td>analysis of variance was not significant, no post hoc analyses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion re theory</td>
<td>analysis of variance was not significant, no post hoc analyses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion re practice</td>
<td>&lt; 4, 5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&lt; 4</td>
<td>&gt; 1, 3</td>
<td>&gt; 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical books: research</td>
<td>&lt; 2</td>
<td>&gt; 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical books: practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>analysis of variance was not significant, no post hoc analyses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminars/presentations</td>
<td>analysis of variance was not significant, no post hoc analyses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences</td>
<td>analysis of variance was not significant, no post hoc analyses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own experiences</td>
<td>&lt; 2, 3, 4, 5</td>
<td>&gt; 1</td>
<td>&gt; 1; &lt; 4</td>
<td>&gt; 1, 3</td>
<td>&gt; 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB  Interest groups are denoted by numbers (i.e., Therapeutic = 1, Community = 2, Legal = 3, Applied Research = 4, Theoretical Research = 5)

“-“ denotes no significant differences in post hoc analyses relevant to that group

For each information source, pairwise significant differences between interest groups are listed in columns (“<“ denotes less useful; “>“ denotes more useful). For example, “discussion re practice” was rated as significantly less useful by the Therapeutic group than by either the Applied or Theoretical Research groups (i.e., < 4, 5).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source / Rating</th>
<th>Therapeutic (1)</th>
<th>Community (2)</th>
<th>Legal (3)</th>
<th>Applied Research (4)</th>
<th>Theoretical Research (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theory articles</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&gt; 3, 4, 5</td>
<td>&lt; 2</td>
<td>&lt; 2</td>
<td>&lt; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory books</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&gt; 3, 4, 5</td>
<td>&lt; 2</td>
<td>&lt; 2</td>
<td>&lt; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research books</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&gt; 4, 5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&lt; 2</td>
<td>&lt; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research articles</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&gt; 5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&lt; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-research books</td>
<td>analysis of variance was not significant, no post hoc analyses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-research articles</td>
<td>analysis of variance was not significant, no post hoc analyses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion re theory</td>
<td>analysis of variance was not significant, no post hoc analyses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion re practice</td>
<td>analysis of variance was not significant, no post hoc analyses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical books: research</td>
<td>analysis of variance was not significant, no post hoc analyses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical books: practice</td>
<td>analysis of variance was not significant, no post hoc analyses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>no significant pairwise differences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminars/presentations</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&lt; 4, 5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&gt; 2</td>
<td>&gt; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&gt; 1, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own experiences</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&gt; 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NB** Interest groups are denoted by numbers (i.e., Therapeutic = 1, Community = 2, Legal = 3, Applied Research = 4, Theoretical Research = 5)

"-" denotes no significant differences in post hoc analyses relevant to that group.

For each information source, pairwise significant differences between interest groups are listed in columns ("<" denotes less useful; ">" denotes more useful). For example, "conferences" were rated as significantly less useful by the Therapeutic group than by either the Theoretical Research group (i.e., < 5).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Therapeutic</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Legal</th>
<th>Applied Research</th>
<th>Theoretical Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of book chapters published</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of journal articles published</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of conference papers given</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10.28  Professional Activities
Participants rated the field of conflict resolution on the "art-science continuum" according to (1) what they themselves thought, (2) how they thought "typical researchers" would respond, and (3) how they thought "typical practitioners" would respond. The initial multivariate analysis was significant \( F_{(12,342)} = 4.75, p < .001 \), allowing the univariate inquiries to proceed, for which results are presented in Table 10.29. A significant effect was obtained for participants' self-ratings. Post hoc analysis indicated that the Therapeutic and Community subgroups rated conflict resolution to be significantly more of an "art" than did the Legal, Applied Research and Theoretical Research subgroups. Further, the Legal subgroup rated conflict resolution to be more of an "art" than did the Theoretical Research subgroup. All subgroups reported equivalent assessments of both "typical practitioners" and "typical researchers", indicating a general level of agreement about these stereotypes.

Finally, the major advantages participants reported to be associated with conflict resolution are described. The number of responses associated with each advantage domain is shown in Table 10.30. The responses to each advantage were individually analysed using Chi-Square to compare subgroups. Note, that due to low expected cell frequencies, some advantages were not able to be compared. The significant result for "win-win" was largely due to the low score for the Legal subgroup. On the other hand, the Legal subgroup provided the highest score for "improves relationships", with the Community subgroup providing the lowest response. The advantages of "cost" and "time" were mentioned least by the Therapeutic and Community subgroups, and significantly more by the Legal, Applied Research and Theoretical Research subgroups. Finally, the Therapeutic subgroup and, to a lesser extent the Community subgroup, were more likely to endorse "emotional benefits" and "empowering" as advantages.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Therapeutic</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Legal</th>
<th>Applied Research</th>
<th>Theoretical Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Typical” researcher</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Typical” practitioner</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advantage</td>
<td>Therapeutic</td>
<td></td>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td>Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Win-win</td>
<td>16 61.5</td>
<td>24 66.7</td>
<td>8 26.7</td>
<td>11 45.8</td>
<td>11 55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves relationships</td>
<td>7 26.9</td>
<td>5 13.9</td>
<td>16 53.3</td>
<td>10 41.7</td>
<td>7 35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>9 34.6</td>
<td>10 27.8</td>
<td>27 90.0</td>
<td>16 66.7</td>
<td>14 70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>12 46.2</td>
<td>14 38.9</td>
<td>29 96.7</td>
<td>19 79.2</td>
<td>14 70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-adversarial</td>
<td>12 46.2</td>
<td>14 38.9</td>
<td>12 40.0</td>
<td>9 37.5</td>
<td>4 20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of settlement</td>
<td>8 30.8</td>
<td>7 19.4</td>
<td>5 16.7</td>
<td>7 29.2</td>
<td>2 10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of process</td>
<td>7 26.9</td>
<td>15 41.7</td>
<td>6 20.0</td>
<td>6 25.0</td>
<td>7 35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional benefits</td>
<td>12 46.2</td>
<td>11 30.6</td>
<td>4 13.3</td>
<td>5 20.8</td>
<td>2 10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simplicity</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 11.1</td>
<td>5 16.7</td>
<td>2 8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowering</td>
<td>17 65.4</td>
<td>16 44.4</td>
<td>6 20.0</td>
<td>8 33.3</td>
<td>4 20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social benefits</td>
<td>2 7.7</td>
<td>3 8.3</td>
<td>2 6.7</td>
<td>2 8.3</td>
<td>1 5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disputant involvement</td>
<td>6 21.3</td>
<td>3 8.3</td>
<td>9 30.0</td>
<td>6 25.0</td>
<td>2 10.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10.3.2 Beliefs About Mediation

The three subscales derived from the Beliefs about Mediation Scale (Liberal/intuitive practice, Conceptual revision and Anti-professionalisation) were initially analysed using MANOVA, with a significant result being obtained \( F_{(12,342)} = 17.94, p < .001 \).

Univariate analyses for each of the subscales also produced significant results (see Table 10.31). Tukey’s HSD post hoc test was therefore applied to each of the subscales.

Support for Liberal/intuitive practice was significantly greater among the Therapeutic and Community subgroups than the Legal, Applied Research and Theoretical Research subgroups. The need for a Conceptual revision of the field was endorsed more by the Applied Research and Theoretical Research subgroups than by the Therapeutic, Community or Legal subgroups. The Community subgroup had a higher mean for this subscale than the Legal subgroup. Anti-professionalisation sentiment was expressed significantly more by the Therapeutic and Community subgroups than by the Legal and Applied Research subgroups. The Community subgroup also reported a higher mean than the Theoretical Research subgroup for Anti-professionalisation.

10.4 Issues relevant to the scientist-practitioner debate

In the following section results of analyses for the Theoretical Orientation, Epistemological Style, and Social Values scales are reported.

10.4.1 Theoretical Orientation

The overall (multivariate) analysis of theoretical orientation subscales provided a significant result \( F_{(32,459)} = 7.13, p < .001 \). Therefore, a univariate ANOVA was calculated for each of the subscales, followed by Tukey’s HSD post hoc test in those
cases where a significant result was obtained. Table 10.32 displays the univariate results. Univariate ANOVAs resulted in significant differences between groups for each of the subscales with the exception of Environmental determinism.

Differences were found between the Legal subgroup and each of the Therapeutic and Community subgroups for Factual orientation. In each case the Legal subgroup reported the higher mean. The Applied Research and Theoretical Research subgroups scored significantly higher on Impersonal causality than the Therapeutic, Community and Legal subgroups. The Theoretical subgroup and the Legal subgroup scored significantly higher than the Therapeutic and Community subgroups on both Behaviour content emphasis and Elementarism. The Applied and Theoretical Research subgroups reported higher means than each of the other subgroups for Biological determinism. In addition, the Legal subgroup had a significantly higher mean than the Therapeutic subgroup. In the case of Physicalism, the Applied and Theoretical Research subgroups reported higher means than all of the other subgroups, and the Legal subgroup reported a higher mean than both the Therapeutic and Community subgroups. Finally, for Quantitative orientation, the Legal, Applied and Theoretical Research subgroups had significantly higher means than either the Therapeutic or Community subgroups.

10.4.2 Epistemological Style

A significant MANOVA result ($F_{(16,392)} = 8.80, p < .001$), was obtained for the subscales comprising the Epistemological Style Questionnaire. The four univariate analyses also produced significant results, shown in Table 10.33. Tukey’s HSD post hoc test was used to determine the specific subgroup differences. For the Metamorphism and Anti-empiricism subscales, the Therapeutic and Community
subgroups had significantly higher means than the Legal, Applied Research and Theoretical Research subgroups. In the case of the Rationalism subscale, this effect was reversed, with the Therapeutic and Community subgroups reporting significantly lower mean scores than the Legal, Applied Research and Theoretical Research subgroups. For the Reductionism subscale, the Community and Applied Research subgroups each scored a lower mean than the Therapeutic, Legal and Theoretical Research subgroups.

10.4.3 Social Values

The multivariate analysis of the eight social value domains produced a significant result ($F_{(32,439)} = 5.36, p < .001$), as did the univariate analyses for all but Research/ethics (refer to Table 10.34). Five different patterns of results were identified by Tukey’s HSD post hoc test. The Therapeutic and Community subgroups were found to have significantly lower means than the Legal, Applied Research and Theoretical Research sub-groups for Science/ethics, Social philosophy and Political philosophy. For Environmentalism, the Therapeutic subgroup had a lower mean than the Applied Research and Theoretical Research subgroups. For Science/theism, the Legal, Applied Research and Theoretical Research subgroups had a significantly lower mean than the Therapeutic and Community subgroups. In the case of Scientist’s social responsibility the following significant differences were indicated: the Theoretical Research subgroup had a lower mean than the Therapeutic, Community and Legal subgroups; the Applied Research subgroup had a lower mean than the Therapeutic and Community subgroups; and, the Legal subgroup had a significantly lower mean than the Community subgroup. Finally, for Health care delivery: the Therapeutic and Community subgroups had a lower mean than the Legal and Applied Research subgroups, and both the Theoretical Research and Applied Research subgroups had a lower mean than the Legal subgroup.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Therapeutic</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Legal</th>
<th>Applied Research</th>
<th>Theoretical Research</th>
<th>$F_{(4,33)}$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liberal/intuitive practice</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual revision</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-professionalisation</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale</td>
<td>Therapeutic $M$</td>
<td>Therapeutic $SD$</td>
<td>Community $M$</td>
<td>Community $SD$</td>
<td>Legal $M$</td>
<td>Legal $SD$</td>
<td>Applied Research $M$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factual orientation</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal causality</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour content</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emphasis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementarism</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>determinism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>determinism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physicalism</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale</td>
<td>Therapeutic</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>Applied Research</td>
<td>Theoretical Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metamorphism</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>19.9 6.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.6 5.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18.7 4.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30.62 &lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationalism</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>26.6 4.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25.8 2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25.1 3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.76 &lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reductionism</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>11.1 2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.3 2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.5 3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.94 &lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiempiricism</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>15.0 5.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.7 4.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.4 3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.68 &lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale</td>
<td>Therapeutic</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>Applied Research</td>
<td>Theoretical Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science/Ethics</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientist's Social Responsibility</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science/Theism</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Philosophy</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Philosophy</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care delivery</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmentalism</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research/Ethics</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10.5 General values systems

The following section reports on the results of analyses for the World Assumptions, Social Interest and Personal Values scales.

10.5.1 World Assumptions

The overall (MANOVA) result for World Assumptions was significant \( F_{(32,459)} = 4.10, p < .001 \). Table 10.35 demonstrates that univariate results were significant for all subscales except Justice and Randomness. Each of the other subscales was further analysed using Tukey’s HSD post hoc test. Benevolence of the world and Benevolence of people produced a significant difference between the Legal subgroup and both the Therapeutic and Community subgroups, with the Legal subgroup having the lower mean. The Legal subgroup also had a significantly lower mean for self-controllability than all other subgroups. A similar pattern was obtained for Luck, with the Legal subgroup being lower than the Therapeutic, Community and Applied Research subgroups. In contrast, the Legal subgroup had a significantly higher mean than the Theoretical subgroup for Self-worth. Finally, the Therapeutic and Community subgroups had lower mean scores for Controllability than the Legal, Applied Research and Theoretical Research subgroups.

10.5.2 Social Interest

A oneway ANOVA was used to determine whether the means for Social Interest, as shown in Table 10.36, were significantly different across the five groups. A significant result \( F_{(4,131)} = 26.27, p < .001 \) was followed by Tukey’s HSD post hoc analysis which suggested that the Therapeutic and Community subgroups each had a significantly higher mean than the Legal, Applied Research and Theoretical subgroups.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Therapeutic</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Legal</th>
<th>Applied Research</th>
<th>Theoretical Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevolence of the world</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevolence of people</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controllability</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randomness</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-worth</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-controllability</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luck</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10.36  Social Interest Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Therapeutic</td>
<td>5 - 14</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>8 - 15</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>2 - 14</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Research</td>
<td>1 - 12</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical Research</td>
<td>2 - 14</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.5.3  Personal Values

While a significant MANOVA result was obtained for Personal Values ($F_{(40,464)} = 2.96$, $p < .001$), only four of the ten value domains resulted in significant univariate group differences (see Table 10.37). Tukey’s HSD post hoc test indicated the following significant differences. The Legal subgroup had a higher mean score for Power than the Therapeutic, Community and Theoretical Research subgroups. The Community subgroup had a higher mean score for Universalism than the Legal subgroup. The Therapeutic subgroup had a lower mean score for Achievement than either the Legal or Applied Research subgroups, while the Community subgroup had a lower Achievement score than the Applied Research subgroup. Both the Therapeutic and Community subgroups had higher mean scores for Benevolence than the Legal subgroup. The Community subgroup also had a higher Benevolence score than the Applied Research and Theoretical Research subgroups.
Table 10.37  Personal Values Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Therapeutic</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Applied Research</th>
<th></th>
<th>Theoretical Research</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>F(μ,df)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedonism</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulation</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-direction</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universalism</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevolence</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tradition</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10.6 General personality issues

The following section describes the results of analyses for the Creative Personality Scale and the Big Five Personality Questionnaire.

10.6.1 Creative Personality Scale

A oneway ANOVA was used to determine whether the means for Creative Personality, as shown in Table 10.38, were significantly different across the five groups. A significant result was obtained \( F_{(4,131)} = 5.99, p < .001 \). Tukey's HSD post hoc analysis suggested that differences lay between the Therapeutic subgroup and each of the Legal, Applied Research and Theoretical Research subgroups, with the Therapeutic subgroup having a significantly higher mean score.

10.6.2 Big Five Personality Questionnaire

A significant MANOVA result was obtained \( F_{(20,422)} = 4.56, p < .001 \) overall, and significant univariate effects were noted for the Extroversion, Pleasantness/agreeableness and Conscientiousness/dependability subscales (Table 10.39). Tukey's HSD post hoc test indicated that for both Extroversion and Pleasantness/agreeableness the Therapeutic and Community subgroups reported significantly higher means than the Applied Research, Theoretical Research and the Legal subgroups. For Conscientiousness/dependability, the Therapeutic and Community subgroups reported significantly lower means than the Applied Research, Theoretical Research and the Legal subgroups.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Therapeutic</td>
<td>1 - 9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>4 - 9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>2 - 8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Research</td>
<td>2 - 8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical Research</td>
<td>2 - 8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale</td>
<td>Therapeutic</td>
<td></td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extroversion</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>66.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasantness/Agreeableness</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>74.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness/Dependability</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>60.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Stability</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellect/Sophistication</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10.7 Summary

This section provides an overview of the major findings for the five subgroups. Overall, the subgroups were similar in their age and length of time involved in the conflict resolution field. However, the Therapeutic and Community subgroups reported a greater level of religious orientation than the Theoretical Research subgroup, and gender was not balanced in the Therapeutic, Community and Applied Research subgroups.

With respect to the first domain, activities and attitudes relevant to the conflict resolution field, expected differences with respect to time spent doing various work activities and the terms used to describe respondent's work in conflict resolution were found. Similarly, predicted differences between the practitioner subgroups and the research subgroups were apparent for the number of quantitative research articles read and the rating of their relevance to the field. Differences were not found across subgroups for the number of qualitative articles read, although the Therapeutic and Legal subgroups rated them as more relevant than Theoretical Researchers. Expected differences were also apparent in the number of journal articles and book chapters published, however contrary to expectations, all subgroups reported an equivalent number of conference presentations.

The most outstanding findings from the ratings of the usefulness of information sources were: the degree of extreme responses of the Theoretical Research subgroup for self ratings; the general level of agreement in ratings of "typical researchers"; and, the distinct variation in ratings about "typical practitioners". These findings suggest that while differences in the usefulness of information sources do exist between groups, the sample has a fairly uniform understanding about what is useful for the "typical
researcher”, but a less uniform idea about what a “typical practitioner” might find useful.

There was clear agreement between subgroups about how “typical researchers” and “typical practitioners” would be expected to rate conflict resolution on an art-science continuum. For self ratings on this domain, the Legal subgroup was aligned with the science orientated ratings of the research subgroups. They were, however, still less science orientated than the Theoretical Research subgroup. It was also interesting to note that the Legal subgroup listed advantages of the conflict resolution approach that were similar to both the research subgroups and were more pragmatically focussed (e.g., “cost” and “time”) than the Therapeutic and Community subgroups who were more emotionally focussed (e.g., “emotional benefits” and “empowering”).

Regarding the Beliefs About Mediation scale it was interesting to note the position of the Legal group on each of the three factors. The Legal group were aligned with both the Applied and Theoretical Research groups in their lack of support for a liberal and intuitive approach to the practice of mediation and in being supportive of further professionalisation of the field. This was in contrast with the results of the Community and Therapeutic subgroups who were highly supportive of liberal/intuitive practice and more negative about the professionalisation of the field. On the other hand, the Legal subgroup was in agreement with the Community and Therapeutic subgroup in their general acceptance of current concepts in mediation, which was in contrast with the Applied and Theoretical Research groups who reported a much higher level of support for the revision of concepts.
There were a number of interesting results relevant to the scientist-practitioner issue in the conflict resolution field (domain 2). For example, there were five basic patterns in the data arising from the Theoretical Orientation measures. First, the Therapeutic, Community and Legal subgroups produced significantly lower responses than the Applied and Theoretical Research subgroups on the Impersonal causality factor. Second, the Therapeutic and Community subgroups were significantly lower than the Legal subgroup on the Factual orientation factor. Third, there were occasions where the two patterns mentioned above were combined. In these cases the Therapeutic, Community and Legal subgroups produced significantly lower responses than the Applied and Theoretical Research subgroups, and at the same time, the Legal group was significantly higher than the Therapeutic and/or Community subgroups. This occurred in the case of both the Biological determinism and Physicalism factors. Fourth, for the Behaviour content emphasis and Elementarism factors, the Legal subgroup was equivalent to the Theoretical Research subgroup, which together were higher than the Therapeutic and Community subgroups. Finally, the Legal subgroup was aligned with both the Applied and Theoretical Research subgroups in appearing to be more quantitatively orientated than the Therapeutic and Community subgroups.

Differences between subgroups also occurred on each of the Epistemological Style subscales. Of particular interest was the alignment of the Legal subgroup with the Applied and Theoretical Research groups once again. This gave results suggesting that the Therapeutic and Community subgroups are antiempiricist, inductive and prefer an intuitive approach to science, while the Legal, Applied Research and Theoretical Research subgroups are more traditionally empiricist, deductive and objective in their approaches to science. Results for the Reductionism subscale indicated that the
Therapeutic, Legal and Theoretical Research subgroups were more reductionist than the Applied Research and Community subgroups. The Legal subgroup also aligned with the Applied and Theoretical Research subgroups for half of the subscales in the Krasner and Houts Social Values Survey. This suggested that unlike the Therapeutic and Community subgroups, the Legal subgroup were more like researchers in their support for concepts of Social Darwinism, neutrality regarding science ethics, liberal focus with respect to political philosophy and a tendency to be atheists.

In the third domain (general values systems) results suggested significant differences between subgroups. The results of the World Assumptions Scale indicated that the Legal subgroup believed less in the Benevolence of others and the Benevolence of world factors than do the Therapeutic and Community groups. Similarly, the Legal subgroup differed from all other subgroups in their disbelief that one can control what happens to oneself in life, and also from all subgroups but the Theoretical Research group in their disbelief in luck. However, the Legal subgroup scores aligned with those of the Applied Research and Theoretical Research subgroups on the Controllability factor with higher scores than the Therapeutic and Community subgroups. Finally, the Legal subgroup reported having a significantly higher degree of self worth than the Theoretical Research subgroup.

Overall there were few differences between subgroups on the Schwartz Values Survey. Four values domains did produce significant differences. The Legal subgroup figured primarily in these differences, standing out as valuing the Power domain more than the Therapeutic, Community and Applied Research subgroups, and also as being significantly less likely to value concepts of universalism than the Community
subgroup. The Applied Research and Legal subgroups were more achievement orientated in their values than the Therapeutic subgroup, and the Applied Research subgroup was also higher than the Community subgroup. Alternatively the Therapeutic and Community subgroups valued concepts of benevolence more than the Legal subgroup, and the Community subgroup scored higher than both of the research subgroups. The Therapeutic and Community subgroups also scored higher than the other subgroups on the Social Interest Scale. This suggested a more empathic understanding and positive attitude towards others.

The fourth domain regarding general personality issues also produced significant results. The analyses of the Big Five Personality Questionnaire suggest again that the Legal subgroup was more closely related to the research subgroups than to the other practitioner subgroups. This was evident by the lower levels of extroversion and pleasantness/ agreeableness and the higher levels of conscientiousness/ dependability that the Legal and research subgroups shared in comparison with the Therapeutic and Community subgroups. The Therapeutic subgroup reported the highest scores on the Creative Personality Scale, suggesting that they are more creative than all other groups.

In summary, clear differences between subgroups existed regarding reports of the information sources used and the professional activities engaged in, with some discrepant views particularly about what was seen as typical for practitioners. The most interesting result was the Legal subgroup’s tendency to agree with the Applied and Theoretical Research subgroups about issues relevant to the scientist-practitioner debate in the conflict resolution field. This similarity was also apparent for the personality domains and general values systems measured in the survey.
CHAPTER 11
QUALITATIVE INVESTIGATIONS

11.0 Introduction

The quantitative study demonstrated the relevance of a number of psychological factors in understanding the differences between research and practice in the field of conflict resolution. This was achieved at both a general level, between researchers and practitioners, and at a more specific level, between subgroups of researchers and practitioners. The current qualitative study aimed to corroborate the results of the quantitative study, and address research aim 5 that stated the need to undertake qualitative investigations into the relationship between research and practice in conflict resolution. It should be noted that this is not intended to replace the findings of quantitative inquiry, but rather, to support and extend such findings in an attempt to adopt a level of methodological pluralism (e.g., van Dijk, 1997).

The aim of the Chapter 11 is to describe the qualitative investigation of the research topic. As a preliminary, the origins and benefits of qualitative approaches are overviewed in Section 11.1, and in Section 11.2 the use of qualitative methods to explore relations
between research and practice is reviewed. Section 11.3 provides an account of qualitative approaches in the study of conflict resolution. The aims of the current study are outlined in Section 11.4, and the methodology for the current qualitative investigation, via short semi-structured interviews, is explained in Section 11.5. The considerations and processes used for the analysis of qualitative data are described in Section 11.6, and the chapter is summarised in Section 11.7. The results from the qualitative investigations are presented in the following chapter (Chapter 12).

11.1 Qualitative methods

The current section provides an introduction to qualitative methods as they are used in the social sciences. This includes an overview of the different types and advantages of qualitative methods, the paradigmatic defence of qualitative methods, and consideration of the developing relationship between quantitative and qualitative methods.

There are a variety of qualitative methodologies that have emerged and have become popular in recent years. These can be categorised into 3 broad methods: field based; action based; and, library based (Grbich, 1999). Field based methods aim to collect original data from informants through either interviews or some form of observation. This is the methodology of choice for the majority of qualitative inquiries. Action based methods reflect the use of field based methods with the added aim of the researcher assisting informants to change their environment in some agreed way, by providing feedback mechanisms into the community of study. Library based methods of qualitative research involve no direct contact with participants, but rather involve the analysis of information that tends to be stored in libraries, including texts, newspapers, media footage, and case notes.
Qualitative research does not traditionally focus on numbers in its analysis. Rather, the data is usually in the form of words that have been recorded to represent observations. Observations are usually made in natural/real life settings rather than the artificial laboratory conditions often used in quantitative studies. It is argued that this enables greater face validity and allows researchers to develop a more accurate understanding of the phenomena being studied. It is the depth and richness of understanding that is offered by qualitative research that may be its greatest advantage. The disadvantages of qualitative research include the potential for subjectivity (however it is acknowledged that poorly conducted quantitative methods may also be subjective), poor reliability (two researchers may arrive at different conclusions based on their observations of the same phenomenon at the same time), and the fact that qualitative research is relatively difficult to conduct and is usually time consuming in comparison to quantitative methods (Bowling, 1998; Denzin & Lincoln, 1994; Miles & Huberman, 1984).

The term "qualitative research" encompasses a variety of theoretical bases and definitions. For the purpose of this investigation the definition offered by Minichiello, Aroni, Timewell and Alexander (1995, p. 10) will be used. That is, qualitative research incorporates approaches that "... seek to uncover the thoughts, perceptions and feelings experienced by informants ...". While this definition could also be applied to quantitative approaches, qualitative approaches are based on a different epistemology.

Denzin and Lincoln (1994) described this fundamental epistemological difference in paradigmatic terms. They argued that quantitative research is based in the "positivistic paradigm", that assumes a mechanistic approach to the discovery of facts about the observed world. This is contrasted with qualitative research, that is based in what they
call the "naturalistic paradigm". They argued that the naturalistic paradigm implies that reality is best conceived as an interdependent whole that cannot be broken down into measurable segments (as entailed by qualitative approaches), and that all situations are bound by time and context, such that generalisations are rarely possible.

There has been considerable debate about the use and validity of quantitative and qualitative approaches in the social sciences. Smith and Heshusius (1986) provided a historical analysis of this, describing three different stages in the quantitative-qualitative debate. The first stage, which described the state of the quantitative-qualitative debate from the late nineteenth century to the 1970s, was best characterised as a "conflict" relationship. Smith and Heshusius proposed that during this period, quantitative and qualitative techniques were polarised in terms of different theoretical positions and were divided by the notions of objectivity and subjectivity. The second stage that emerged during the late 1970s was termed by the authors as "détente", because during this period there was a move away from describing the good and bad aspects of quantitative and qualitative approaches, to a focus on the procedural issues associated with these techniques as parallel research tools. "Cooperation" emerged in the early 1980s as the third stage in the quantitative-qualitative debate. This was based in the notion that these different approaches were complementary, and was marked by attempts to enhance the rigour of qualitative approaches (Smith & Heshusius, 1986).

While these three levels of debate are still apparent in various areas of the literature, the last decade has involved a utilisation of quantitative and qualitative methods in an attempt to gain the advantages of combining both forms of data collection (Grbich, 1999). In situations where qualitative and quantitative measures are used in parallel to
collect data about the same issue, "triangulation" is achieved (Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Hammersley & Atkinson, 1995). Triangulation involves the overlapping of perspectives to enhance the overall reliability of a study (Grbich, 1999). It is expected that the combined quantitative and qualitative approaches of the current thesis will allow greater confidence in the validity of the conclusions that can be drawn about the relationship between research and practice in conflict resolution.

11.2 Application of qualitative methods to investigate research and practice

It is widely accepted that research regarding applied areas of psychology (e.g., practice research) should include qualitative methods (Danziger, 1997; van Dijk, 1997; Iniguez, 1997). Further, some authors have argued that as the extent of practical application of an endeavour increases, so does the need for qualitative research (Grbich, 1999; Silverman, 1993). It should be noted that the practitioners involved in the original focus group (Section 7.3.1) were particularly mindful of these issues, and suggested that interview based research should be conducted to augment the quantitative investigations described in Chapters 7 through 10.

In recent years the most commonly adopted qualitative strategy in psychology has been discourse analysis. The objective of the current study was not to employ specific discourse analytic techniques, rather it was to embrace the general philosophy of this qualitative approach through a 'content analysis' of interviews with researchers and practitioners in conflict resolution. Further details about discourse analysis can be found in the works of Potter (1996), Potter and Wetherell (1987), and van Dijk (1985).
With the growing popularity of qualitative methods, there is a substantial literature about the value of interview based research. Kvale (1996) claimed that interviews are useful in inquiries about research and practice because they increase the depth of information that can be obtained. For example, qualitative techniques have been used to investigate relations between research and practice in counselling psychology (Gilgun, Daly & Handel, 1992), and in exploring the content of scientists’ discourse (McKinlay & Potter, 1987; Potter & Mulkay, 1985). Rennie (1994) proposed that in exploring the gap between research and practice in counselling psychology (which is not dissimilar from standard practices of mediation, and in fact many counselling psychologists also practice mediation), qualitative research methods promise to give more informative results.

Rennie (1994) argued that the characteristics of qualitative research are well suited to the investigation of practical therapies. He listed the characteristics of qualitative research as: a focus on subjectivity, an emphasis on understanding the situation rather than on demonstrating the truth, collaboration with the participants rather than subject-object dualism, and holism rather than fragmentism. It was noted that these characteristics are present in the subject matter of most counselling psychology (and also of conflict resolution), and therefore that qualitative research provides a congruent approach for the study of practice. This is further supported by the findings of Gilgun, Daly and Handel (1992) who provided further evidence for the importance of qualitative research, ethnography and interviewing in understanding research and practice in applied family therapy.
11.3 Qualitative approaches in the study of conflict resolution

Ethnographic and interview techniques have been used to a moderate extent in the conflict resolution field. For example, Benyamini (1985) used interviews to evaluate the strategic decisions of conflict resolution workers. In a later study Benyamini (1987) used retrospective interviews to evaluate the differences between researchers and practitioners in their choices of strategies to deal with conflict in crisis situations. Benyamini identified characteristic differences in researcher and practitioner behaviour. He reported that researchers tended to adjust their behaviour to suit the abnormal (crisis) conditions, and practitioners tended to disregard the crisis and follow their normal routines. This research demonstrated the potential for interviews to be used to identify differences between researchers and practitioner groups in conflict resolution.

Other qualitative studies have focussed specifically on the practice of conflict resolution. For example, Baskin and Sommers (1990) used ethnographic methods to study conflict resolution as practiced by a state-planned mediation program and a community-based mediation program. Ethnographic methods included observations of actual mediation sessions, interviews with practitioners and analysis of archival data. This study emphasised the differences between agencies and approaches that could not be informed using quantitative methodologies. Bilmes (1992) used ethnographic techniques, particularly those of conversation analysis and sociolinguistics, to provide a culturally contexted account of a mediation. Evidence was provided that suggests interviews and the analysis of conversational structure can be used as tools to generate insight both into the process of mediation and the activities of mediators. Other ethnographic research about mediation practice has included audiotaped mediation sessions (Kandel, 1992), and studies of the differences between the discourse of
traditional legal adjudicators and mediators (Maley, 1995), and the nature of mediator and disputant discourse (Rifkin, Millen, & Cobb, 1991).

Hunt and Benford (1994) explored the discourse of persons involved in several peace movement and conflict resolution organisations, with the aim to compare what they called the “identity talk” of the participants. They identified six types of identity talk: “associational declarations, disillusionment anecdotes, atrocity tales, personal political reports, guide narratives, and war stories”. The stories they elicited revolved around the themes of becoming aware, active, committed, and weary. This study provides further evidence for the value of a discursive approach to interpreting the attitudes of those involved in the conflict resolution movement.

In summary, interviews have been used to provide useful information about the relationship between research and practice in practice dominated fields, and also in the study of conflict resolution practice. However they are yet to be used in an investigation of the relationship between research and practice in the conflict resolution field. Therefore, in broad terms, this study was designed to extend understanding of how researchers and practitioners construe the dynamic relationship between research and practice in the conflict resolution field through interview based research.

11.4 Objectives of the qualitative investigation

Based on the literature reviewed above, and the considerations detailed in previous chapters, the following objectives were developed to investigate further the findings of the quantitative study, and to guide the investigations for the qualitative study.
1. To establish a more specific understanding of the activities of:
   a) researchers and practitioners;
   b) interest groups.

2. To establish a more specific understanding of the training and educational backgrounds of:
   a) researchers and practitioners;
   b) interest groups.

3. To determine the extent to which interviewees felt their training prepared them for their respective activities in conflict resolution.

4. To determine the extent to which practitioners use theory based processes or other processes (e.g., common sense) to guide their work.

5. To determine the attitudes of interviewees about the extent to which they think theory affects practice in conflict resolution.

6. To determine the extent of consensus experienced by interviewees about theory (or equivalent constructs) with colleagues.

7. To gain an understanding of the attitudes of interviewees towards the relationship between the domains of research and practice.

8. To gain an understanding of attitudes of interviewees towards the relationship between researchers and practitioners
11.5 Methodology

The methodology for the current study is described below, incorporating descriptions of the design of the study, participants and procedure.

11.5.1 Study design

The qualitative study comprised semi structured interviews. Interviews were conducted with participants using a "guided conversation" approach (Lofland & Lofland, 1995), based on the core interview questions listed in Table 11.1. These core questions were structured in order to address the objectives detailed above in Section 11.4. A total of fifteen interviews were conducted (see Section 11.5.2 below). This is a sufficient sample according to the requirements of typical interview research (Rubin & Rubin, 1995), where sample size is generally low in comparison with more quantitative data collection methods. It should also be noted that in interview research, each word is considered to be a unit of data (Potter & Wetherell, 1987).

A pilot study was conducted in order to test the sequence and comprehensibility of core questions and to allow for the potential modification of ambiguous or redundant questions. This was conducted with two local conflict resolution practitioners who had been involved in the original focus group (see Chapter 7). Minor modifications to questions were made, resulting in 14 core interview questions (Table 11.1). The two practitioners supported the need for interviews and suggested that the interviewer use tact and patience in order to obtain useful information. Ethics approval was obtained from The University of Adelaide Human Research Ethics Committee, and data were collected in accordance with the procedure outlined in the ethics proposal which sought particularly to maintain the anonymity of interviewees (see Appendix B).
Table 11.1:  Interview schedule: Core interview questions

1. How long have you been working in the conflict resolution field?
2. What is it that you do in conflict resolution?
3. Did you have any training for your current work?
4. Do you feel that this training prepared you adequately for what you are doing now?
5. Do you see clients?
6. How many clients do you see per day, or per week?
7. Over what period of time (for how long) do you see clients?
8. When you see clients, how much do you rely on what you learned from your training and how much are other factors like common sense relevant?
9. Do you think that standard theories of conflict resolution effect what is done in practice?
10. Do you do any research?
11. Can you briefly describe the nature of your research?
12. How would you describe the relationship between research and practice in the conflict resolution field?
13. Do you think that researchers and practitioners adequately assist each other in this field?
14. Is there consensus about the theories and processes that underlie conflict resolution among people you work with?

NB In most cases the specific questions about experience in practice (questions 5 through 8) were not asked of researchers, and the specific questions about experience in research (questions 10 and 11) were not asked of practitioners because they were not relevant.
11.5.2 Participants

Participants were purposively sampled from people who were well known in the conflict resolution field in the United Kingdom. The researcher was familiar with these people because of their high profiles or because they were suggested to the researcher by another participant ("snowballing" sampling method). Both purposive sampling and "snowballing" are sampling methods commonly used in the selection of participants for interview research (Bowling, 1998). There were three selection criteria for the study: (1) that participants had been involved in the conflict resolution field for a minimum of five years; (2) that participants had not been involved in the quantitative survey; and, (3) that participants fitted into one of the five prescribed subgroups from the previous study. In addition, the background of each participant was checked as far as possible by the author to ensure that they had suitable experience in conflict resolution to be able to adequately complete the interview. Finally, an effort was made to ensure that each interest group included both male and female interviewees.

11.5.3 Procedure

There was relatively little difficulty in arranging interviews with participants. Of 18 potential interviewees approached, 15 interviews were agreed to and conducted.

Participants were selected according to the same five subgroups (Therapeutic, Community, Legal, Applied Researcher, and Theoretical Researcher) that were formed in the second part of the quantitative study (Research Aim 4). These subgroups will be termed "interest groups" throughout the qualitative study as participants with a specific "interest" in the field were actively pursued for interest group membership, rather than being extracted from an existing sample as was the case in the quantitative study. Three participants were interviewed from each of the five interest groups. Membership of
interest groups was discussed prior to the interview and a consultative decision was made as to which group interviewees felt they best belonged. This was particularly important when deciding between Applied and Theoretical Researcher groups.

On most occasions the interviews involved a reasonably sequential progression through the core question list (Table 11.1). There were two variations from this procedure. First, some of the questions were not relevant to particular interviewees. For example, some of the Researchers interviewed did not undertake any conflict resolution practice and therefore were not questioned about clients. Second, there were occasions where the order of questions was changed due to the natural flow of the conversation. For example, if an interviewee had already provided an appropriate answer to question 11 while answering question 2, then question 11 was not asked again. When this occurred the interview was transcribed in the order it actually occurred. Analysis of such questions involved consideration of responses from the previous question as appropriate. For example, if the interviewee answered question 11 in their response to question 2, then interpretation of question 11 was conducted by reviewing the response to question 2.

Interviews were conducted in the workplace of interviewees. The “talk” time for each interview was between thirty and forty-five minutes. Interviews were audio recorded, and then transcripts were made of the recordings using standard transcribing procedures (see Potter & Wetherell, 1987; Silverman, 1993), and according to the ethical procedures outlined in Appendix B. Due to the close-knit nature of the conflict resolution field, anonymity was of primary concern. Therefore all personally identifying details were edited from the transcripts and interviewees were offered the
opportunity to view transcripts in order to check the editing process. None of the interviewees elected to check their transcript. After the transcription of interviews was completed and scripts were prepared and checked, the tapes were erased. It should be noted that one interviewee (ID 007) requested that the name of their organisation be left in their script.

11.6 Analysis of qualitative data

All scripts are available for viewing in Appendix C. The total time taken to transcribe interviews amounted to approximately 250 hours, including more than 50,000 words of text. An ethnographic strategy (Goodenough, 1970; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Silverman, 1993; Spradley, 1979) for the coding and analysis of these data was adopted. As reported above, this type of approach has been used productively in a number of conflict resolution contexts. The cornerstone of this approach is the recognition of distinct patterns of responding, both within and across cases. Glaser and Strauss (1967) described the process of relating these patterns to the contexts in which they occur as “the constant comparative method”. Inconsistency and variation between interviews helped to identify differences in themes.

The derivation of these patterns of responding was a four-stage process. In the first stage (review), all participant’s responses to a given question were examined. The topics raised were noted, given a brief descriptive label, and assigned a code. The object of the review phase was to familiarise the author with the data in order to conduct the next step, that aimed to produce a set of codes capable of recording a detailed picture of the responses offered to each question. In the second stage (coding), the responses of each participant to each question were assigned as many codes as were necessary to
describe the information. Coding was completed for each core question in turn. A complete account of the coding process, including tables for each question, codes and examples of text for each code, is available on request.

The third stage involved a reliability check on the Stage 2 coding process, as there has been some concern about the reliability that can be achieved using qualitative methods (Mays & Pope, 1996). All coding was carried out by the author, and while this had the advantage of eliminating inter-rater variability, there was a risk of systematic bias or inconsistency in the allocation of codes. To address this issue, a 10% random sample of the interview data was independently coded by a second person. It was not feasible to request a second person to code all of the interviews because of the lengthy nature of this process. The sample used to check the reliability of the coding process was determined on the following basis. As 15 interviews were conducted, each consisting of 14 core questions, a total of 210 responses needed coding. A random number table was used to generated a 10% sample of these responses (i.e., responses to 21 questions). The second coder then undertook steps one and two described above (review and coding) on the chosen responses. The second coder was skilled in the general use of qualitative research methods and was made familiar with the specific aims of the study.

The themes identified by both coders were compared and showed a high level of agreement. The agreement between the two sets of ratings ranged from 85% (question 8, ID005) to 100% (response to questions 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, and 10). This was accepted as a very satisfactory level of agreement, indicative of a reliable coding process, and demonstrates an acceptable degree of "synchronic reliability" (Kirk & Miller, 1986). Accordingly all results presented here are based on the coding prepared by the author.
In the final stage (data reduction), the very large number of codes identified in Stage 2 (coding) were amalgamated to produce a smaller number of codes that were more tractable for analysis. Each of these new codes represented a broad theme, or pattern of responding. As is implicit in an ethnographic approach, these patterns were not derived from any *a priori* theory, but represented themes inherent in the responses themselves.

11.7 Summary

The aim of Chapter 11 was to describe the methodology for the qualitative aspect of this investigation into the relationship between research and practice in conflict resolution. This was achieved by first introducing the reader to qualitative analysis, and providing a reasonably broad review of the philosophical and methodological considerations of qualitative research methods. The use of qualitative research techniques for investigations into research and practice was briefly reviewed, as was the use of qualitative methods in the field of conflict resolution. Following this, the specific objectives of the qualitative study were listed. The methodology for this study was then outlined in detail, as were the processes for data transcription and analysis. The results of the qualitative study are presented in the following chapter.
CHAPTER 12
RESULTS OF QUALITATIVE INVESTIGATIONS

12.0 Introduction

In-depth semi-structured interviews were conducted with 15 individuals involved in the conflict resolution field. Interviewees included practitioners from legal, community and therapeutic backgrounds; and researchers from applied and theoretical backgrounds. Transcripts of interviews were produced and content analysis was undertaken using an ethnographic strategy of identifying common themes and differences. Chapter 12 presents the results of these analyses. Section 12.1 identifies three technical points to be considered in the presentation and interpretation of results. Following this, Section 12.2 describes the categorisation of interview questions into a series of issues that were used to guide the interpretation of qualitative data, and the presentation of results. Sections 12.3 through 12.9 present the results of data analyses. The chapter is summarised in Section 12.10.
12.1 Technical points regarding the presentation of results

Three important notes regarding the presentation of results are made below. These relate to the scoring of themes, the style adopted for reporting results, and the potential methodological concerns associated with interview data.

12.1.1 Scoring of themes

It was possible for any individual interviewee to mention a given theme more than once in response to a question. There are two ways to enumerate such data. One approach is to record the number of references to the theme for each interviewee. Alternatively, the fact that a theme has been mentioned by an interviewee can be recorded, regardless of how many occurrences (i.e., themes are interpreted as a “hit” or a “miss” for each interviewee). The latter approach has been adopted as it was considered more important to identify whether a theme was mentioned than it was to attempt to quantify responses.

12.1.2 Reporting style

Possible modes of presentation of qualitative results cover a wide variety of techniques including descriptive statistics, bar graphs, pie charts, tables and matrix displays (Miles & Huberman, 1994a). When a small number of cases is available, it is also helpful to present data in tabular or graphical form to allow easy comparison between data sets or groups (Miles & Huberman, 1994b). In addition to formal techniques of reporting, a range of more literary forms can be used to report qualitative results. These include vignettes, anecdotes, information layers, and quotes from interview data (Grbich, 1999). A combination of tables and direct quotes from the interviews is used in the reporting of the current data. This approach has been chosen so that comparison between groups can be easily achieved, and also so that a large number of themes can be highlighted.
12.1.3 Potential methodological concerns

It is acknowledged that the interview data are likely, at least in a small way, to have been affected by the dynamics of the interview process. The information reported by interviewees may have been effected by the presence of the researcher. This is particularly important to consider in relation to the fact that interviewees may have felt obliged to present a certain view. The issues raised may have been considered contentious and it is possible that interviewees were motivated by self interest to present conservative views. While this may not have resulted in any major distortions, it is a potential methodological concern. A discursive approach implies that the interview data should be considered as a form of discursive action.

12.2 Presentation and structure of results

The current chapter reports results in terms of both the research-practice division and between the five interest groups. The interview schedule consisted of 14 core questions, and was divided into 6 groups of questions (Table 12.1) that formed the structure for reporting results. Therefore, results are presented in terms of the following 6 issues:

(1) Experience and application; (2) Training; (3) Conflict resolution practice; (4) Conflict resolution research; (5) Theoretical issues; and, (6) Relationship between research and practice. A seventh category, that relates to issues associated with the professionalisation of the conflict resolution field, is also included in the presentation of results. Each category is addressed in a section of this chapter. Within each section (except those relevant only to researchers or practitioners), the results are discussed at two levels. First, the findings about researchers and practitioners are discussed. Second, the findings about types of researchers and types of practitioners, or “interest group” (as explained in Section 11.5.3) are considered.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Experience and application                     | 1. How long have you been working in the conflict resolution field?  
2. What is it that you do in conflict resolution?                                                                                                                                                    |
| Training                                       | 3. Did you have any training for your current work?  
4. Do you feel that this training prepared you adequately for what you are doing now?                                                                                                               |
| Conflict resolution practice                   | 5. Do you see clients?  
6. How many clients do you see per day, or per week?  
7. Over what period of time (for how long) do you see clients?  
8. When you see clients, how much do you rely on what you learned from your training and how much are other factors like common sense relevant? |
| (Practitioners only)                           |                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| Conflict resolution research                   | 10. Do you do any research?  
11. Can you briefly describe the nature of your research?                                                                                                                                                |
| (Researchers only)                             |                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| Theoretical issues                             | 9. Do you think that standard theories of conflict resolution affect what is done in practice?  
14. Is there consensus about the theories and processes that underlie conflict resolution among people you work with?                                                                                   |
| Relationship between research and practice     | 12. How would you describe the relationship between research and practice in the conflict resolution field?                                                                                               |
|                                               | 13. Do you think that researchers and practitioners adequately assist each other in this field?                                                                                                          |
For each of the six issues listed above, tables are presented for each question. An exception is that results for questions 6 and 7 are combined into one table because the responses are inter-related. For questions that were relevant to both Researchers and Practitioners, tables include the results for “Research/Practice” and “Interest Groups” categories (e.g., Table 12.3). For those questions that were only relevant to researchers, results are presented for “All Researchers”, and the “Applied Research” and “Theoretical Research” interest groups (e.g., Table 12.10). For those questions that were relevant only to practitioners, results are presented for “All Practitioners”, and the “Therapeutic”, “Community” and “Legal” interest groups (e.g., Table 12.8).

Each table lists the relevant themes identified for a given question, and a summary of the number of interviewees who responded in terms of those themes. For interest groups, entries to tables were made according to the responses of individual interviewees. For example, if the second interviewee from the Legal interest group responded to a certain theme, the table entry was made in the appropriate place as “L2”. This method allowed a greater amount of information to be presented than would be possible by a frequency or percentage based aggregation of data, and allowed the pattern of individual responses to be followed. This form of presentation enables comparison between members of interest groups and reveals relative consensus or dispersion of responses.

In addition, percentages (rounded to the nearest whole number due to small sample size) are given for the total number of responses for a given theme for All Researchers and/or All Practitioners, and also for the whole sample where appropriate. For example, in Table 12.11 the theme “theory does effect practice” was reported by three Practitioners
(33% of the Practitioners interviewed), and five Researchers (83% of the Researchers interviewed), which summed to 53% of the total sample.

All data exist in three forms, the raw scripts (Appendix C), the coding protocols used to translate raw scripts to themes (available on request), and the aggregated themes, presented in Tables 12.2 through 12.18. These three sources of data are linked by codes assigned to each interviewee as described in Table 12.2 and line numbers that denote where in the script the discourse can be found. In all tables, “P” is used to abbreviate the term “Practitioners” and “R” is used to abbreviate the term “Researchers”.

12.3 Experience and application

This section reports the results of core interview questions 1 and 2 that sought information about the length of time interviewees had been involved in the conflict resolution field and their activities or occupational roles. Results for this section are presented in tabular form in tables 12.2 through 12.5.

12.3.1 Researchers and Practitioners

Table 12.2 details the ID, table code, interest group and gender of interviewees. It also provides the results of the first interview question about the length of time interviewees had been involved in the field. Overall, seven women and eight men were interviewed. Length of time that interviewees had been involved in the field ranged from 5.5 years to 20 years for Practitioners, and 5 years to 20 years for Researchers. When asked to describe what it was they did in conflict resolution, two thirds of the Practitioners identified with a particular profession. Half of these identified themselves as community mediators and half as lawyers. In contrast, all of the Researchers
interviewed nominated a professional affiliation. Two thirds of the Researchers reported that they were academics, one identified himself as a research officer and another as an author. Table 12.3 details these results.

There was a clear distinction between the activities of Practitioners and Researchers, as outlined in Table 12.4. Practitioners focussed completely on describing various modes of practice, ranging from 67% of Practitioners who reported working in divorce mediation, through 33% reporting involvement in business applications and community mediation, to a number of other individual responses. Researchers tended to report only the types of research that they were engaged in with half of the group reporting an involvement in efficacy research and half nominating qualitative research to best describe their activities. There was a characteristic lack of involvement outside of primary activities. It seemed that both Researchers and Practitioners were highly identified with the particular types of practice or research in which they were engaged.

Table 12.5 reports the themes that interviewees used to describe how their time was utilised in their work. More than half of the Practitioners interviewed reported being involved only in practice, with the remainder reporting a variety of combined roles (e.g., practice and administration, training and practice). The majority of Researchers interviewed reported that their time was equally divided between teaching and research, with only one Researcher committing their time purely to research.

12.3.2 Interest groups

Table 12.2 details the interest group membership for all interviewees. The Therapeutic interest group included two females and one male, with experience in the field ranging
from 6 to 12 years. The Community interest group also included two females and one male, with experience ranging between 5 and 20 years. The Legal interest group included all males, with between 5.5 and 7 years experience. There were two females and one male in the Applied Research interest group, and years of experience in the field ranged between 9 and 20 years. Finally the Theoretical Research interest group included two males and one female, with range of experience between 5 and 12 years.

The most striking result reported in Table 12.3 is that members of the Therapeutic interest group did not identify with any particular professional group in the same way that other interest groups did. It should be noted that interviewees were not directly asked what their profession was, rather this information was volunteered. Lawyers were forthright in their assertion of their status as lawyers in immediate response to the question about what they did in conflict resolution. For example:

"... Well, as you know I am a lawyer ..." (L1, 006).

Similarly, members of the Community interest group all identified themselves as community mediators. For example:

".... I mediate, ... I mean I'm the community mediator, ..." (C2, 006).

The Therapeutic interest group included two psychologists and one counsellor. None of these interviewees nominated a profession in explanation of what they did in conflict resolution in response to question 2. Rather they focussed on the roles and activities undertaken in their work. For example:

"... I do a bit of everything. Being in conflict resolution so long means that you see all the different ways it can be used ... and you learn how to do most of the things ... mmm mainly counselling sort of things, but most things in conflict resolution I can do ..." (T1, 004).
It seems that members of the Therapeutic group were less concerned with establishing a professional identity for themselves that was related specifically to conflict resolution activities by comparison with the other practitioner interest groups. There was no such variability in the responses of Applied and Theoretical Researchers.

There was substantial divergence in the activities of Applied and Theoretical Researchers. As described in Table 12.4, all of the interviewees from the Applied Research interest group reported that they were involved in qualitative research, in the areas of peace research and communication research. In contrast, the Theoretical Researchers indicated that they undertook efficacy research and implied a more quantitative approach. For example:

"... Primarily I'm doing research into whether mediation methods work or not..." (TR1, 012).

"... evaluating the effectiveness of different techniques that are put into training programs and that ..." (TR2, 012).

The broad divergence between the Applied and Theoretical Research interest groups is apparent in the accounts offered by AR3 (008-046) and TR1 (002-010). AR3 reported that his vocational experiences ranged from working in the army and peace building training of United Nations troops, to studying the behaviour of diplomatic missions during the Cold War. He stated that his aim was to find practical applications for conflict resolution research:

"... that experience um made me very passionate about finding out some of the more practical ways to put this sort of belief into work that would help people at a more general level rather than just in the area of politics hmm I mean find more practical applications for it and ar I er did some interviews with people in practice to find out what they er want ..." (AR3, 044).
In contrast, TR1 described how he became involved in conflict resolution research through the interest of a student and in an effort to keep up with a new area of social psychology research. He stated that his interest was influenced by the following issues:

"... The er it was very easy for example to get things to get articles published ... and there was a lot of interest in the area, and it was a public interest issue that lots of people wanted to know about and um there was er ... so that it meant there was opportunities for funding and that sort of thing. Like any area you have to move with the interests of the area and stay up to date ... so this was a new area for ah for social psychology to look at, so I moved with the general interest in the area I suppose ..." (TR1. 008).

This suggests a more detached or academic approach to research. The Theoretical Researchers generally expressed the decision to undertake research in conflict resolution because it was a valid and meaningful subject area that was relevant to social psychological inquiry. This suggests a more detached approach in general than is customary for Applied Researchers. TR1's (008) decision to research whether mediation works or not in order to keep up with social psychology research and get articles published, contrasts with the passionate motivation expressed by AR3 (044) and his desire to apply conflict resolution research findings.

Table 12.4 also details the various domains of practice described by practitioner interest groups. As would be expected, Lawyers reported being involved in the practice of alternative dispute resolution, primarily for business applications and divorce mediation. Members of the Community interest group also reported predictable types of practice. Of interest was the breadth of responses in the Therapeutic interest group. For example, T1 reported that she typically used conflict resolution processes for business, counselling, custody decisions and divorce mediation. Table 12.5 also demonstrates the diversity of activities undertaken by members of the Therapeutic interest group.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Table code</th>
<th>Interest group</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Years experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005</td>
<td>T1</td>
<td>Therapeutic</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006</td>
<td>T2</td>
<td>Therapeutic</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007</td>
<td>T3</td>
<td>Therapeutic</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010</td>
<td>AR1</td>
<td>Applied Research</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>011</td>
<td>TR1</td>
<td>Theoretical Research</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012</td>
<td>AR2</td>
<td>Applied Research</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>013</td>
<td>AR3</td>
<td>Applied Research</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>014</td>
<td>TR2</td>
<td>Theoretical Research</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>015</td>
<td>TR3</td>
<td>Theoretical Research</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Research / Practice</td>
<td>Interest groups</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Practitioners</td>
<td>All Researchers</td>
<td>Therapeutic</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 (67%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community mediator</td>
<td>3 (33%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C1, C2, C3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lawyer</td>
<td>3 (33%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>L1, L2, L3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>research officer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (17%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>author</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (17%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Research / Practice</td>
<td>Interest groups</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Practitioners</td>
<td>Therapeutic</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alternative dispute resolution</td>
<td>2 (22%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>business applications</td>
<td>3 (33%)</td>
<td>T1</td>
<td></td>
<td>L1, L2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community mediation</td>
<td>3 (33%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C1, C2, C3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>counselling</td>
<td>1 (11%)</td>
<td>T1</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>custody decisions</td>
<td>2 (22%)</td>
<td>T1, T3</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>divorce mediation</td>
<td>6 (67%)</td>
<td>T1, T2, T3</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>L2, L3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family mediation</td>
<td>1 (11%)</td>
<td>T2</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>victim offender mediation</td>
<td>1 (11%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>youth work</td>
<td>1 (11%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>efficacy research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mediator behaviour research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communication research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peace research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qualitative research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Research / Practice</td>
<td>Interest groups</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Practitioners</td>
<td>All Researchers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all practice</td>
<td>5 (56%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all research</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (17%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>author and consultant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (17%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practice and administration</td>
<td>1 (11%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practice and supervision</td>
<td>1 (11%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching and research</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 (67%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>training and practice</td>
<td>1 (11%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>training, practice and administration</td>
<td>1 (11%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T3</td>
<td>C2, C3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T3</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T1</td>
<td>T2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L2, L3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TR2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AR3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AR1, AR2</td>
<td>TR1, TR3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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12.4 Training

This section reports the results of core interview questions 3 and 4 that asked interviewees to describe the training that they had undertaken for their work in conflict resolution and to comment on the extent to which they felt that training had prepared them for their work. Tables 12.6 and 12.7 detail interviewee’s responses to the questions about training and satisfaction with training respectively.

12.4.1 Researchers and Practitioners

The themes that emerged for Practitioners ranged from no formal training in conflict resolution techniques (22%) to workshops about skills (100%). Only one third of the interviewees reported having undertaken a formal training course in mediation, but 78% felt that their training from another profession (e.g., psychology) had prepared them for work in conflict resolution. Other themes identified in Practitioner transcripts included learning how to work in conflict resolution from colleagues (44%), by simply doing conflict resolution (33%), by teaching themselves (22%), or through teaching others (22%).

All of the Practitioners interviewed reported being satisfied and positive about the extent to which their own training prepared them for their current work. In answering this question other themes emerged, with Practitioners emphasising the importance of applied aspects (learning by doing) of their training (67%), and expressing negativity about the extent and type of training undertaken by some of the other practitioners involved in the field (44%).
All of the Researchers interviewed reported having an undergraduate degree in an area relevant to conflict resolution. Of the six Researchers interviewed, three had achieved doctorates (PhDs) by research, two had achieved Masters qualifications (one by research, one by course-work) and one had not undertaken a higher degree. Themes that emerged included an emphasis on both qualitative (50%) and quantitative (50%) research; coursework training in research methodology (67%) or not (33%); and the significance of learning research skills from colleagues and from supervision (both 67%). Two of the six Researchers interviewed reported having had some training in mediation practice.

All of the Researchers felt that their training had adequately prepared them for their work, however two of them emphasised that their research training was boring. Similar to the Practitioners, 67% of the Researchers interviewed explained that they learned about how to do research by actually doing it. However, in contrast to Practitioners, none of the Researchers emphasised the importance of having a specific aptitude for their work, or commented on the philosophy of their training. Also fewer Researchers emphasised the importance of experience or mentoring to achieve satisfactory preparation for their work. However, Researchers did not express any negative views about the extent of the training of their contemporaries, indicating either that they were satisfied with the level of training of their peers, or that it was not a significant issue for Researchers as it was for Practitioners.
12.4.2 Interest groups

An analysis of the data on the basis of interest groups provided some interesting results in terms of the themes raised. This provides an insight into the state of training of conflict resolution practitioners. For example, all of the Lawyers interviewed reported that their training for conflict resolution practice was significantly assisted by learning from their colleagues. Perhaps the fraternal structure of the work place experienced by lawyers was instrumental for this.

Another finding was that while all of the Therapeutic and Legal interviewees claimed that their training from another profession prepared them for their work in conflict resolution, this was not the case for all members of the Community interest groups. This is likely to be because only one community orientated practitioner (C2) had received professional training (in social work). The other two community practitioners (C1 and C3) had no prior training in another profession, although one (C3) did report having undertaken a training course in mediation practice. The training experience of C1 is worthy of further discussion as it is typical of many community oriented conflict resolution practitioners.

This practitioner reported having no formal training for her work in conflict resolution, but rather had been involved in the field for 20 years and claimed to have learned her trade simply by doing mediation. The concept of little formal training and learning through experience is very common in the training experiences of many community mediators. Evidence for this is provided in the following interview transcript data extracted from Appendix C. When C1 was asked if she had undertaken any formal training for her work in conflict resolution, she answered:
Well not really anything specific. Most of it I have picked up along the way. Ah ... occasionally I do courses and training groups at (names organisation) and I teach there and that has helped my understanding.

So you haven't done a special course yourself or anything like that?

No I haven't done a course. But I've been around this sort of thing for a long time now and I feel that I have got a lot of training in mediation from doing mediations. I have done hundreds of mediations with lots of people in lots of different situations, for lots of reasons. That's my training. I'm trained by life I suppose, and its taught me a lot.

This type of response represents a holistic approach to training (e.g., "being trained by life") and suggests that for people with no training from another profession, the accepted mode of thinking is that experience is the best teacher. C1's responses to the question of whether she thought her training was adequate or not, and had suitably prepared her for her work, were also illustrative of this point:

Yes, okay, absolutely. The only way to really learn in my opinion, is to do this sort of mediation, is to do it in the community. Its like like a school of hard knocks that way. Life teaches you what to do by giving you different experiences. You, you can't learn to cope with violence, with abuse and physical conflict from books and studies, you can't, you have to see it and experience how people generally deal with it. The more you do the more you learn.

So you feel that this training was good preparation?

Uh huh. But it takes special kind of person ... umm, you have to be flexible, some people can't do it. Recipes aren't enough it has to be an emotional preparation too, they have to feel it. I help others prepare by doing it too, not just by courses and books learning, practice is the key part of learning to mediate and solve disputes.

So now you are teaching other people in the same way that you learned about mediation and conflict resolution?

Yes, I suppose that is right, but it's because of the experiences that I have had that show me that this is the best way to do it. It's not just because I had it that way that I think it is the only way.

Thus in the opinion of this community mediator, who has had 20 years of experience in the field, the best way to train was the way that she trained. Some valid points were
made about the need for experience and the shortcomings of "recipe" approaches. C1 also claimed that some people have a special aptitude for conflict resolution work. This theme was also raised by all members of the Therapeutic interest group but none of the other practitioners. C1 and the Therapeutic interest group were also distinctive in their high emphasis on experience as training in conflict resolution practice. Members of the Therapeutic interest group emphasised that the philosophy of the training is an important factor. For example:

"... we did the sort of things that you would use when you are going counselling, but we don't do counselling, and we basically use the same skills, body language and things like that, its the same philosophy of training anyway ..." (C3, 030).

As this theme was not raised by members of other interest groups, it is reasonable to conclude that the Therapeutic interest group were more sensitive to these particular aspects of the educational and philosophical foundation of practitioner training in conflict resolution. Concern about training practices was also typically raised by members of the Legal interest group. The Lawyers focussed on the inadequacies of the training that practitioners from other interest groups received. Based on the interview data, it can be concluded that lawyers would not approve of the holistic approach to training described above by C1. Their negative comments included:

"... our training too makes us feel very well prepared for working with clients, which is more than I can say for most of the other forms of training for this work that I see out there ..." (L1, 026).

"... yeah er better than some of the people who I have seen coming through ... who er have just done a short course or something like that when they are then sent in to do it, it gives the whole field a bad name when er people with no training do it badly ..." (L3, 044).

While this dissatisfaction could be attributed to the lawyer's feeling that poorly trained practitioners give the field a bad name, it also places the legal profession, with its
appearance of a high degree of training, in a position of authority. However, there also appears to have been concern for the well being of conflict resolution users and the need for practitioners to have a deeper understanding of theory:

064  L1  Of course, how can you use them properly if you don’t understand them ... (laughs) ... I know I am biased, I think my way is right, but really I am concerned about how little training people have when they are let loose on the community ...

065  INT  You don’t think they are trained enough?
066  L1  That’s right ... I mean some people do a weekend workshop and then think they are mediators, that can’t be right, you know ... and they could do damage with it ... more harm than good I’d argue in most cases. I know most people have never studied the theoretical basis of these techniques.

Differences also existed in the training of Applied and Theoretical Researchers. These differences were highlighted by the heavy reliance of Theoretical Researchers on supervision to assist their training, and the fact that they reported having learned from their colleagues. This is typical of most academic training programs, and indicates that the Theoretical Research interest group is typically supportive of the normal academic role, and the supervision experienced by most higher degree students.

Applied Researchers were more practically focussed, with two of those interviewed (AR1 and AR3) having had some training in mediation practice. None of the Theoretical Researchers interviewed mentioned that they had undertaken such training. Another interesting difference was the different emphases of Applied and Theoretical Researchers on qualitative and quantitative research respectively. No Researchers emphasised the importance of both approaches, indicating a methodological polarisation between the two interest groups. In addition, the majority of the Applied Researchers interviewed reported having had no course work training in research methodology, while all of the Theoretical Researchers did nominate this theme as important.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Research / Practice</th>
<th>Interest groups</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Practitioners</td>
<td>All Researchers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Therapeutic</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no formal training</td>
<td>2 (22%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self taught</td>
<td>2 (22%)</td>
<td>1 (17%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learned by doing</td>
<td>3 (33%)</td>
<td>1 (17%)</td>
<td>T1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learned from colleagues</td>
<td>4 (44%)</td>
<td>4 (67%)</td>
<td>T2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learned by teaching others</td>
<td>2 (22%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>training from another profession</td>
<td>7 (78%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>T1, T2, T3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>workshops about skills</td>
<td>9 (100%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>T1, T2, T3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formal mediation course</td>
<td>3 (33%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>T3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>undergraduate degree in related area</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6 (100%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no higher degree</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (17%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>masters by course-work</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (33%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>masters by research</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (17%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doctorate by research</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>course-work training in research methodology</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 (67%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no course-work in research methodology</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (33%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learned from supervision (of self)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 (67%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some training in mediation practice</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (33%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emphasises qualitative research</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emphasises quantitative research</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12.7: Question 4: Do you feel that this training prepared you adequately for what you are doing now?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Research / Practice</th>
<th>Interest groups</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Practitioners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Researchers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positive about own training</td>
<td>9 (100%)</td>
<td>T1, T2, T3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative about other training methods</td>
<td>4 (44%)</td>
<td>C1, C2, C3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learn by doing</td>
<td>6 (67%)</td>
<td>L1, L2, L3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emphasises mentoring/supervision</td>
<td>6 (67%)</td>
<td>T2, T3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emphasises aptitude</td>
<td>3 (33%)</td>
<td>C1, C2, C3</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emphasises experience</td>
<td>4 (44%)</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emphasises philosophy of training</td>
<td>4 (44%)</td>
<td>T1, T2, T3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>training was boring</td>
<td>3 (33%)</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (33%)</td>
<td>T1, T2, T3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12.5 Conflict resolution practice

This section focuses on the Practitioner interviews only. It reports the results of core interview questions 5 through 8 that aimed to establish a profile of the different types of conflict resolution practice. These questions incorporated the number of clients that interviewees serviced each week, the period of time that they spent with clients, and the extent to which interviewees felt their practice was guided by their training or by other factors like common sense. These data are described in Tables 12.8 and 12.9.

12.5.1 Practitioners

All members of the Practitioner group, including those with high administrative loads, stated that they regularly saw clients. One of the interviewees from the Theoretical Researcher interest group reported having seen clients in the past when previously employed as a clinical psychologist, but he clarified that this was not directly related to conflict resolution and that it was ‘years ago’, so no further questions were asked.

Table 12.8 details the practice oriented activities of the Practitioners interviewed including the average number of clients seen per week, the average length of sessions, and the average number of sessions per case. The specific characteristics of conflict resolution practice varied in a relatively uniform manner across the three practitioner interest groups. Therefore results will be reported according to interest groups only. Table 12.9 details the themes that were derived from interviewee’s responses to the question about what factors influenced their practice. In brief, 78% of Practitioners felt that both training and common sense were important in guiding what they did in practice, and 67% emphasised the importance of intuition in their work. Further details are provided in the analysis of this question according to practitioner interest groups.
12.5.2 Practitioner interest groups

The Practitioners interviewed provided some interesting data about the way different interest groups undertook conflict resolution practice. The data are detailed in Table 12.8. Members of the Therapeutic interest group explained that on average they serviced between 10 and 15 clients per week, with each session lasting between 1.5 and 2.0 hours. Therapists consistently reported that each case typically involved 3 sessions, one with each of the disputants, and then one to undertake the actual mediation between disputants. They also reported that they saw clients at different stages of the conflict resolution process, meaning that they would have a number of different cases in progress at one time. This is described clearly by T1:

060 T1 No, no er I don’t mean that. Well er one case always has at least two people so I see them individually to get them ready for the actual mediation between er with each other ... and then there is the other cases that I am setting up or interviewing other people that are involved in new cases ...

061 INT ... oh okay ... when you say getting them ready for the case what do you do?

062 T1 You have to give people a chance to work through their problem before its safe or er for them to feel safe to go through it with the other person, and its also to handle any anger that they might have so that doesn’t come out in the actual settlement and leave them in a bad situation. Er I use it to explore the problem with them and help them heal their pain and understand what they conflict means for them in their lives, and and at the same time find out what they are really wanting out of the settlement so I can try to get that for them when we go to mediation ... hearing both sides first before the actual mediation means I can usually pick a solution that’s going to make everyone happy, um so they feel heard and so they get their needs met and they know how to sort it out next time so they’re building skills at the same time.

063 INT Mmm so its like therapy for each of the people in the case and then they meet and sort it out together, with your help?

064 T1 Yeah that’s it, most of us use techniques from counselling to help them with the personal part and then mediation to sort out the conflict.

This perspective presents conflict resolution practice as a therapeutic endeavour. Each disponent consulted the therapist to work through the dispute at a personal level and to
prepare them for the meeting with the other party. This is to assist disputants to resolve personal feelings of anger or fear and allow for a deeper personal understanding and meaning of the conflict for themselves. The aim is for a more positive interaction with the other disputing party during the actual mediation phase. Therefore the conflict resolution process is a tool for the personal development of disputants so that they can learn skills not only for the resolution of the current dispute, but also for other future difficulties.

The Community interest group members reported seeing between 3 and 6 clients per week, for 2 to 3 hours each session. Two of the Community interest group interviewees claimed to typically have 2 sessions with each client, while the other interviewee only normally saw the disputing parties once. In addition, two of the Community mediators interviewed emphasised that they undertook mediation at night when it is convenient for disputants. The accounts provided by interviewees present community mediation practice as a structured process, and as part of a broader network of community services, through which cases are directed to conflict resolution. This is different to the sources for the Therapeutic group who were generally approached by parties independently of other services (T2, 058). Therefore the Therapeutic interest group is more “self help” focussed, whereas the Community interest group is more “community development” focussed. Below, C2 explains the extensive case research and liaison with other community workers:

“... Yes, when you have all of the research into the case and spoken to the relevant officials, like the social worker in charge of the case or the parole officer, or sometimes the family or police, then you have to spend time with both of the party's together before you can actually help with the mediation process ...” (C2, 024).
There was also a high degree of flexibility and public involvement in community mediation. This is evidenced by the inclusion of volunteers in the services (however all interviewees in this study were employed), the flexibility of times offered for mediation (C3, 062), and even the flexible working conditions for community mediators:

"... Err its always about the same number of hours each week and the agency just tells me who I’m going to have to see at what time, people makes appointments with the agency and the agency sets up different mediators to handle different cases ... we get matched up to the kind of cases that we have had lots of experience with, that’s why I get all the youth ones ..." (C3, 064).

Lawyers also presented a consistent pattern of themes in their responses to the questions about conflict resolution practice. They reported seeing between 5 and 10 cases per week for approximately 2 hours each session. Two of the three Lawyers interviewed reported that they typically saw clients for four sessions in the resolution of a dispute, and L.1 reported that there was considerable variation in the number of times he saw clients for a particular case. The applications of conflict resolution processes for legal problems varied among interviewees. For example, L.3 (060) provides an account of a typical divorce mediation, while L.1 (036-046) describes the use of alternative dispute resolution processes for cases that take more than 12 months to be resolved. He adds that this is still a shorter period of time than would be customary for a traditional court based settlement and also stresses the business aspects of the legal enterprise:

"... we are always following up as a way of satisfying them and maintaining the relationship, that’s part of this type of business, to make sure they use us next time as well ..." (L.1, 042).

L.1 also describes the importance of legal conflict resolution practice by emphasising the large sums of money that are often involved, and implies that legal practice is more important than other forms of conflict resolution practice:
"... Well its hard to say exactly, but we are dealing with very big stakes in a lot of our work. Sometimes the mediation cases that we are doing are for amounts in excess of one hundred thousand pounds. You need training and experience to deal with that because there’s so much money involved. Its not like mediating a fight between neighbours ... the stakes are much bigger ..." (L1, 046).

Table 12.9 provides the results of core interview question 8 that asked interviewees to consider the extent to which their conflict resolution practice was influenced by what they had learned in their training, and how much other factors like commonsense were important. While all the interest groups tended to agree that in general both training and commonsense were important parts of conflict resolution practice, there were other differences in the themes as reported below.

The Therapeutic interest group unanimously highlighted three themes in their responses to this question. First, they consistently emphasised the importance of having a specific aptitude for work in mediation that separates conflict resolution practice from other forms of therapeutic endeavour like, for example, regular counselling. Second, they emphasised the importance of developing one’s own individual style in doing conflict resolution practice that is often a hybrid of other counselling techniques and specific conflict resolution techniques. And, third, they emphasised the importance of an intuitive approach to conflict resolution practice. It should be noted that they did not emphasise the use of intuition to the exclusion of more accepted practice models, rather they tended to conclude that both were equally valuable.

The development of an intuitive approach to conflict resolution practice is expounded by T3 in the following quotation from Appendix C. While this is a long quote, it is rich with information, providing valuable insight into the practice habits of those who use conflict resolution techniques for therapeutic purposes.
You have to understand that mediation is a very intuitive process.
... yes ...
... there are rules that I follow, basic steps or competencies, but a lot of it I would have to say it is mainly intuitive ... But er I have to say that the Quaker way teaches you to be intuitive in your mediation.

What do you mean?
Well ... we basically tune in to where the client is coming from and then use the principles of nonviolence, in er thought or action, that’s verbal too, to try to mediate effectively, and that requires you to think quickly and make suggestions that feel right ... therefore its intuitive. I know I said I follow a model, I do, but most of it is how I feel, that’s usually what works best.

And how do you know what you should be doing?
Well as I said it is very much a process that you get to learn but it’s about being in touch with your own reactions to the client’s situation and being very aware of the clients situation at the same time.

So does that mean that you are alert to things that they are feeling?
Yes it’s true that I am trying to do that er but also you er get very good at reading people.

Mmm, er can you tell me how you read people?
You read people umm with practice you get better, you get good at noticing their body language and their individual reactions you can tell how they are feeling and I suppose that you have to think how would I be feeling in their situation ... ar that’s a very simple way of getting insight into how the client might react next

And that helps you to developing your intuition?
Er it’s a very difficult concept to actually name ... and describe ... to you, I find it hard to describe at all but er I think it means that you have an empathy for the person's situation so closely that you can almost tell what they are going to ask or feel next. Hmm, now that might sound a little too much like magic for you ... but I er don't mean it like that er I mean that you have a feeling for what might happen next and that feeling is often correct so that eventually you learn by feedback what is going to happen in a er many situations.

I understand what you’re saying, can you tell me what you think being actual process of developing intuition is all about?
Its part of the training you do with the Quakers and I suppose its something that people like me are attracted to, so it’s very much a individual thing, but it’s something that anyone could learn it’s just a hard thing to explain. But I think it is clear though that it’s a valid way of doing things, umm ... and I know that that is not scientific and I er know that that is not something that people would put in a text book to explain how good mediation is, but at the cold face of doing mediation with people, it works and I feel comfortable with it.

I suppose you have to go with what works
076  T3  Yes obviously (laughs) it is obvious to me that this is a valid way of doing the mediation process and as I said before it makes it a kinder way of being with the people who are trying to find a peaceful way to settle their differences, that is what is important how the people feel and how they cancel their problem in a non-violent way, especially when there are children involved it's much more important to keep this simple and gentle in those cases.

077  INT  So it's intuition before science?

078  T3  I wouldn't say one is better than the other, it is both at the same time ...

079  INT  ... yes ...

080  T3  ... the training to use intuition allows me to do mediation better, it is a skill that I have learned so have my own way, but I think it is also an aptitude that some people have more than others.

This example describes how the practitioner has learned an intuitive approach and in fact, how that approach was a part of their training. T3 explained how the practitioner can learn to recognise patterns of responding in the client and how these can be developed into an approach where the practitioner’s feelings about the situation guide the way they approach the conflict. T3 also implied that his approach aims to be a peaceful and nonviolent way of resolving conflict that is couched in the philosophical position of his Quaker training. Further, T3 explained that he realised that this approach would not be approved of as scientific, but asserted that he does it this way because it works and is consistent with his values. However, while it appeared from these comments that T3 would give his full support to an intuitive approach being more important than a scientific approach, he disagreed, preferring to claim that both approaches were equally important. Evidence for this is also apparent by T1’s reluctance to claim either approach is more valid, rather she asserted:

"... Okay okay, I know what you're getting at, there is a lot of common sense involved in conflict resolution. But you do get better at it as you practice (laughs). I know a lot of my colleagues will say that its all intuition and those sort of unconscious processes but that's pretty simplistic ... but they haven't been educated in a way that helps that view along ..." (T1, 086).
It seems that there was a reluctance among the Therapeutic group to fully commit to the idea that their work was primarily influenced by intuitive and commonsense processes rather than by any particular process that they learned in their training. This is a complex issue as they also reported being primarily trained in learning “common-sense” approaches to conflict resolution practice. The issue at hand seemed to be more about not wanting to appear to have divorced themselves completely from any model or theoretical foundation in their work. This is interesting, as in question 9 (reported in Section 12.7), they all argue that theory does not affect practice.

This issue can be contrasted with the responses of the Community interest group, who all concluded that intuition was the most important guiding influence in their conflict resolution practice. Also, they exhibited no inhibition in claiming that they do not use theory to guide their practice. For example, C1 claimed that theories do not achieve anything in the real world, C2 asserted that intuition is the most important skill in practice, and C3, while acknowledging that she takes a liberal approach, claimed that she knows what clients need. Examples supporting these claims include:

“... Look, intuition in this game is much more relevant than any theory you'll see. Some expert about mediation might know what he is talking about in his er area and it, it might help and all that, but it's not the truth. I mean it doesn’t mean that he’s right about it all, in all situations, it doesn’t work that way theories don’t really mean anything when your trying to sort out a problem in the real world ...” (C1, 050).

“... The more you know about mediation the quicker you can see things coming and I guess that is what intuition is about its the most important skill in my practice. ... Actually it becomes even more clear when you have a work experience person with you. The answer that you can see coming ... that they have no idea about, and that simply confirms this concept of intuition to me ...” (C2, 044, 046).

“... You develop your own style after a while, everyone is different in how they do mediation. My approach is pretty liberal, I usually adjust what I'm doing to fit with what the clients want. I sort of know what they need if you know what I mean, its like an intuition and that's the most important factor in what I er do with mediation ...” (C3, 078).
In general, the Legal interest group reported different themes to those of the Community and Therapeutic groups. In particular, they acknowledged the importance of both training and commonsense in legal conflict resolution practice. For example:

"... I don't know, I'd have to say both, equally. Some situations you can solve using the book, er that is theories, others will be best handled with no theory, when you have to use your gut, go with what feels right ..." (L2, 056).

The Lawyers reported that the use of intuition was a learned process and shared the opinion that intuitive factors allow the practice of conflict resolution techniques to become a more efficient process and enable a high degree of efficiency. For example:

"... Yeah, the right training results in the skills which can seem to be commonsense after a while. It looks like commonsense, but really its just the skilful use of knowledge and the right model and you get quicker and that looks like intuition but it's just that your quicker and that's okay because we get more done ..." (L3, 066).

"... There is a need to be skilled in what you do ... of course ... but there is er you develop skills that makes you more efficient in what you do ... make it better for the clients be because it is a quicker process for them ..." (L2, 062, 064).

These views differed from the Community and Therapeutic interest groups, where the concept of intuition was treated as a philosophical position. Unlike the Community and Therapeutic interest groups, Lawyers raised the issue of having a model and “proper” training, suggesting they were keen to align themselves with traditional empirical approaches to conflict resolution practice. All of the Lawyers interviewed reported that what other practitioners called “commonsense”, to them only looked like commonsense:

"... Because it sounds like it is all simple and using very basic language and because it sounds more like anyone could actually do it properly, then I think that many people would think that it is a technique that anyone could do and its just commonsense. But er that's not to say that there’s not a very large commonsense part to doing ADR or mediation. It is commonsense but at the same time you use a model ... you have to be very skilled to use that commonsense approach. It looks easier than it is, believe me (laughs), it’s more complex, we only make it look easy ..." (L2, 068).
The Lawyers argued that because the processes of conflict resolution appear simplistic and use a common language, they are sometimes inaccurately mistaken for processes based purely on commonsense. Therefore, it was maintained by the Legal interest group that the commonsense aspects of conflict resolution practice are inextricably linked to training and practical models. As L3 states "... it's the type of common sense that takes the right sort of training to acquire ..." (064). This issue further associates the Legal interest group with a conventional or traditional empirical approach to practice.

In summary, three very different forms of conflict resolution practice were discerned from the accounts provided by the different practice interest groups. This evidence supports the need to not only avoid broad generalisations about conflict resolution practice, but also to be specific in evaluating the activities of different branches of practice. In the current study, for example, the Therapeutic interest group can be conceived as using conflict resolution techniques as another tool for their work helping individuals to improve their own personal development. They reported being approached voluntarily by self referred clients to help them learn to work with and overcome conflict. The Community interest group described their activities as part of a broader community services network where clients are referred for mediation about disputes in an effort to address issues in the community rather than by the courts. A major issue was the flexibility of this type of conflict resolution practice and the inclusion of volunteers in an effort to encourage community empowerment. The Legal interest group described their practice of conflict resolution techniques through the structure of normal legal practice. In this case, conflict resolution was being used because of its specific attributes that made it more appealing and less costly to clients than more traditional forms of dispute settlement.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Practice Interest Groups</th>
<th>All Practitioners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Therapeutic</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of clients seen per week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 / week</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 / week</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 / week</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 / week</td>
<td>T1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 / week</td>
<td>T2, T3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average session length</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 hours</td>
<td>T3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 hours</td>
<td>T1, T2</td>
<td>C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 hours</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 hours</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of sessions per case</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one session</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two sessions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C1, C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three sessions</td>
<td>T1, T2, T3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>four sessions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>considerable variation depends on the case</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nights</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C1, C3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>different stages</td>
<td>T1, T2, T3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12.9: Question 8: When you see clients, how much do you rely on what you learned from your training and how much are other factors like common sense relevant?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Practice Interest Groups</th>
<th>All Practitioners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Therapeutic</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>both training and commonsense is important</td>
<td>T1, T3</td>
<td>C2, C3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>depends on your training</td>
<td>T3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emphasises individual style</td>
<td>T1, T2, T3</td>
<td>C3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aptitude for mediation</td>
<td>T1, T2, T3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emphasises intuition</td>
<td>T1, T2, T3</td>
<td>C1, C2, C3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intuition allows efficiency</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intuition is most important</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C1, C2, C3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>only looks like commonsense</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emphasises the importance of experience</td>
<td>T1</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emphasises the importance of a model</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emphasises the importance of proper training</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12.6 Conflict resolution research

In core interview questions 10 and 11, researchers were asked whether they did any research, and if so, to describe the nature of their research. Table 12.10 outlines the common responses to these questions, describing the nature and extent of interviewee’s conflict resolution research activities.

12.6.1 Researchers and Practitioners

As expected, all of the Researchers interviewed reported that they were currently engaged in undertaking research. The nature of these research endeavours is detailed below where results are considered in terms of research interest groups. However, before proceeding to this, there is data from Practitioners regarding research activities to be considered. Three of the Practitioners initially made affirmative responses when asked if they undertook any research. Two of the Practitioners interviewed reported that they undertook research by way of experimenting with different techniques in their practice. However, when questioned about the nature of their research, they were both very quick to report that their inquiries were not “real research”. For example:

"... Its very simple. And it's really about being efficient and getting better at what we do rather than doing real research. .... scientific studies, rigorous stuff, ours is just guess work really ... but it has paid off, made us better at what we do ..." (L1, 078, 080).

"... We check out our processes and keep a track of successes and failures, but it's not research as you would call it ..." (C1, 068).

The third Practitioner to report having undertaken some research had written a book about conflict resolution practice. However, again, when questioned about the nature of her research she renounced the research aspect of the book preparation, calling it “quite simple stuff” and that it “wasn’t properly researched”. She stated:
"... I have just pulled together all my ideas over the last few years, about what works and what doesn't, um it was like a condensed version of a counselling model, you know, quite simple stuff ... I just watched what good mediators have done over the years and put together some ideas into a format for others to use. It wasn't properly researched or anything like that, it was really er a collection of my ideas about it ... no I wouldn't really call it research ..." (T1, 104).

These comments indicate a reluctance on the part of practitioners to emphasise their own research activities. However, there was some support for the concept of practitioners undertaking research into practice. For example C3 (116-126) suggested that practitioners could make a positive contribution into practice research if they were adequately resourced to allow the time for such endeavours. She outlined a multifaceted and logical program of research that she claimed would be a useful contribution to both understanding the effects that resolving long-standing community conflict has on the quality of life of disputants, and checking the efficacy of her organisation's practice methods, thereby improving the quality of their service.

12.6.2 Research interest groups

The Applied and Theoretical Research interest groups reported some characteristically different patterns in the themes they raised to describe their research activities. These data are presented in Table 12.10, categorised according to research focus, research philosophy and research methods. The Applied Research interest group reported a variety of different research foci, including disputant satisfaction and disputant behaviour. In contrast, the themes reported by Theoretical Researchers included research foci in model testing and evaluating the claims of practitioners. The Applied Research group appeared more concerned with research that would inform practice, while Theoretical Researchers were more concerned with evaluating what practitioners do and whether models of conflict resolution work. This was supported by the research
philosophies emphasised by Applied Researchers, who tended to assert the need for qualitative inquiry into the conflict resolution field. For example:

"... It's very difficult to study the mediation process easily there are too many variables and subjective aspects ... that's why we can't do really structured research ... we need a more qualitative understanding first ..." (AR1, 018).

One Applied Researcher criticised theoretical inquiry:

"... we know that if it's not practical and simple then that means that people who are doing the work won't listen to what researchers say. Usually we're too theory driven and challenging as that might be to us who know, it is irrelevant to anyone else who is listening ... so it has to be much more practical, and aimed at getting a simple message across. That's what I try to do anyway ... why do we try to develop theories and er models and if they can't help the people who they are designed to help, if they don't help them they are useless ..." (AR3, 106).

Collectively, the Applied Researchers emphasised three significant issues that were not mentioned by Theoretical Researchers. First, they emphasised the applied aspects of conflict research. Second, they argued for the need to undertake research that has a flow on affect to those people in the community who utilise conflict resolution services, and therefore reported that their research endeavours were all based in the community. Third, all reported a desire to help practitioners, and assist them to improve the conflict resolution services that they offered to the community. These issues are encapsulated in the following extract where an Applied Researcher explains her approach to research:

"... It is very applied work that we are doing and we are out there sitting in the mediation rooms with people and interviewing the disputants as to why they or what er they think works in the way that the mediator handles the problems that they bring to mediation, so from that perspective it is very applied and very community based qualitative research. Umm er it is not working from a abstract or ideal model of what all of or how the mediator makes decisions or how they balance a choice model or something like that, we really well we've focused more on the effects on the people or the community in general and then what mediators can do to do it better. We want to help them with what they do to find out what's working and what's not, not tell them how to do it but help them find out the best way. Do I er ... I think that it is um more applied than it sounds ..." (AR1, 014).
In contrast, the Theoretical Research interest group tended to report a more detached approach than the Applied Researchers. Their emphasis was on the more theoretical aspects of conflict resolution research, focussing on the need for quantitative results to use in the evaluation of conflict resolution efficacy. All of the Theoretical Researchers interviewed raised questions (either directly or indirectly) about the knowledge claims of practitioners, and emphasised the need to evaluate methods of conflict resolution practice.

For example, TR1 explained that while he was not directly questioning the knowledge claims of practitioners, there was a need to move beyond anecdotal evidence and “prove” the assertions of practitioners. In the same statement he also raised questions about the standards of practitioner training.

064 TR1 We just think it is important to check out some of the claims and ideas that are going around at the moment ... we would like ... mmm ... to see if mediation actually does what many of the practitioners have been very up-front about saying what they think it does.

065 INT Hmm so you say their knowledge claims could be a little overstated?

066 TR1 No ... I am not saying that, I think that what you need to make sure that whatever you say you can justify or prove with some sort of study to back it up. It's no good carrying on about how good a method is if the evidence is purely anecdotal. You need to make sure that you are giving people what you tell them you are giving them. Er when er I think its particularly important now because there are so many people doing mediation and there is very few, er well fewer than one would like, fewer standards in place for training than there er probably needs to be.

Clearly this approach to research is potentially much more contentious than the approach of Applied Researchers, who did not raise questions about the efficacy of conflict resolution practice or the need to quantify it. The message portrayed by Theoretical Researchers can be construed as that of the “watchdog” or “expert” who can
sanction or condemn conflict resolution practice. However, the clear assertion that practitioners do not know what they are doing is either avoided (see TR1's comments above), or disguised as being the result of a lack in the advances of theoretical models of mediation (as stated by TR3 below). In such accounts the practitioner is portrayed as almost naive, not really knowing what they are doing (as proposed by TR2 below).

"... It's not just about the mediators at that level, it's more about the um theory or model of mediation, but it helps to know if they are doing what they say they are ..." (TR3, 090).

"... We are trying to see if they are doing in practice what we are teaching them in the training ... to er check up on the er method that they're using to see if its as er they say it is, um to see if they are a doing what they think they are ..." (TR2, 034).

The research methods that Applied and Theoretical Researchers reported using in their conflict resolution research activities were also fundamentally opposed. Applied Researchers reported using interviews and observations as their primary sources of data, while Theoretical Researchers reported using quantitative methods for model testing. The broad differences between the Research interest groups, further supports the argument that it is not appropriate to make broad generalisations about conflict resolution research. The Applied Researchers appeared to be more committed to the conflict resolution cause. They were more enthusiastic about their research and made more specific efforts to be amicable in their approach with practitioners. In contrast, Theoretical Researchers seemed to play out the role of the detached scientist. They expressed virtually no enthusiasm or passion for the topic and took an evaluative rather than supportive approach to conflict resolution practice. For Applied Researchers, the maxims of proof and efficacy were secondary to the need to cooperate with practitioners.
Table 12.10: Question 11: Can you briefly describe the nature of your research?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Research Interest Groups</th>
<th>All Researchers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Applied Research</td>
<td>Theoretical Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disputant behaviour</td>
<td>AR3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disputant satisfaction</td>
<td>AR1, AR3</td>
<td>TR1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluate claims of P</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TR1, TR2, TR3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mediator behaviour</td>
<td>AR2</td>
<td>TR3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>model building</td>
<td>AR2</td>
<td>TR2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>model testing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TR1, TR2, TR3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research philosophy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anti-theory</td>
<td>AR3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emphasises need for qualitative results</td>
<td>AR1, AR3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emphasises need for quantitative results</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TR1, TR2, TR3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emphasises theoretical</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TR2, TR3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emphasises efficacy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TR1, TR2, TR3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emphasises applied aspects</td>
<td>AR1, AR2, AR3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emphasises community focus</td>
<td>AR1, AR2, AR3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emphasises wants to help P</td>
<td>AR1, AR2, AR3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interviews/observations</td>
<td>AR1, AR2, AR3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meta-analysis</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TR1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quantitative methods</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TR1, TR2, TR3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>video tape</td>
<td>AR2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB In all tables, “P” is used to abbreviate the term “Practitioners” and “R” is used to abbreviate the term “Researchers”.
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12.7 Theoretical issues

This section reports the results for core interview questions 9 and 14 that sought information about theoretical issues in the conflict resolution field. This incorporated questions about the interviewees' opinions about the extent to which they thought the standard theories of conflict resolution affected practice, and the extent to which they agreed with their colleagues about the theories or processes that guide their work. These results are detailed in Tables 12.11 through 12.13.

12.7.1 Researchers and Practitioners

Responses to question 9 are presented in two tables. Table 12.11 describes interviewees overall responses and the general issues that emerged regarding theories affecting conflict resolution practice, and Table 12.12 details themes that were categorised as assumptions about practitioners. These incorporated general assumptions about practitioners, reasons proposed for why practitioners do not use theories, and reasons proposed for why practitioners should use theory.

Overall, the majority of Researchers (83%) felt that the standard theories of conflict resolution do affect the practice of conflict resolution. In contrast, two thirds of the Practitioners interviewed claimed that theories do not affect practice. General themes that emerged from the transcripts included the extent to which theories affected practice being dependent on the training of the practitioners, and concern about the lack of training of most practitioners. Researchers and Practitioners tended to be comparable in the extent to which they raised these themes. However Researchers also tended to assert that not enough had been done to equate theory with practice (50%) and that it was the
theoretical base and input from research that enabled the development and popularity of
the conflict resolution field (Researchers 67%; Practitioners 11%).

With respect to general assumptions about practitioners (Table 12.12), there was a
significant degree of agreement between Practitioners (78%) and Researchers (67%)
that practitioners do not use theories. Further, 44% of Practitioners claimed that it is not
necessary for practitioners to know about theory; and one Researcher asserted that
practitioners want to know more about theory and how to be more effective.
Interestingly, this last theme did not emerge from the Practitioner data.

The themes raised by Practitioners for why practitioners do not use theory ranged from
theories being irrelevant to what practitioners do and practitioners not understanding
theories (both 56%); to practical reasons like practitioners not having time to keep up
and current techniques not being based on theories (both 22%). Researchers agreed that
practitioners do not, in general, understand theories (67%), but also asserted that
practitioners are not interested in theories (67%). There was a notable absence of any
practically oriented themes in Researchers’ explanations of why practitioners did not
use theories. This suggests that Researchers assume that practitioners minimal use of
theory is because of dispositional characteristics rather than situational limitations such
as lack of time. The reason most frequently stated by Researchers for why practitioners
should use theory was that it would provide a structure to their work. The Practitioners
who agreed that practitioners should use theory, felt that this would give them greater
confidence in the outcomes of their work.
The results of question 14 are detailed in Table 12.13. This describes the extent to which interviewees claimed that there was consensus with work colleagues about the theories and processes that underlie conflict resolution. While overall the majority of Practitioners (89%) and Researchers (83%) agreed that there was consensus about theories or processes used in their workplaces, the themes that emerged from analyses of transcripts were quite different. Practitioners emphasised practical aspects of using the same sort of mediation processes or having uniform training, while Researchers were much more theoretical in their approach. Practitioners tended to emphasise themes that were relevant to ways of doing practice, rather than any specific theoretical approach. For example, they emphasised practice issues as most important (100%) and consistency of practice methods (89%) to indicate consensus. They noted that having the same training was important for there to be consistency of methods (67%) and emphasised that having similar values or philosophy was also important (44%)

Another characteristic response of Practitioners included themes that emphasised ‘what works’ as being important in deciding consensus about processes (33%). Two of the Practitioners interviewed even called for the complete rejection of any theory.

The basic polarisation of themes between Researchers and Practitioners is illustrated in Table 12.13. Almost none of the themes raised by Practitioners were raised by Researchers. The responses of Researchers tended to focus more on consensus about theoretical issues, suggesting they are more open to divergent views than Practitioners. For example, Researchers claimed that while consensus about the larger issues was the norm, they were prone to disagree about the details of theories because it is an important aspect of the research endeavour (67%), and contended that debate about such issues is indeed healthy (67%). They asserted that while there may be some disagreement about
the specifics of theory (50%), they were usually working towards the same goal (50%). This indicates that researchers and practitioners are quite different in their approaches. Practitioners favoured the same training and philosophy and valued consistent practical methods (a homogeneous approach), while Researchers emphasised the need for a variety of different methods (a heterogeneous approach).

12.7.2 Interest groups

The data detailed in Tables 12.11 and 12.12 provides evidence that the Therapeutic group was distinct from the other practice interest groups in their unanimous agreement that theory did not affect the practice of conflict resolution. All of the Therapeutic practitioners were firmly opposed to the proposition that theory affected conflict resolution practice, and that practitioners did not usually use theories in their work. They also claimed that most practitioners did not understand theories, and that the theoretical basis of conflict resolution was irrelevant to their everyday experience of conflict resolution practice. These issues are summarised below in the rather lengthy quote from the interview with T2.

082 T2 Yeah I would have to say that I don’t think they do. But I don’t even know what is the popular theory er model at the moment or that I never really kept up with the sort of theoretical side of conflict resolution, I never have really been into it er I s’pose I’m not really interested and I don’t bother keeping up with the theories because frankly it doesn’t effect what I do and it it can’t help me with my work.

083 INT Do you think that if you did know what the theories and other ideas were that they could ever help with the work that you do with your clients?

084 T2 I don’t think so (laughs). I don’t think it would, even if I read up on the latest theories I don’t think they’d actually help what I do. Maybe I’m not smart enough to use them, I have never understood that side of it all really.

085 INT What, you er haven’t understood the theories?

086 T2 No I wouldn’t say I couldn’t understand the theories its more that I haven’t really tried (laughs)
INT Well, I think you would understand it if you wanted. (laughs) er but I'm not saying that you should have. I am just interested in the sort of reasons why people do or don't, you know? Is there some reason you haven't tried to keep up with them?

T2 I suppose I'm not interested in it ... and its not easy to do ...

INT ... because?

T2 ...because there's so much other work to be done and its not easy to have time to read the right journals or even get access to the right resources and books, does make sense?

INT Yes, yes are there any other reasons that you don't find theories and models useful?

T2 Well theories can't help me to understand what makes my clients tick, er why they do the things they do and how I can get an idea of what compromises they are prepared to come to. They need people contact and a lot of listening before anything else and I haven't seen a theory that can teach someone how to do that yet?

INT So where do you get them if not from models?

T2 You learn how to be a mediator on the job.

INT And that's the best way in your opinion?

T2 Yeah I am one of those people who think that mediation is more of an art, and to learn how er to do it it takes a long time, er a lot of practice and a good apprenticeship to learn it properly.

The majority of the members of the Community interest group also asserted that theory did not affect practice. They tended to argue that practitioners' training would largely affect whether they ended up using some sort of theoretical framework to guide their practice. However, both of the community mediators who made this statement also claimed that theory does not affect practice. Therefore, one must assume that they are also stating that theory is not emphasised in the training of community mediators. This is supported by the proposition that practitioners did not need to know about theory, which received unanimous support from the Community interest group, and also the notion that practitioners tended not to use theory in their work because it was irrelevant to what they did in practice. Nevertheless, it should also be noted that the discourse of the Community interest group interviewees was contradictory. In many cases they would agree with one issue and then assert a conflicting idea. For example, C2 explained his own need to have a theoretical base to his work in practice because it gave
him confidence in the outcomes that he mediated, but in the same statement asserted that other practitioners do not need to use a theoretical base:

"... it is important to me to make sure that what I am doing is grounded somewhere in theory. For me I need to feel that what I am doing is not simply from flying by the seat of my pants. I want to know that what I have done with people has a good chance of helping them because it is a theory or a practice that has been tested with other people and has been shown to work. But ar I don't know that everyone doing mediation needs to know about theories, er it should be up to them ..." (C2, 054).

In a similar contradictory manner, C3 asserted that theory does affect practice (092), and mentioned the following two issues to support this statement. First, she asserted that practitioners should use theories because "it sounds better" than not using theory (094), and second, she argued that theories have made conflict resolution practice valid because the popularity of mediation has been assisted by the rigorous approach offered by research (102-108). However, toward the end of the line of questioning about theory affecting practice, she made the following contradictory statements:

"... Er the most important thing for me is making the clients happy with their resolution, its not being all that technical. I think I don't need to know the current theories ... you know ... I just use my basic ways to help people solve their problems ... yeah really to help the clients solve the problem ... I facilitate them to do it, I accept that I don't have to have all of the answers ..." (C3, 112).

This can be contrasted with the more direct and uncompromising statement from C1 about theory affecting practice, that is:

"... It's kind of irrelevant to what we do, so we don't really need to know about it ..."(C1, 066).

The lack of consistency both within and between the themes raised by members of the Community interest group is somewhat confusing and implies a high degree of uncertainty about the issue of theory affecting practice in community mediation. It is
possible that interviewees from the Community interest group had an expectation about the way they should respond in order to appear to be rigorous and scientific in their approach, but were unable to support this approach with real data from their own experiences. At the same time they were also reluctant to criticise any other practitioners involved in the field, stating that the choice to follow theory or not should be made by the individual.

The Legal interest group were not as reserved about criticising other practitioners in the field. While the majority of the Lawyers interviewed felt that theory did affect their own practice, they all emphasised concern about the lack of training that other practitioners (i.e., from other backgrounds) had in the theoretical basis of conflict resolution. They asserted that the type of training practitioners received would affect the extent to which a theoretical base would permeate their practice. However, all of the Lawyers stated that currently most other practitioners do not use theories to guide their work. This was for two reasons. First, because practitioners do not understand theories, and second, because the techniques that they were using were not originally based on any theoretical tenets. The Lawyers’ emphasis on the importance of some theoretical underpinning to their work was conspicuous in comparison with the other practitioner interest groups. However, the extent to which their methods are any more or less theoretical is not clear. For example, L2 asserts “…The approach is the theory, what we do is based on theory …” (110), but when asked to explain which theory of conflict resolution his practice was based on, he answered “… I’m not really sure (laughs) but it is a theory …” (112).
Both research interest groups also asserted that theory affects practice. While one of the Applied Researchers (AR2) claimed that theory did not affect the practice, he was asserting a realist position that currently they did not "... as much as they should ... or um as much as they er probably could ..." (058). The other two Applied Researchers interviewed asserted that theory does affect practice. However all of these interviewees claimed that not enough was being done to establish the necessary links between research and practice and equate such theories with practical concerns. For example:

"... It ... that bothers me. I am annoyed at how little is actually done to make sure that research and people involved in putting the ideas into practice don't get on with the job together ..." (AR3, 088).

Applied Researchers tended to think that practitioners did not use theories in their work for three reasons. First, because practitioners were generally more concerned with people skills rather than theoretical concerns; second, because practitioners were frankly not interested in theoretical issues; and third, because practitioners have a philosophical opposition to the use of theory in practice. These themes are expounded clearly by AR2 in the following series of statements:

"... you know there's a lot of a er a general rejection and um a lack of awareness of the theories of er conflict resolution and mediation in the field we need to improve the relationship and do more to make it work better. Most of the people I know in practice they just don't pay any attention to the relevant theories of conflict because they er think they won't mean anything for their work ..." (AR2, 060).

"...Its probably both of those things er, if they know about it they reject it ... though ... and then there is the rest that just don't know anything about research or about any sort of theory that would be the basis of conflict resolution, so um neither of those two groups have much to do with the theoretical side of conflict resolution, its not part of their philosophy ..." (AR2, 066).

"...Yes essentially that's what we are trying to find out. If there is to be the total acceptance of these ideas then it really shouldn't be based purely on the feel good factor which is so much a part of many mediation approaches. Not that there is a problem with that, mediators just tend to be more into how the person feels than what the theory is of what they are doing, but it becomes more of a trend than a acceptable means of settling people's disputes ..." (AR2, 076).
"...Well, what I think happens with these sorts of things, and we have seen it a lot in therapies and counselling methods particularly, is that what happens is that people get carried away with a new way of doing mediation or, a newcomers way of doing some sort of thing and then eventually the public gets a bit sick of it, and a new institutions forms instead so um the old for gimmicks get replaced. What is happening with mediation is that we are setting up centres and places for people to go to get help and that sort of thing, but you need to know if that is worth doing in the long run. What we want to find out is is it a good idea to keep our supporting those things we don't want it just to be a trend ..." (AR2, 078).

This final statement provides further evidence for the concept of Applied Researchers supporting cooperative efforts with practitioners to improve the field. It is a stark contrast to the series of themes raised by the members of the Theoretical Research interest group. Theoretical Researchers all asserted that the popularity of the conflict resolution field today is the direct result of its theoretical base that was established through rigorous research and enabled the justification of public funds for conflict resolution services. This theme is declared by TR1 in the following two extracts:

"... Er the research has to underpin the practice in my way of thinking. I mean it was the um research into conflict resolution methods is what popularised the whole conflict resolution movement. The research into international mediation and negotiation is what made conflict resolution popular with practitioners ..." (TR1, 040).

"... it's clear that none of the mediation centres would have been put into place and supported by governments and community services if they hadn't been checked out by people like us first. There were many studies about efficacy and about how er reliable they were. That had to come first to convince the funders that it was money well spent ..." (TR1, 044).

The Theoretical Researchers also raised concerns about the standard of training that most practitioners received. It is interesting to note that this issue was not raised by the Applied Researchers, and also that the issue of not enough being done to equate theory with practice (which received full support from Applied Researchers), was not mentioned by Theoretical Researchers. This interest group also proposed that practitioners did not use theories because they were generally not interested in them, and
did not understand them. However, Applied Researchers argued that practitioners should use theories as it would give them a structure to follow in their practical endeavours.

The other core interview question that inquired into theoretical matters was question 14, that asked interviewees to comment on the degree of consensus in their workplace regarding theories or processes of conflict resolution. These data are presented in Table 12.13. While similar themes were raised by the different practice interest groups, there were two major sources of variation. The first was the Community interest group’s unanimous emphasis on “what works” as being the most important factor for deciding about consensus. This theme was not raised by any of the other interest groups. Although the Community interest group deliberated about whether they felt there was consensus about the theories and processes used in their workplaces, all reverted to answers that amounted to explanations that because everyone in their workplaces was concerned with “what works”, then there was a consensus. This further demonstrates the very applied nature of community mediation. Examples of this theme follow:

“... We all agree on what we use ... probably because I teach them all, (laughs) ... but again it’s more about what works. We all agree on what works ...” (C1, 120).

“... if we keeping making it work and people keep being made happier with our work than I don’t suppose it matters what we are doing differently or the same as each other, or the consensus that you said is that we make it work, that’s what we’re all trying to make happen ...” (C2, 098).

“... Yeah, there’s not much variation away from stuff that I use or anyone else uses, but there can’t be really, we just follow a set of processes like a series of steps that have always seemed to work ...” (C3, 148).

The second variation in themes raised by Practitioners was the Therapeutic interest group’s unanimous emphasis on the importance of having the same values and philosophical base as their work colleagues. In deciding that they all worked in
environments where there was consensus about the theories or processes that guided
their work, the issue of values seemed to guide their responses. This highlights the high
degree of emphasis that the Therapeutic interest group placed on values and philosophy,
which has been a recurrent theme in other results sections. While this theme was also
mentioned by one of the community mediators, none of the other Practitioners (nor any
Researchers) responded in this way. Examples of the interviewees responses are listed
below:

"... Well of course we all have our own style, but we all come from the same
philosophical place, we have the same values, so our ways of doing conflict
resolution is very similar ..." (T1, 158).

"... Its much easier to have shared agendas for doing this kind of work. You
have to be doing it for the same reasons so that you can support each other
properly ... its very hard work ... I can't imagine doing it in isolation ... we need
to share the same values so that we can understand what each other is going
through and what the client is going through ... we have the same agendas ... you
know? ..." (T2, 158).

"... I tend to mix with other practitioners who have had the same training
background, like in the Quaker methods of mediation, or at least from some kind
of empowerment perspective and values for what we're doing ..." (T3, 124).

The major variation between Applied and Theoretical Researchers was in the frequency
of their responses. In general, the Theoretical Researchers interviewed had very little to
say about the issue of consensus of theories. While all agreed about the theories and
processes that underlie conflict resolution, and two reported that they worked with their
colleagues towards the same goal, the remaining responses were all made by TR1. This
was in contrast to the relative agreement of the Applied Researchers who all reported
that researchers usually disagree, that disagreement tended to be about the specifics of
theories, and that debate between colleagues is a healthy component of any research
endeavour.
Table 12.11: Question 9: Do you think that standard theories of conflict resolution affect what is done in practice?  
Part 1: Overall responses and general issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Research / Practice</th>
<th>Interest groups</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Practitioners</td>
<td>All Researchers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>theory does affect practice</td>
<td>3 (33%)</td>
<td>5 (83%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>theory does not affect practice</td>
<td>6 (67%)</td>
<td>1 (17%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>depends on training</td>
<td>5 (56%)</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mediation is both an art and a science</td>
<td>1 (11%)</td>
<td>1 (17%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concern about lack of training of P</td>
<td>4 (44%)</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not enough done to equate theory with prac</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>theoretical base / research created popularity</td>
<td>1 (11%)</td>
<td>4 (67%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research / Practice</th>
<th>Interest groups</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Therapeutic</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>C1, C2</td>
<td>L1, L2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>L3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>L1, L2, L3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Research / Practice</td>
<td>Interest groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Practitioners</td>
<td>Therapeutic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumptions about practitioners</td>
<td>7 (78%)</td>
<td>T1, T2, T3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 (67%)</td>
<td>T1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (17%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (17%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons P do not use theory</td>
<td>2 (22%)</td>
<td>T2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 (22%)</td>
<td>T1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (11%)</td>
<td>C3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (11%)</td>
<td>T2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 (56%)</td>
<td>T2, T3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 (56%)</td>
<td>T1, T2, T3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 (22%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons P should use theory</td>
<td>1 (11%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 (33%)</td>
<td>T1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (11%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12.13: Is there consensus about the theories and processes that underlie conflict resolution among people you work with?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Research / Practice</th>
<th>Interest groups</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Practitioners</td>
<td>All Researchers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall consensus</td>
<td>8 (89%)</td>
<td>5 (83%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no consensus</td>
<td>1 (11%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emphasises consistency of practice methods</td>
<td>8 (89%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emphasises practice issues as most important</td>
<td>9 (100%)</td>
<td>1 (17%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emphasises 'what works' is most important</td>
<td>3 (33%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emphasises same goal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emphasises same values/philosophy</td>
<td>4 (44%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emphasises same training as important</td>
<td>6 (67%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rejects theory</td>
<td>2 (22%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emphasises diversity of practice methods</td>
<td>1 (11%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative about training/views of other groups</td>
<td>1 (11%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R usually disagree</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 (67%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>debate is healthy</td>
<td>1 (11%)</td>
<td>4 (67%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disagreement about specifics in theory</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disagreement about specifics in methodology</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (17%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapeutic</td>
<td>T1, T2, T3</td>
<td>C1, C3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>C1, C3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>L1, L2, L3</td>
<td>L1, L2, L3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Research</td>
<td>AR1, AR2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical Research</td>
<td>TR1, TR2, TR3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12.8 Relationship between research and practice

The results of the core interview questions relating to the relationship between research and practice in conflict resolution are reported in this section. This incorporates interviewees' responses to question 12, that asked interviewees to describe the nature of the relationship between research and practice; and question 13, that asked them about the ways in which researchers and practitioners cooperate in the conflict resolution field. Tables 12.14 through 12.18 describe the themes nominated in response to these questions.

12.8.1 Researchers and Practitioners

Tables 12.14 through 12.17 present the themes that emerged from responses to question 12 that asked interviewees to give their opinions about the relationship between research and practice. A substantial amount of data was collected from this question, providing a large number of themes that were grouped into a series of categories. These are reported as overall responses and general issues, general reasons for the poor relationship between research and practice, reasons for the poor relationship between research and practice directed specifically at practitioners, and reasons for the poor relationship between research and practice directed specifically at researchers.

Table 12.14 details the overall responses of interviewees and some general themes. Overall, two thirds of the interviewees felt that there was a poor relationship between research and practice. The relationship between research and practice was poor according to 78% of Practitioners, however Researchers were divided (50:50) on this issue. In contrast, there was a positive consensus among Researchers about the potential for improvement of the relationship between research and practice in the future, while
Practitioners were divided. In this instance 56% of Practitioners were positive about the future of the relationship, while 44% were pessimistic. Other general issues raised by Researchers included an emphasis on efforts being made to rectify the relationship between research and practice (50%), the need for greater cooperation between researchers and practitioners (50%), and the role of research in establishing the professionalisation of the field (50%). It was notable that only a small number of themes were raised by the Practitioner group.

General reasons for the poor relationship between research and practice are reported in Table 12.15. These included a variety of themes including poor communication and understanding between research and practice (Practitioners 44%, Researchers 67%); the different focus of research and practice (Practitioners 33%, Researchers 33%); the observation that research and practice are isolated from each other as professional endeavours (Practitioners 33%, Researchers 33%); and, that the values base of research and practice are different (Practitioners 56%, Researchers 33%).

Table 12.16 details the themes identified as reasons for the poor relationship between research and practice that were directed specifically at the behaviour or attitudes of practitioners. Practitioners commonly discussed a number of issues that were conspicuously absent from the responses of Researchers. For example, Practitioners reported that they were not interested in research (56%); that they did not expect to gain anything from making an effort to keep up with research (56%); and that they did not have the time to follow research developments (44%). Another pertinent theme raised by Practitioners was that they were resisting the professionalisation of the field (33%) and that this contributed to the poor relations with researchers. Practitioners also
asserted that most research was irrelevant to practice (56%), and this was also noted by 50% of the Researchers. Researchers also commonly reported that practitioners did not like research (50%) and that they did not understand the need for research (66%).

Table 12.17 details the themes raised by interviewees regarding the behaviour and attitudes of researchers that could account for the poor relationship between research and practice. It should be noted that virtually all of the themes categorised in this section were raised by Practitioners, with only one Researcher scoring on each of the two themes. Practitioners reported that reasons for the poor relationship between research and practice included the following issues: researchers were too self interested (56%), researchers try to tell practitioners what to do (44%), and researchers did not understand the needs of practitioners (44%). One third of the Practitioners interviewed claimed that in general, the poor relationship between research and practice was primarily the fault of researchers. One Researcher also mentioned this theme.

The results to question 13, that asked interviewees if they thought researchers and practitioners assisted each other adequately, are outlined in Table 12.18. Overall, all of the Practitioners (100%) felt that researchers and practitioners did not help each other adequately. Researchers were divided in their responses with 50% asserting that researchers and practitioners did help each other adequately and 50% asserting that they did not. One third of Practitioners and two thirds of Researchers expressed a desire to cooperate and learn more about the others’ area in order to improve the relationship. In general, Practitioners felt that no real efforts had been made to facilitate communication between researchers and practitioners in order to improve the relationship (78%) and that they did not value input from research as it was irrelevant to what practitioners do.
(78%). Further, at least half of the Practitioners interviewed felt that researchers did not value the potential input and experience that practitioners could offer (56%) and that there was a general lack of interest in each others’ areas (56%). Another finding was that 44% of Practitioners felt that philosophical differences between researchers and practitioners contributed to the poor relationship. In addition, one third of the Practitioners interviewed claimed that researchers and practitioners did not like each other.

A similar patterns of results emerged for Researchers, with 67% agreeing that practitioners did not value research, and 50% agreeing that this was due to both philosophical differences and different views about the future of conflict resolution. Another finding was that 67% of Researchers stated that in general, researchers need the cooperation of practitioners to do their work effectively. However 50% of Researchers acknowledged that practitioners were unlikely to gain a great deal from their association with researchers.

12.8.2 Interest groups

Members of the Therapeutic and Applied Research interest groups unanimously agreed that the relationship between research and practice was poor. This perspective was contrary to that of the Theoretical Research interest group members who all felt that the relationship was good. Such a difference in opinions is interesting, particularly between the Applied and Theoretical Research interest groups. For example, one member of the Applied Researcher group stated “I think it’s disgraceful”(AR3, 108), while at the other end of the spectrum a member of the Theoretical Researcher group claimed:
"... It's good ... they're er very co-operative with our research ... you know happy to be involved and interested ... um I think it's one of the few fields where this sort of relationship is good ..." (TR3, 094).

The polarisation between applied and theoretical approaches to research is also highlighted by the fact that the Applied Researchers interviewed all stressed the need for greater levels of cooperation between research and practice in order to improve the relationship. In contrast, the Theoretical Researchers preferred to emphasise the efforts that had already been made to improve the relationship. These differing perspectives are detailed below:

"... The ah relationship is so very vital that I think it's disgraceful that nothing's been done by more people to try to make it better and it would get better if people worked at it ..." (AR3, 112).

"... Everyone I work with would think that, and most of the people in practice that I have had dealings with seem receptive to working together now that the problems have been fixed up ..." (TR1, 070).

Table 12.14 summarises two other issues that are pertinent to an understanding of the relationship between research and practice according to interest groups. First, most of the interviewees were predominantly positive about the potential for the improvement of the relationship between researchers and practitioners. However, interviewees from the Therapeutic interest group all reported a high degree of pessimism about the future relationship between research and practice. Second, two of the three Lawyers who were interviewed, and one Theoretical Researcher, emphasised that significant professional gains would be made from greater cooperation between researchers and practitioners. This is further evidence that the Legal interest group, arguably the more qualified and professionally mobile interest group, welcome the opportunity for research about practice. Further, some Researchers expect practitioners to be involved in research, in order to have their practice ratified. For example:
"... it's in both of our interests to find out more about the mediation process. I mean the law society wants to make sure they have a slice of the mediation cake if you know what I mean, I mean everyone wants to make sure that their profession will er do well in the um market place. So if the lawyers as a group work together we can ah do the research to show how er what we er do works and how it can be made to help people, its a good er for all of us ..." (126, L3).

"... Its probably because they understand that there is a lot to be gained professionally by having conflict resolution and mediation tightened up ... Yeah because when it is then the profession will be more respected and people will pay more for it and the government will have to support it more generously so it only makes sense for practitioners to get involved with what we're doing ...” (TR3, 116-118).

Table 12.15 details the general themes that were raised by interviewees to account for the poor relationship between research and practice. It is not particularly surprising that only two entries are listed for the Theoretical Researchers, given that those interviewed reported that they felt the relationship between research and practice was going well.

There were few responses from the Community interest group, in fact, only C1 provided data that was categorised as a general theme. The Legal interest group provided more data, agreeing that poor communication between researchers and practitioners was the most likely reason for the poor relationship between research and practice.

Furthermore, they made the pragmatic statement that the current relationship between research and practice has been hindered by the fact that nothing positive has resulted from the relationship between researchers and practitioners in the past. For example:

"... overall I'd have to say that research and practice haven't worked well together in the past, there hasn't been much that has been very useful that has come out of any attempt to work together ...” (L1, 096).

The Therapeutic interest group commonly reported three themes as general reasons for the poor relationship between research and practice. First, they argued that researchers and practitioners have different values. Second, they claimed that the broad differences in the respective activities of researchers and practitioners have led to difficulties.
Finally, they proposed that the relative isolation of research and practice activities has significantly contributed to the problem. For example, a member of the Therapeutic interest group stated:

"... I have not really thought about it a great deal, but I think that it is as simple as making sure that there is some kind of useful dialogue between those people who are involved in the practical side of conflict resolution and those to a practising their trade as researchers in their area, they are so different ways of doing things and we hardly ever come into contact with each other and we have different values for what we do ..." (T1, 120).

Further values based reasons for the uneasy relationship between research and practice are provided by T2. As a psychologist, T2 explained that she had an understanding of the goals and methods of research, however, she asserted that while some practitioners rejected research out of ignorance, others (like herself) rejected it on philosophical grounds. The extracts from the interview with T2 (provided below) highlight the contrast between research and practice: first, on cognitive versus emotional grounds; second, because of objective versus subjective approaches; and third, on historical grounds.

"... Okay ah the research tends to be cerebral, so mental that they can't get in to with what practice is all about. We are much more emotionally based in practice, researchers don't seem to understand that ..."(T2, 110).

"... I suppose that the er the basic point of difference is that we um is that they believe that they can know something objective about mediation and er predict what will happen, and what we think is that most of the processes of mediation and conflict resolution are more subjective ideas that are based very much on the situation and in the feeling of the situation..." (T2, 128).

"... Because it's a way of making the process sterile, all mathematical, rather than embracing the group therapeutic roots of how we do mediation which is about emotional change in the disputants rather than about a mental process of what can I gain ... you know the work about needs and interests, er we are looking at a what the deep needs are and those are things that we don't bargain with. And most of the time it's about being able to who feel like they have been heard and seen, this is much more a therapeutic idea than a theoretical idea..." (T2, 132).
The Applied Research interest group were responsible for the majority of comments offering general reasons for the poor relationship between research and practice. They asserted that it was due to the lack of Applied Research in the field, poor communication between researchers and practitioners, the fact that research and practice endeavours tend to have a different focus in activities, and that the two areas are relatively isolated professional activities. This further reinforces the proposition that Applied Researchers are concerned with a cooperative approach to the advancement of the conflict resolution field.

Table 12.16 details the reasons for the poor relationship between research and practice raised by interviewees that were directed specifically at practitioners. The Legal interest group reported very few themes that were categorised in this table, implying that they felt practitioners could not be held solely responsible for the poor relationship. Similarly the Community interest group reported few themes, although two members agreed that practitioners tended to lack interest in, and understanding of, research. The same was true for the Applied Research interest group who claimed that practitioners tend not to understand the need for research, nor do they attend to research findings.

The Therapists introduced a substantial number of themes pertaining to the activities and attitudes of practitioners that contribute to the poor relationship between research and practice. The following four themes were prominent in their responses. First, due to busy schedules, practitioners lacked the time required to pursue the relationship between research and practice. Second, practitioners were generally not interested in research. Third, practitioners did not believe research was relevant to practice. Finally,
practitioners did not expect to gain anything from being involved in relationships with researchers. The last theme is explained in the following example:

"... I mean that we have been involved with some hmmm organisations before which have tried to make these ideals more of a practical reality, but they tend not to come out with any real gain for us the practitioners. I think that it affects researchers more. At the end of all of the work it is them that gained from publishing our work or using our ideas to get publications. Other practitioners don’t really get involved in thinking about the sort of things that the researchers are really interested in doing. That means that we don’t really gain anything from it ..." (T1, 126).

The Theoretical Research interest group reported a large number of themes regarding the attitudes and behaviour of practitioners that they felt were responsible for the poor relationship between research and practice. In general, their views were that: practitioners think research is irrelevant to practice; practitioners think research is boring; practitioners generally do not like research; practitioners do not understand research; and finally, practitioners do not understand the need for research.

Two other notable issues raised by a small number of interviewees are the last two themes listed in Table 12.16. These incorporate the opinion that practitioners are reluctant to be cooperative in the relationship between research and practice because they are resisting professionalisation and fear being exposed as non-scientific. These issues are inextricably linked to the issues of training and the future of the conflict resolution field. That is, because of differing opinions about the impending professionalisation of the field, practitioners avoid collaboration with the researchers who are establishing standards. Evidence of these issues are provided in the following extracts:

"... I think most people doing mediation have been very guarded about what they have been doing, they don’t want to be studied in case they’re not doing the right thing ..." (L3, 110).
"... It's really about the future of standards and training, about who will be allowed to mediate and what sort of training that will be required by various governing organisations. Obviously ah lots of the mediators are concerned by that because they most of them have very few qualifications or none at all ... and they're worried about their futures in the area and therefore there has been a lot of resistance to the changes that are coming in. And they think that its being er pushed along by the researchers and by what we do ..." (TR2, 092).

Table 12.17 details the results of question 12, categorised as reasons for the poor relationship between research and practice directed specifically at the activities and attitudes of researchers. All of the Therapists interviewed and one of the Community mediators claimed that researchers do not understand the needs of practitioners. In addition, all of the Community mediators and one member from each of the Therapeutic and Applied Research interest groups, stated that researchers tend to assume a hierarchal relationship with practitioners and "try to tell practitioners what to do". Examples of these two issues are provided below:

"... Its well, um its so far out of touch with what we do in practice that it means nothing to us. There's not one theorist that I know who is really interested in the science of mediation or eh conflict resolution as we are interested in it ..." (T2, 102).

"... but er most of us in practice um don't really know a lot about it and blame them for a lot of the pressure that's on us now to be more rigid in our approaches Err I think we just don't trust them because we think they are only looking after their own jobs and they do that by telling us what to do ..." (C3, 128).

Another theme that received broad coverage was the criticism that researchers are self interested. This is linked to the previously mentioned theme about practitioners being unwilling to be involved in research because they have little to gain compared to researchers. The Therapeutic interest group provided most of the data about this theme. The examples provided below demonstrate this trend. The second quote in particular takes the issue to the next level, where T1 explains her belief that researcher's self interest leads to them using devious methods in their work.
"... It’s that the research is just irrelevant to what we do and to why we do the mediation in the way that we do it ... ah ... and er the people doing research they are usually only trying to prove a new theory and that’s important to their world not to what we do ..." (T2, 106).

"... It’s also somewhat manipulative in the ideas of many of my friends in practice, ... they think it’s very theoretical, very flashy, you know, and they don’t like the idea of tricking people into coming into the mediation the way the mediator wants them to er its like they have an underhanded reason for it coming out the er way they want to make them look better ..." (T1, 112).

In addition, all of the Community group and one Applied Researcher made the statement that, in general, the difficulties between researchers and practitioners can be attributed to the actions of researchers rather than practitioners. Such themes were not reported by the Theoretical Research interest group, suggesting a lack of reflection on their part, which is particularly striking considering their condemnation of practitioners.

Table 12.18 details the results of data analysis for question 13, that asked interviewees if they thought researchers and practitioners assisted each other adequately. All of the practitioner interest groups asserted that researchers and practitioners generally do not assist each other. In the research groups, the majority of Applied Researchers agreed with the practitioner interest groups, while the majority of Theoretical Researchers concluded that the level of assistance was adequate. The theme concerning a desire to cooperate more with researchers or practitioners was mentioned by all of the Applied Researchers, and was supported by at least one member of each of the other interest groups, except the Therapeutic interest group.

In general, most of the reasons offered by interviewees to explain the level of cooperation between researchers and practitioners received relatively equal levels of support across all interest groups. The following themes were notable exceptions. The
issue of researchers not valuing the practical experience and potential input of practitioners was noted by at least one interviewee from all groups with the exception of the Theoretical Research interest group. One member from each of the research interest groups reported that in their experience practitioners were happy to be involved in research. This theme was not mentioned by any of the Practitioners.

The Legal interest group were alone in their unanimous support for the theme that professional diversity in the conflict resolution field leads to difficulties for the potential cooperation between researchers and practitioners. For example, L2 responded:

"... Yeah and that's harder because it's so diverse, and so many applications means lots of professionals and groups are using ADR. So it's hard to keep up with it all, as it gets more well known and everyone wants to use it. But with er conflict resolution because there are people from er different fields involved multidisciplinary also means multidifficult er multidifficulty (laughs). I don't mean to be negative, it's just hard to keep standards and know what's happening everywhere its no wonder that researchers and practitioners don't work very well together yet ..." (L2, 106).

Another major difference between interest groups was the Applied Researchers' commitment to the idea that one of the reasons for the low level of cooperation between researchers and practitioners was that practitioners had very little to gain from the relationship. This provides further support for the idea that Applied Researchers are more concerned with the needs and interest of practitioners compared to Theoretical Researchers. For example, when asked to explain why researchers and practitioners do not cooperate more, one member of the Applied Researcher group replied:

"... Mainly because we're always asking mediators to do things for us, and they get sick of it. And I can't blame them because its more for us than for them at this stage ..." (AR2, 116).
Table 12.14: Question 12: How would you describe the relationship between research and practice in the conflict resolution field?
Part 1: Overall responses and general issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Research / Practice</th>
<th>Interest groups</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Practitioners</td>
<td>All Researchers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overall the relationship is poor</td>
<td>7 (78%)</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overall the relationship is good</td>
<td>2 (22%)</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positive about potential for improve</td>
<td>5 (56%)</td>
<td>6 (100%)</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pessimistic about future</td>
<td>4 (44%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-P problem is common in many fields</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>research has had to catch up with practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the need for more cooperation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>efforts to rectify relationship/cooperate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional gains from R - P cooperation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the role of R in professionalisation of the field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 12.15: Question 12: How would you describe the relationship between research and practice in the conflict resolution field?  
Part 2: General reasons for the poor relationship between research and practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Research / Practice</th>
<th>Interest groups</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Practitioners</td>
<td>All Researchers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of applied research</td>
<td>1 (11%) 2 (33%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor communication / understanding</td>
<td>4 (44%) 4 (67%)</td>
<td>T1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated professional activities</td>
<td>3 (33%) 2 (33%)</td>
<td>T1, T2, T3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different focus in activities</td>
<td>3 (33%) 2 (33%)</td>
<td>T1, T2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing positive has come from it in past</td>
<td>2 (22%) -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No flow on of research findings</td>
<td>1 (11%) 1 (17%)</td>
<td>T1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different values</td>
<td>5 (56%) 2 (33%)</td>
<td>T1, T2, T3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R and P don't like each other</td>
<td>1 (11%) 1 (17%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interest groups:  
- Therapeutic  
- Community  
- Legal  
- Applied Research  
- Theoretical Research  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lack of applied research</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>AR2, AR3</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor communication / understanding</td>
<td>T1</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>L2, L3</td>
<td>AR1, AR2, AR3</td>
<td>TR2</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated professional activities</td>
<td>T1, T2</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>AR2, AR3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different focus in activities</td>
<td>T1, T2</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>AR1, AR2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing positive has come from it in past</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>L1, L2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No flow on of research findings</td>
<td>T1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>AR2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different values</td>
<td>T1, T2, T3</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>AR1</td>
<td>TR1</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R and P don't like each other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>AR2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12.16: Question 12: How would you describe the relationship between research and practice in the conflict resolution field?
Part 3: Reasons for the poor relationship between research and practice directed specifically at practitioners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Research / Practice</th>
<th>Interest groups</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Practitioners</td>
<td>All Researchers</td>
<td>Therapeutic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P have not time to pursue relationship</td>
<td>4 (44%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>T1, T2, T3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P do not expect to gain anything</td>
<td>5 (56%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>T1, T2, T3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P don't think research is relevant to practice</td>
<td>5 (56%)</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
<td>T1, T2, T3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P not interested in research</td>
<td>5 (56%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>T1, T2, T3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P think research is boring</td>
<td>1 (11%)</td>
<td>2 (33%)</td>
<td>T3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P don't like research</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P do not understand research</td>
<td>2 (22%)</td>
<td>2 (33%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P don't understand the need for research</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 (67%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P focus on feel good factors only</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (33%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P don't listen to research</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (33%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P are resisting professionalisation</td>
<td>3 (33%)</td>
<td>1 (17%)</td>
<td>T2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P frightened of being exposed as non-scientific</td>
<td>2 (22%)</td>
<td>1 (17%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12.17: Question 12: How would you describe the relationship between research and practice in the conflict resolution field? Part 4: Reasons for the poor relationship between research and practice directed specifically at researchers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Research / Practice</th>
<th>Interest groups</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Practitioners</td>
<td>All Researchers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Therapeutic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Applied Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Theoretical Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R do not understand the needs of P</td>
<td>4 (44%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R tell P what to do</td>
<td>4 (44%)</td>
<td>1 (17%)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R emphasises devious methods</td>
<td>1 (11%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R are self interested</td>
<td>5 (56%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R are too theoretical</td>
<td>1 (11%)</td>
<td>1 (17%)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R fault / to blame in general</td>
<td>3 (33%)</td>
<td>1 (17%)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12.18: Question 13: Do you think that researchers and practitioners adequately assist each other in this field?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Research / Practice</th>
<th>Interest groups</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Practitioners</td>
<td>All Researchers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Therapeutic</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R and P do not help each other</td>
<td>9 (100%)</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R and P do help each other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expresses some desire to cooperate/learn more</td>
<td>3 (33%)</td>
<td>4 (67%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General reasons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>different views about conflict resolution</td>
<td>3 (33%)</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>philosophical differences</td>
<td>4 (44%)</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P don’t value research/research is irrelevant</td>
<td>7 (78%)</td>
<td>4 (67%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R don’t value experience/practice</td>
<td>5 (56%)</td>
<td>1 (17%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P are happy to be involved in research</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (33%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R and P don’t like each other</td>
<td>3 (33%)</td>
<td>1 (17%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R and P not interested in each others’ areas</td>
<td>5 (56%)</td>
<td>2 (33%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no attempt to communicate/cooperate</td>
<td>7 (78%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional diversity leads to problems</td>
<td>3 (33%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hierarchical relationship implied by R</td>
<td>2 (22%)</td>
<td>2 (33%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nothing in it for the P</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R need P to cooperate</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 (67%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12.9 Professionalisation of the conflict resolution field

Another series of themes that emerged throughout the interviews, and can be considered as an independent issue, were those that were relevant to the professionalisation of the conflict resolution field. It was clear from the analyses of data that this issue was critical in the formation of interviewee responses. In general, Researchers tended to support the idea of the professionalisation of conflict resolution, while Practitioners were more likely to express resistance to the idea.

However, this issue becomes more interesting when the data is reviewed in terms of interest groups. In the practitioner interest groups the results suggested that the Therapeutic and Community interest groups were very negative about the impending professionalisation of the conflict resolution field. However, members of the Legal interest group were more positive about the idea, suggesting that they felt this would advantage lawyers over other practitioner groups. The majority of issues regarding professionalisation for Practitioners have already been reported in previous sections (in particular see Section 12.8.2). Therefore the following results will focus on data from the research interest groups only.

Responses from Theoretical Researchers suggest that they feel it has been the rigour introduced by a research approach that has established the popularity and intellectual climate for mediation to be accepted and funded. Theoretical Researchers therefore expect the professionalisation of conflict resolution to be inevitable. For example, it was claimed that volunteers and weekend training workshops would be a thing of the past, and that practitioners would learn to accept this and capitulate:
INT So what about the volunteers and the people who just learn to do mediation at a weekend workshop?

TR3 I don’t think we will see much more of that in years to come. I think that as it becomes a profession all of that will disappear and I think the field will become much better for that and it’ll really improve everything.

INT Do you think everyone is happy with that?

TR3 No, they’re not happy with it, but there’s enough people who are to make it work.

INT So why do people want it that way?

TR3 It’s probably because they understand that there is a lot to be gained professionally by having conflict resolution and mediation tightened up.

INT Do you mean having it made more professional?

TR3 Yeah because when it is then the profession will be more respected and people will pay more for it and the government will have to support it more generously so it only makes sense for practitioners to get involved with what we’re doing.

The issue of “it only makes sense” for practitioners to respond more to the input of researchers implies an expectation that practitioners will conform to a scientist-practitioner model of practice, and also that there is a natural legitimating effect of research. While one of the Theoretical Researchers accepted that practitioners were concerned about the professionalisation of the field, she focussed on the lack of training of practitioners as the source of their concerns rather than any philosophical or values based differences:

“... Obviously ah lots of the mediators are concerned by that because they most of them have very few qualifications or none at all ... and they’re worried about their futures in the area and therefore there has been a lot of resistance to the changes that are coming in ...” (TR2, 092).

TR2 also reported that while she was aware that there may be some difficulties associated with the introduction of stronger training standards, such changes were fundamental requirements for rigorous practice. For example:

“... Yes it is possible that the extra focus on standards could be end up in making mediation less or spontaneous or er therapeutic, but its also unavoidable ... we have to bring in standards and training, if we don’t the problems could be worse ...” (TR2, 098).
It is possible that there were some unrealistic expectations reported by Theoretical Researchers. For example, TR3 assumed that all practitioners had achieved a minimum standard of training (064-068), and also that practitioners wanted to know more about the theoretical side of mediation. For example:

"... We ask them in our research and they always say they'd like a better understanding of the theories and processes behind mediation practices, so er maybe they don't have a really good understanding yet and they need the training. They sound really eager to learn more about the scientific side of it you know how it is er works and the sort of ideas that it is all based on and er the history of mediation ..." (TR3, 072).

When challenged about the generalisability of this opinion, he responded:

"... Yeah they could be. I don't know ... um they're very genuine though and they say their colleagues would like to know more too ... it's hard to say, we get the feeling from our research contact that they're eager to find out more about how to do mediation better, I mean how to be more effective you know what I mean? ..." (TR3, 076).

The adherence to this belief suggests an overestimation of practitioners' willingness to be involved in research enterprises or to incorporate the findings of research in their work. The Applied Research interest group was more realistic in their expectations.

For example AR1's comments expressed an understanding of reasons why practitioners might be reluctant to be involved in research. She endorsed a more cooperative approach than that espoused by the Theoretical Researcher noted above. She stated:

060  AR1  Um I think practitioners feel that we don't understand what they do in the real world, and they think that we can't really help them if we don't see what they do everyday.
061  INT  Is that fair of them?
062  AR1  Well yeah for a lot of research they're exactly right and I s'pose they have learned to er to think like that. But that's why I'm now running the sort of applied research that we're doing now. It's around the idea of getting practitioners to help us direct our research models because it might be better that way. Err I mean having practitioners involved may help to get a better picture of what they do ... and they might take our advice more too if we can get some sort of cooperative approach going.
Another Applied Researcher (AR2), stated that one of the main reasons for tension with practitioners is that they see researchers as portraying an image of authority on conflict resolution practice. She explained that practitioners have become frustrated by the continual suggestions of new practice methods or conflict resolution processes typically suggested by researchers. Further, AR2 noted that practitioners see researchers as aloof and generally practitioners have no respect for research findings. While AR2 considered the response of practitioners to be reasonable given the previous input of more theoretically focussed research, she asserted that greater cooperation is required for the future development of the field. The interview data follows:

106  AR2  Uh huh and I think that the other problem is that researchers are always in the position where they are always telling the mediators what to do in their eyes.
107  INT  And that leads to what?
108  AR2  We're always coming up with new methods and new approaches and then we say that this is the way that they should be doing it.
109  INT  What, and practitioners don't like that?
110  AR2  Yeah and um of course I can understand them not liking that. And even if that's not what we are doing then they still see that it is. It's very frustrating and the results are that no-one communicates. Researchers go on on their research paths not bothering to try to make their findings relevant to practices and not worrying about making the findings available to practitioners. It's a vicious cycle because then mediators see researchers as more aloof and less relatable to the point where they have absolutely no respect for the findings.
111  INT  Is there any truth in that? Do any researchers act like that?
112  AR2  Yes probably, but it's wrong, very wrong, but it's been like that for a long time now. Mediation is so practical that the research has to be practical too. In many ways most of it is not. The decision making models and bargaining equations are more like mathematics than mediation. I actually don't even think it's relevant, and I can understand that it's very annoying that that always happens because we really need to come at the problems together if we are going to make good solutions.

An interesting point was made by the most experienced member of the Applied Research interest group, a veteran of the conflict resolution field (AR3). He proposed
that all researchers are originally attracted to the conflict resolution field for
philosophical and good-willed reasons. However, the processes of academic research
do not favour idealism about one’s research topic, and this encourages a more
theoretical approach. The result is that researchers neglect their original idealistic
intentions. For example:

132 AR3 Yes lots more than it seems. I know it's easy in research to play
the publication game, but most of us have a vision to actually
make a difference, to do something good for the world you know.
It's more than you think, the system hides it but you have to
believe in what you're doing.

133 INT And most researchers, do they do that?

134 AR3 You know I don't know one researcher who is in this field who
isn't interested in this or this perspective for peace and such,
but er they forget about making it applied after a while which
means that eventually it turns out that there's a big gap in the
thinking of researchers and practitioners where originally it was
all the same.

135 INT What, you er think they loose sight of that?

136 AR3 Yes, but I'm not blaming them really, there is so much pressure
to make it more and more academic and that doesn't er help
when you are trying to get ideas across to all levels of the
society.

This supports the notion of the detached researcher who has no personal interest in the
subject of the research and is traditionally associated with empirical approaches to
practice research. AR3 also argued for greater reflexivity in the field, which has been
another criticism of empirical approaches to practice research. He claimed:

"... No not enough, that's what I'm saying it has to be more, more clear, more
directed towards a mutual helping of each other to get at the problems and find
out answers everyone can use. We make it more complex than that and it
becomes very tangled up with theories and models that's a waste of everyone's
time and makes practitioners like researchers even less. We'd all help each other
much more if we'd just stop and look at where we're going and where we've
been. It's been the same question for twenty or thirty years, since the peace
movements started research has been too slow to listen to what practitioners
need to hear, it's their fault really but they're a pigheaded lot (laughs). We have
to pull together, to make a stand to listen to each other to do the research that
best addresses the problems of everyday mediators, you know the simple stuff,
otherwise its just research for research's sake its got to be useful too ..."
(AR3, 126).
While Applied Researchers also supported the shift towards the professionalisation of the field, their focus was not specifically on the application of research to achieve this end. Rather, their focus was on cooperation with practitioners, specifically with the aim of practitioners driving the direction of any research that might be useful. In contrast, Theoretical Researchers assumed that that only way forward for the conflict resolution field was research into efficacy and model testing, and emphasised the assimilation of practitioners.

12.10 Summary

A summary of the data from the semi-structured interviews was presented in the current results section. The structure for reporting results was achieved by combining the interview questions into categories. Differences were evident in the areas of application of conflict resolution, training, conflict resolution practice, conflict resolution research, theoretical issues, the relationship between research and practice, and attitudes towards professionalisation of the field. Differences in themes for all categories were noted between the broader Researcher and Practitioner groups, and also between the five interest groups. The qualitative data reported in this chapter will be considered, along with the quantitative data described in previous chapters, in Chapter 13 where results are discussed.
CHAPTER 13
TOWARD AN UNDERSTANDING OF RESEARCH
AND PRACTICE IN CONFLICT RESOLUTION

13.0 Introduction

Chapter 13 aims to review and evaluate the original intentions of this thesis, and consider the implications of the research findings. Section 13.1 involves a consideration of the thesis aims as outlined in Chapter 1. The degree to which these aims have been achieved is evaluated by reference to the literature reviews that constitute the first half of the thesis. Section 13.2 discusses the extent to which the research aims that emerged at the end of Chapter 6 have been addressed. A general consideration of researcher/practitioner differences is offered in Section 13.3, while the more specific differences between interest groups are discussed in Section 13.4. Section 13.5 considers the limitations of this program of research, and directions for future conflict resolution research. Section 13.6 includes a discussion of the future of the relationship between research and practice in conflict resolution incorporating the findings of this thesis. Finally, Section 13.7 attempts to summarise the preceding discussions and present conclusions.
13.1 Consideration of thesis aims

The primary aim of this thesis was to provide an understanding of the relationship between research and practice in conflict resolution. In Chapter 1 eight broad aims were identified, providing a useful structure for reviewing the conflict resolution literature and resulting in questions to guide the empirical research reported in the latter chapters of the thesis. Each of these thesis aims is reviewed and evaluated below.

13.1.1 Thesis aim 1

The first aim of the thesis was to detail the multidisciplinary interests in conflict and conflict resolution. This was achieved primarily in Chapter 2. An overview of psychological, social, political and anthropological interpretations of conflict was provided. This review illustrated the variety of academic and professional interests that have combined in the formation of the conflict discipline. A major finding was that traditional conceptions of conflict and conflict resolution emphasised overt behaviour, with little consideration of intrapersonal or cognitive and affective factors. Further, most traditional discussions of conflict resolution practice actively promoted the need for a behavioural approach, and denied the importance of internal factors.

It was argued that a multidisciplinary interest in the field has led to a reconsideration of the importance of intrapersonal factors in conflict. This emerging trend was highlighted primarily by Burton's (e.g., 1985) conception of the importance of needs and interests in conflict analysis and conflict resolution. While it is generally accepted that a broad discipline base has influenced the conflict resolution field, few writers have considered this matter in detail. For example, the behavioural paradigm underlying the majority of the single discipline approaches to conflict has not been emphasised in the past. It was
proposed that multidisciplinary interest in the field activated an emphasis on intrapersonal conflict, and that this was a main influence in the shift from a behaviourist to constructivist philosophy in conflict resolution practice. It was therefore concluded that the modern conflict resolution movement was in need of academic inquiry.

**13.1.2 Thesis aim 2**

The second aim of the thesis was to develop an understanding of the conflict resolution field from a socio-historical perspective. This was achieved through the separate consideration of legal contributions to conflict resolution (described in Chapter 3), and the development of the mediation enterprise (described in Chapter 4). While other major findings of Chapters 3 and 4 are reviewed below in Sections 13.1.3 through 13.1.5, the breadth and depth with which the socio-historical influences are considered in this thesis is extensive. In summary, these included the economic and social pressures from a congested legal system, the impact of the peace and social activism movements, the political developments in international relations and philosophical trends. Therefore conflict resolution practice can be considered as the result of a series of social processes and historical contingencies, rather than purely as a tool or technology based on scientifically tested theory.

**13.1.3 Thesis aim 3**

The third thesis aim was to explore the substantive input of the law in the development of the conflict resolution movement. It was proposed that the modern conflict resolution movement was in part prompted by the shortcomings of the law and order model. This theme originated from developments in the field of international relations
where cooperative approaches to the resolution of international disputes were first introduced as substitutes for authoritarian legalistic approaches.

It was proposed that the departure from the hierarchial law and order model, and movement towards more cooperative problem solving models, constituted a paradigm shift for how society dealt with conflict. A comprehensive literature review demonstrated a change in the philosophy of international relations to include a consideration of the more subjective aspects of conflict, influenced by systems theory, and by developments in the philosophy of science.

It was then shown that these ideas filtered down from an international level to a domestic application in alternative dispute resolution. The literature indicated that alternative dispute resolution emerged primarily from a need to restructure the legal system because of social, political and economic pressures. It was argued that a major factor in this was the inability of traditional legal approaches to address the cognitive and affective aspects of conflict. The diverse applications of alternative dispute resolution were then detailed. Despite the many advantages and broad success of these approaches, legal critiques of the area have identified a number of unresolved issues for alternative dispute resolution from a more philosophical perspective.

13.1.4 Thesis aim 4

The fourth aim of the thesis was to review the development of the mediation enterprise. This aim was addressed in the first half of Chapter 4. The technique of mediation was described in terms of its diverse historical origins, revealing a substantive history of broad cultural applicability. Evidence suggested that the rise of mediation as part of the
conflict resolution movement was also influenced by social and political factors. These included public opposition to the excessive legalism in the USA, the birth of the modern peace movement as a reaction to American involvement in the Vietnam War, and religiously inspired notions of pacifism. Further, it was argued that the popularity of mediation was strengthened by the emerging philosophical position of postmodernism.

The development of the mediation enterprise was tracked through the establishment of community justice centres and various areas of application, including labour relations and the resolution of business disputes, and it was demonstrated that mediation is a phenomenon of significant social and economic power. It was also established that these developments were at times enthusiastically embraced across community, legal and business sectors with little consideration of evaluation.

To further highlight the social nature of the development of the mediation movement an examination of the institutionalisation, public face, and knowledge claims of the mediation movement was conducted. This demonstrated that the practice of mediation became institutionalised through predominantly social rather than scientific processes, which raised questions about various claims made about its validity. The institutionalisation of mediation practice was traced in a historical manner, and followed the emergence of the mediation movement from specific disciplines, through conferences, professional associations, research grants, academic training programs, and the development of journals and seminal books. This process assisted the public acceptance of mediation through its association with scientific sounding claims that were not in fact based on empirical evidence.
An examination of the knowledge claims and public face of mediation provided further insight into the development of the mediation enterprise. This review involved a consideration of the central knowledge claims and ideology that has developed around the mediation enterprise. It comprised a critical review of the many bold statements made about mediation including the assertions that it is flexible, it builds relationships, it is time and cost effective, and that it is user friendly, values emotions, and leads to empowerment. Further, it was argued that these claims have been instrumental in the institutionalisation of mediation, and some of the issues of monopolisation and the development of professional language were discussed.

13.1.5 Thesis aim 5

The fifth aim of this thesis was to review the results of traditional social scientific inquiry into mediation research and the efficacy of mediation. This is presented in the latter part of Chapter 4. Initially the various approaches to mediation research were discussed and reviewed, and then specific research about efficacy was examined in detail. This revealed a broad literature that provided both positive and negative findings about the efficacy of mediation.

Positive evidence for the efficacy of mediation included increased user satisfaction, higher rates of compliance with settlements, and reduced costs. Negative and inconclusive evidence included the reduction in court delays and backlogs, rates of settlement, and whether improvement in relations between disputants was possible. It was concluded that a substantial body of empirical evidence is yet to be gathered to either sanction or discredit the efficacy of mediation practices. However it was argued
that a large proportion of the variability in outcome study results was due to methodological difficulties.

The perspective that conflict resolution could be considered as both an art and a science was emphasised in the review of methodological limitations. The growing tendency for practitioners to reject scientific approaches and to accept alternative epistemologies for practice was also considered. This highlighted the issue of tension between the epistemological positions of researchers and practitioners in the conflict resolution field.

13.1.6 Thesis aim 6

A review of the relationship between research and practice in the discipline of psychology was undertaken in Chapter 5 in an effort to provide a deeper understanding of the issues. This addressed the sixth aim of the thesis. Chapter 5 comprised a review of the contributions of a philosophy of science approach to understanding the research-practice dilemma in psychology. This included developing an understanding of the scientist-practitioner model that has been adopted as the ideal model for psychological practice. The many critiques of this model were considered, and it was argued that significant secondary gains resulted from psychological practice being considered scientific. In addition the issue of value differences between research and practice communities in psychology was identified.

It was concluded that findings about the relationship between research and practice in psychology could be paralleled with developments in the conflict resolution field. Corresponding themes included: (1) attempts to present the fields itself to the public as "scientific" was aimed at establishing epistemic authority; (2) the shifting focus toward
more applied practical methodologies was indicative of practitioners' movement away from the assumptions of empiricism; and, (3) attempts to professionalise the field have led to requests for a more conservative approach to practice, further exacerbating disharmony between researchers and practitioners.

13.1.7 Thesis aim 7

The seventh aim of the thesis was to review the specific literature about research and practice in conflict resolution and to determine research aims. This was undertaken in Chapter 6. The high degree of uncertainty in the state of relations between research and practice was demonstrated in a summary of the numerous requests for greater links between research and practice. A review of more practice oriented literature revealed extensive evidence of dissatisfaction among practitioners about the typically empiricist approaches used by researchers interested in conflict resolution.

The historical absence of research into conflict resolution practice, the rejection of scientific methodology and philosophy, and rejection of measurement and evaluation of practice were proposed as evidence for the polarisation of research and practice. Detailed analyses indicated that such difficulties had their origins in philosophical differences between researchers and practitioners. In addition, various alternative models or epistemologies for conflict resolution practice were described, and the potential for discord between interest groups in the field was discussed. These findings were used to guide the direction of the research questions addressed in this thesis.

It was concluded that the uneasy relationship between research and practice in conflict resolution constituted a suitable area for investigation. Therefore research aims were
proposed in the last part of Chapter 6. However, prior to this, pertinent methodological issues were discussed and previous surveys of the field were reviewed in detail. A research program involving consultation with members of the field, a survey, and detailed individual interviews was then proposed.

13.1.8 Thesis aim 8

The eighth aim of the thesis was to undertake quantitative and qualitative research into the relationship between research and practice in the conflict resolution field. This aim was addressed in Chapters 7 through 12, which constituted the empirical research component of the thesis. The specific stages of research were nominated at the conclusion of Chapter 6, and comprised five broad research aims. These research aims are discussed and evaluated below.

13.2 Consideration of research aims

The five research aims that emerged during Chapter 6 are briefly reviewed below. Following this, Section 13.3 provides a discussion of the specific research findings associated with research aims 3, 4 and 5. It should be noted that when the first letter of a group is capitalised (e.g., Researchers) the specific sample used in this thesis is being referred to. Description of a group name using lower-case letters (e.g., researchers) indicates an inference about the group in general (e.g., other researchers in the field).

13.2.1 Research aim 1

The first research aim was to establish the perceived state of the relationship between research and practice in the field of conflict resolution, and allow this to guide the empirical research phase of the thesis. While this was informed by the findings of
preceding chapters, it was elaborated through consultation with researchers and practitioners who had substantial experience in the conflict resolution field.

Chapter 7 described how the conduct of a focus group and some semi-structured interviews was used to generate the research questions. It was particularly important to gain the input of practitioners as the literature suggested a high degree of ambivalence and/or negativity about their attitudes toward research. It was argued that a participatory approach would improve the quality of the research questions and identify relevant issues that would encourage participants to be involved in the research.

Overall this resulted in a useful strategy and a high degree of insight into the issues that were relevant to both researchers and practitioners was gained. In addition to specific ideas for the content of the survey instrument, a number of very important methodological issues were raised to guide the nature of the inquiry. The sources of difficulty in the relations between research and practice, (and between researchers and practitioners), that were proposed by members of the focus group and interviews were diverse. These were summarised into four broad domains: (1) activities and attitudes relevant to the conflict resolution field; (2) issues relevant to the scientist-practitioner debate in the conflict resolution field; (3) general values systems; and, (4) general personality issues. These domains were used to guide the construction of the survey instrument.

13.2.2 Research aim 2

The second research aim was to develop an instrument that would effectively measure the differences that are proposed to exist between researchers and practitioners. As
described above, the specific content of the survey was informed by the findings of the first research aim. The four domains nominated above, and the specific themes defined in Tables 7.2 through 7.5, were used to guide the development of the survey instrument. The assignment of specific questionnaires and items for each of these themes was also detailed in these tables. Two phases of piloting the survey instrument resulted in some modest changes, and it was concluded that a serviceable instrument had been constructed. A detailed description of the survey instrument was provided in Chapter 8.

13.2.3 Research aim 3

The third research aim was to conduct survey research into the proposed differences between researchers and practitioners in the conflict resolution field. This was conducted in accordance with the survey methodology that was described in Chapter 8. The survey data provided a large number of results, reported in Chapter 9. These results are further discussed in Section 13.3.

13.2.4 Research aim 4

The fourth research aim was to investigate the proposition that disaccord in the conflict resolution field is not only influenced by the broad differences that exist between research and practice, but also by the interests of various professional interest groups. Therefore Chapter 10 described the analyses of the participant group across professional areas. Five distinct interest groups, three of which were practitioner based, and two that were researcher based were revealed. The practitioner interest groups were named Therapeutic, Community, and Legal, and the researcher interest groups were named Applied Research and Theoretical Research. The survey data were then reanalysed according to interest groups, the results of which are discussed in Section 13.4.
13.2.5 Research aim 5

The fifth research aim was to undertake qualitative research using semi-structured interviews to further determine the nature and extent of differences between both researchers and practitioners, and between the interest groups proposed in research aim 4. The goal was to acquire an additional form of data with which to interpret and extend the results of research aims 3 and 4, and address the recommendations made by focus group members that qualitative data would be highly useful (Section 7.3.1). This aim was addressed in two chapters. Chapter 11 comprised a brief introduction to qualitative methods, a review of the use of qualitative methods both in the study of relations between research and practice communities, and for the study of conflict resolution, and then outlined the study methodology and methods of analysis for the interview data. Chapter 12 presented the results of the qualitative inquiry on the basis of a research-practice analysis, and according to interest groups. These results are discussed, along with the relevant quantitative results, in Sections 13.3 and 13.4.

13.3 Differences between researchers and practitioners

The following section outlines the major findings concerning the differences observed between researchers and practitioners in this investigation. The findings are discussed in two parts. First, Section 13.3.1 through 13.3.4 includes interpretations of the results of the quantitative investigations according to the four domains of difference that were proposed to exist between researchers and practitioners. Section 13.3.5 then summarises the quantitative findings. Second, Sections 13.3.6 through 13.3.12 include the discussion of the qualitative interview data according to the seven major issues that were identified from the interview protocol. The discussion of qualitative findings
about the relationship between researchers and practitioners is summarised in Section 13.2.13.

13.3.1 Activities and attitudes relevant to the conflict resolution field

A number of broad conclusions can be drawn about the differences between researchers and practitioners with respect to their activities and attitudes about the future of conflict resolution. Predictably, Researchers spent their time undertaking research or being involved in academic teaching, while Practitioners spent the major proportion of their time engaged in conflict resolution practice. The expected differences in professional activities were also found, with Researchers publishing more articles and book chapters than Practitioners, and also reading journals more regularly. There was very little crossover between the activities of the two groups. In some fields (e.g., clinical psychology), it is very common for at least a small proportion of people to engage in both research and practice. Through these dual roles of such individuals the possibility exists for greater communication and appreciation of the domains of researchers and practitioners. This appears not to be so in conflict resolution, most likely because of the fact that conflict resolution is still a relatively new field that lacks the scope for such dual roles.

Consistent with the finding that Researchers and Practitioners engage in different activities was their use of various information sources. A knowledge of the information sources utilised by members of a field provides a useful indicator of their familiarity with and commitment to the traditional ideas and guiding principles of that field (Simionato, 1991). This was reflected in participants' ratings of how useful they found information sources. In general Researchers tended to rate those information sources
that are traditionally accepted as being associated with authoritative sources of information (e.g., empirical research data and books about conflict theory) as much more useful than Practitioners. Practitioners seemed less concerned with the authority of their information sources, focusing on more personally fulfilling, interactive sources of information (e.g., workshops and seminars/presentations). These findings support the general proposition outlined in Chapter 6 that practitioners are not particularly concerned with the traditional methods and objectives of research.

Another informative set of findings were the predictions made by Researchers and Practitioners about both "typical researchers" and "typical practitioners" that revealed some powerful biases. For example, the Researchers in the study felt that "typical researchers" would rate the traditionally more authoritative forms of information (e.g., articles and books about conflict theory and empirical research) as more highly useful than they would themselves. Also they expected "typical researchers" to rate the less authoritative sources (e.g., workshops and their own experiences) as less useful than they would themselves.

There are two likely reasons for this tendency. First, the Researchers in the sample were clearly aware of the difficulties associated with the relationship between research and practice in conflict resolution and were therefore motivated to present themselves as less conservative than the traditional view of researchers. Second, and perhaps more likely, is the possibility of a polarised view of what a "typical researcher" is expected to value as useful, authoritative information. This trend was not apparent in the Practitioner group, suggesting they were less concerned with a view of what the "typical practitioner" should be like, and that they felt that their personal responses were
consistent with those of most "typical practitioners". Also, in a number of instances, Researchers (in comparison to Practitioners), overestimated the extent to which they expected typical practitioners would find some sources of information useful. For example, this was the case for ratings of "how to" books about practice, and workshops and seminars/presentations, that are traditionally considered less authoritative sources of information.

These types of stereotyped responses were also recorded for participants' ratings of conflict resolution as an "art" or a "science". While the expected difference between Researchers and Practitioners existed (with Practitioners leaning toward the art end of the continuum and Researchers toward science), both groups predicted that typical members of their group would give a more extreme response than they would personally. That is, Researchers felt that "typical researchers" would report that conflict resolution was more of a "science" then they did personally; and Practitioners reported that "typical practitioners" would respond that conflict resolution were was more an "art" than they did personally. Again this suggests powerful biases within each of the groups and a polarised view of what is expected of practitioners and researchers. If a researcher maintains that conflict resolution is predominantly a science, then his/her role in using scientific means of investigation is justified. Similarly the practitioner who maintains conflict resolution is an art, is justified in their rejection of traditional scientific sources of information and scientific methodology in their practice. These findings illustrate the previously untested propositions made in the literature about the split between researchers and practitioners with respect to the art and science of conflict resolution (Menkel-Meadow, 1993; Saposnek 1987, 1993b; Yale, 1993)
However, Researchers and Practitioners did not differ in their identification of the various advantages of conflict resolution. This suggests that both groups have a reasonably broad view of the benefits of conflict resolution. In contrast, they did differ in regard to those they nominated as influencing them to become involved in the conflict resolution field. For example, Researchers tended to nominate famous researchers, whereas Practitioners tended more to identify religious and social activist figures (notably "Jesus Christ" and "Ghandi"). This finding supports the intimations of the literature (e.g., Rothman, 1996), that researchers and practitioners are motivated by different reasons for their involvement in the field, and this may affect their values and attitudes. This is also supported by the fact that more than 63% of the Practitioners in the sample reported having some kind of religious affiliation.

As was expected, Researchers and Practitioners differed in their general attitudes toward many of the current issues in the conflict resolution field. In general these differences also support the general rejection of scientific philosophy and methodology (including measurement and evaluation of practice) by practitioners, as raised in Section 6.3. The Beliefs About Mediation Scale revealed three factors that indicated these broad epistemological differences. First, Practitioners generally supported the concept of an open intuitive approach to practice, while Researchers supported a more structured, scientific approach. These findings support the unverified propositions made in recent practice oriented literature (e.g., Bush & Folger, 1994; Saposnek, 1993a; 1993b). Second, Practitioners generally reported an opposition to the professionalisation of the field. This is a contentious issue in conflict resolution, and many practitioners feel that professionalisation is being driven primarily by the efficacy research conducted by researchers (e.g., Kirkup, 1993; Kressel, 1997). Many practitioners also reject the
notion that mediation should be professionalised because of the associated philosophical implications for their work (these issues are more fully discussed in subsequent sections). Finally, Researchers were more supportive of a "conceptual revision" of the field than Practitioners. This finding also mirrors the intimations made in recent literature (e.g., Gentry, 1994; Pinzon, 1996). In summary, the findings about these three factors are consistent with the aims of researchers to make the field more rigorous and scientific, and for practitioners to favour more liberal approaches. This reflects the common tendency for there to be regression toward the mean in the attitudes and behaviour of like minded groups (refer to Bohmer & Ray, 1993 for an example).

13.3.2 Issues relevant to the scientist—practitioner debate

Three scales were included in the survey instrument to provide insight into the differences between Researchers and Practitioners on issues relevant to the scientist-practitioner debate. These scales provided measures of Theoretical Orientation, Epistemological Style and Social Values regarding science. Differences in the expected directions were recorded, and were consistent with implications found in recent literature (refer to Chapter 6 and Table 7.3).

The Theoretical Orientation Survey and Epistemological Style Questionnaire provided an indication of participants' attitudes toward science, scientists and the theory and method of scientific inquiry. In most cases the Researchers exhibited responses that are generally attributed to an empiricist view of science. In contrast, Practitioners rejected most of these concepts. For example, Researchers reported being more focussed on external behaviour, while Practitioners were more concerned with the experiential (internal) content of a situation. Researchers believed in the concept of impersonal
causality, while Practitioners were more focussed on personal will to explain behaviour. Researchers believed the best way to study human behaviour was to break an issue down and study its elements individually (elementarism) while Practitioners believed that human behaviour can be best explained through a holistic approach, considering each part of an issue in relation to each other. Researchers highlighted the need for quantitative data, while Practitioners reported being more oriented towards qualitative information and methodology. Researchers also adopted a more reductionist orientation than did Practitioners, with a focus on biological determinism and physicalism. It can be concluded that the basic assumptions and practices of logical empiricism guide the work of conflict resolution researchers, while conflict resolution practitioners reject such approaches.

Similar effects were observed with respect to the Epistemological Style Questionnaire. Practitioners produced high levels of Metamorphism, indicating that they believed in an intuitive approach to science, which again was in contrast to the empiricist responses of Researchers. The same effect was recorded for Anti-empiricism, with Practitioners being in opposition to traditional empiricism.

Results of the Krasner and Houts Values Survey, that aimed to identify participants' social values regarding science, indicated that Practitioners and Researchers differed in the predicted directions. For example, Researchers believed that they were able to achieve the empiricist ideal of a value neutral position in science, while Practitioners believed that scientific knowledge claims were value laden. Also, Researchers leaned towards a survival of the fittest, or Social Darwinist philosophy, while Practitioners were more inclined towards Social altruism. The value neutral ideal of traditional
scientific epistemology is also apparent in Researchers' lower levels of concern for the
Scientist's social responsibility. Researchers' higher levels of Atheism contrasts with
Practitioner's general Theism.

In this thesis, substantial differences were found between researchers and practitioners
regarding how science should be done and how it affects society. The implications of
these basic differences are diverse, and they demonstrate a basic mismatch in the
epistemologies of researchers and practitioners in the conflict resolution field.
Therefore these findings support many of the opinions expressed by practice oriented
authors (documented in Chapter 6) that philosophical differences account for the
difficulties experienced by researchers and practitioners in the conflict resolution field.

13.3.3 General values systems

The most marked differences between Researchers and Practitioners on the measures of
general values were on the Social Interest Scale. This finding supported the previously
untested assertions that practitioners are more empathic towards others and more
interested in social equality than researchers (e.g., Della Noce, 1997; Severens, 1997).
These are congruent with the stereotypical view of practitioners as empathic and
affiliative in their dealings with others, and highly concerned with social equality. This
is in contrast with the stereotypical views of the scientist, that presents researchers as
value neutral in their interpretation of others. This type of difference is likely to
provoke further difficulties for researchers and practitioners, particularly regarding
issues such as neutrality and intervention in cases of social injustice (refer to Section
6.3.4, and the work of Folger and Bush (1996) and McCormick (1997)).
The results of the World Assumptions Scale were less supportive of values based
differences between researchers and practitioners. The only substantial differences were
that Practitioners reported having higher self worth and Researchers reported having a
higher degree of belief in the assumption that people control what happens to them in
life. These moderate differences are out weighed by the similarities between the
responses of Researchers and Practitioners on the other six subscales of Janoff—
Bulman's World Assumption scale which aims to provide a heuristic model to identify
the content of people's assumptive worlds. As minimal differences were recorded it can
be suggested that researchers and practitioners are members of a common culture.
Subsequently their assumptions about the world are relatively congruent. The finding of
similar "world views" for Researchers and Practitioners is contrary to the many
suggestions in the literature, particularly from practice oriented authors, that
practitioners and researchers have different world views (refer to Table 7.4). It is noted,
however, that this is based on the assumption that the World Assumptions Scale actually
measures world views.

These findings raise interesting questions about the assertions made by some practice
focussed authors and the members of the focus group, about what is meant by the
statement "researchers and practitioners have different world views". The most likely
explanation for this inconsistency is a definitional difficulty. Many of the concerns of
practitioners arise from their feeling that researchers fail to understand the activities and
values of practice, and that researchers expect practitioners to adopt more "scientific"
approaches. It is clear from the investigations of this thesis that practitioners (in
particular) generalise their experiences of researchers and conclude that researchers have
different values and/or different views of how the world should work. However it is
likely that researchers' different views about conflict resolution practice is indicative of the differences in activities, philosophy, and attitudes toward science as were detailed previously in Sections 13.3.1 and 13.3.2. That is, practitioners have generalised from "epistemological" differences, to more individual based "values" differences. It is also likely that this may be a function of discourse, as practitioner's lack the scientific language associated with proposing such differences in terms of epistemology. A more colloquial or practical discursive style is used by practitioners and practice focussed authors, and this leads to a lack of specificity about the perceived differences between researchers and practitioners. Therefore language like "different basic world views" and "different values" may in fact constitute the practitioners interpretation of divergent epistemologies. The findings of this thesis suggest that these differences seem to be more focussed on the doing of science and how this impacts on the future of the conflict resolution field rather than on differences in world views or values.

This conclusion is also supported by the findings of the Schwartz Values Survey. Overall there was very little difference recorded between the personal values of Researchers and Practitioners. Therefore it can be inferred that researchers and practitioners in the conflict resolution field are relatively similar in their personal values systems. This finding supports the proposition that the tension between researchers and practitioners is not related to individual differences so much as it is to epistemological differences.

These differences and assumptions can be conceived in terms of attribution theory, which in broad terms can be defined as the social cognition process of ascribing characteristics or motivations to ourselves and other people. This is done by observing
someone's behaviour, and attributing fundamental motivational characteristics to the person, which appear to be consistent with his or her overt behaviour (Jaspars, Fincham & Hewstone, 1983).

Of particular interest in the current study is the distinction between situational and dispositional attributions. For example, practice focussed authors and practitioners in the field (e.g., focus group participants who assisted in the development of hypotheses for the investigation), may interpret the situational characteristics of researchers (i.e., utilising a scientific approach, etc..) as representative of their dispositional characteristics, and may therefore conclude that they have different values and world views.

Further, there may be a polarisation effect due to both informational and normative biases. In the conflict resolution field most practitioners have had very limited opportunities to experience researchers. Their perceptions of researchers are therefore based primarily on their views of researcher attempts to measure the efficacy of conflict resolution practices. Attribution theory proposes that stereotypes are strengthened by informational and normative influences. In practitioners' perceptions of conflict resolution research, informational biases are reinforced by research findings that appear complex and research papers that are convoluted. Normative biases are reinforced by other practitioners presenting a negative view of research, especially as many practitioners believe that researchers present a threat to the field continuing as it is. Therefore the attributions about research and practice discussed so far may be challenged through increased communication between researchers and practitioners.
This would provide an opportunity for the various assumptions and stereotypes about roles to be tested and re-evaluated.

13.3.4 General personality issues

The personality issues that were measured as part of the conflict resolution survey were the Creative Personality Scale as a measure of creativity, and the Big Five Personality Questionnaire. Both of these measures resulted in significant differences between Researchers and Practitioners. Practitioners appeared to be significantly more creative than Researchers. This finding is in keeping with the common perception of practitioners as more artistic and creative, a central part of the rhetoric surrounding conflict resolution practice (see Section 4.4 for examples). In the idealised account of conflict resolution, the practitioner is usually considered as an agent of creativity, helping disputants to discover new ways of thinking about the conflict at hand, and proposing insightful, creative solutions or resolutions. In contrast, the researcher is generally considered as an agent of science who uses reason and rigorous method to investigate phenomena.

The results of the Big Five Personality Questionnaire suggest that researchers in conflict resolution believe that they are more conscientious and less outgoing than practitioners are. This is congruent with the standard view of the diligent, methodical scientist (refer to Section 5.1 for a summary). Conversely, the finding that Practitioners consider themselves to be more extroverted and more pleasant than Researchers supports the stereotypical representation of the warm, friendly and outgoing practitioner. In summary, the personality measures supported the notion of epistemological differences between researchers and practitioners in conflict resolution.
13.3.5 Summary of quantitative findings about researchers and practitioners

It can be concluded that researchers and practitioners in this sample did differ markedly in their core values systems. They did however exhibit diverse differences in relation to epistemological issues. They also differed in their conflict resolution activities, and their views about the future development of the conflict resolution field that are related to epistemic values. Finally, researchers and practitioners appeared to differ according to personality domains in ways support the identified differences in epistemology. These findings all confirm the predictions made in Chapter 6. The differences between research and practice discussed and summarised above were further reinforced and clarified through the qualitative analyses discussed below.

13.3.6 Experience and application

While the Researchers and Practitioners interviewed described being involved in the conflict resolution field for equivalent periods of time, the most outstanding aspect of these results was again the distinct lack of overlap in activities. These findings support the conclusion drawn from the quantitative findings that very little opportunity for communication exists between researchers and practitioners. Specific questions about activities and workloads revealed that many of the interviewees undertook combined roles. For example, only half of the Practitioners interviewed undertook practice 100\% of the time, their remaining time being spent on activities like administration and training. Similarly all but one of the Researchers interviewed reported that at least half of their time was spend in an academic teaching role in addition to their research role. Therefore while those involved in conflict resolution seem to be accustomed to multiple roles, these are restricted exclusively either research or practice oriented endeavours.
13.3.7 Training

The marked differences in levels of training between Researchers and Practitioners were most apparent in the interview data. The distinctively different profiles of training, and the attitudes expressed about what makes training important, seemed to be a primary source of tension between Researchers and Practitioners. For example, only one third of the Practitioners interviewed reported having undertaken a formal training course in mediation for their conflict resolution work. However, all of them reported having participated in skills based workshops, and felt that their training from other professions (e.g., psychology, social work), had suitably prepared them to work in conflict resolution.

This finding highlights one of the distinctive issues for conflict resolution in that there is no common standard of training among practitioners. It was clear from the interviews that this issue has caused a high degree of tension between researchers and practitioners in the movement toward the professionalisation of the field. Researchers typically argued for more rigorous, standardised training for practitioners of conflict resolution techniques, and reported that they valued formal training courses above workshops or prior training. This was presented as a desire to package the training for conflict resolution so that a minimum level of skill could be assured for practitioners. However, in contrast, Practitioners seemed to emphasise the diversity of training possibilities, and generally accepted that differences in training were acceptable, if not preferable. The fact that Researchers reported the desire to establish training standards is evidence of their aim to establish and sanction conflict resolution as an independent and autonomous field. Specific training and rigorous training methods are intended to build an authoritative image of conflict resolution practice that is based on scientific theory.
Therefore, such approaches are also aimed at introducing a scientist-practitioner model to conflict resolution. As mentioned before, most of the Practitioners appeared unmoved by such issues and were comfortable with a less scientific approach to training.

The range of background disciplines in conflict resolution compounds differences in opinions about training. This is not so in fields like clinical or counselling psychology where tension between researchers and practitioners also exists. In such fields practitioners at least have a standardised level of training, and they share at least 50% of their training with the researchers from that field. These common training experiences provide shared language to communicate with. As such a continuum does not exist in conflict resolution, it is not surprising that there are difficulties.

There were also marked differences in the training methods considered suitable by Researchers and Practitioners. The Practitioners interviewed consistently argued that their preferred method of training was through the direct application of conflict resolution techniques. For example, they reported that they "learned by doing", or they were self taught, and that an apprenticeship system with more experienced colleagues was an important aspect in their training. Such approaches to training were considered by the majority of Researchers to be unacceptable, and in contravention to the type of training prescribed by the scientist-practitioner model. The Researchers interviewed were generally highly qualified in terms of the required conventions for their chosen area of research. Interestingly, Researchers also raised similar themes to those expressed by Practitioners, in that they reported learning from colleagues and supervision, and also "learning by doing" were important aspects of their research.
training. This finding suggests that if communication between researchers and practitioners were to be improved, some common ground may exist around practical issues in training.

Both Researchers and Practitioners reported being highly satisfied with whatever degree of training they received. This also suggests a difference of opinion regarding what constitutes acceptable training, and can be interpreted in terms of epistemological differences. The culture of practice in conflict resolution allows one to learn conflict resolution practice through "on the job" experience, with only a minimal level of theoretical or model based knowledge, if any, required. This position diverges from the traditional view of practice that is upheld in the culture of research, and as demonstrated by the findings of the quantitative data regarding issues relevant to the scientist-practitioner debate.

13.3.8 Conflict resolution practice

The two most common themes in Practitioners' descriptions of their approaches to practice were that both training and commonsense were important in guiding practice, and that intuition was an important aspect in their work. While these issues will be considered later in terms of the interest groups responses (Section 13.4.2), it is useful to recognise at this stage the emphasis on intuition and commonsense as primary tools or methods in conflict resolution practice. Among conflict resolution practitioners, intuition is discussed unashamedly as a valuable, practical tool for working with clients. The validity, or even existence, of intuition is not even questioned. Rather, it is a highly valued and acceptable form of knowledge. These ideas are in direct contrast to those
implied by a scientist-practitioner model that incorporates the use of theoretical principles and hypothesis testing in the application of knowledge for practice.

13.3.9 Conflict resolution research

The findings regarding conflict resolution research activities strongly confirmed the propositions made about researchers in Chapter 6. It was apparent from the interviews that Researchers had very traditional empiricist views about the role of research. They emphasised the need to evaluate methods of conflict resolution practice and assumed the role of informing practitioners about research findings. Researchers' strong commitment to such roles appears to have influenced Practitioners' perceptions of research, resulting in the establishment of stereotypes concerning what constitutes acceptable research.

Three of the Practitioners interviewed reported having undertaken research. However, when asked about the nature of their research endeavours all were quick to dismiss their research efforts as "not real research". This was true of one Practitioner who had authored a book about a counselling model of conflict resolution practice. This finding implies that conflict resolution practitioners have an idealised view of what constitutes "real" research. However, in other fields (e.g., clinical or counselling psychology), the three Practitioners who responded positively could easily be considered to be undertaking important practice oriented research. Practitioners emphasised that their efforts could not be considered as "real research" because they were not rigorous or scientific enough. While this may be true, it highlights the fact that only a conventional empiricist model of research is accepted as adequate in conflict resolution. Therefore, it can be argued that conflict resolution practitioners lack access to, (or language for),
alternative forms of research, both in philosophy and/or methodology. In summary, as researchers' approaches have been so dominated by empiricist epistemology, practitioners have learned a stereotypical view of what "research" is, that is also based in empiricist epistemology.

13.3.10 Theoretical issues

There were marked differences between Researchers and Practitioners regarding the theoretical basis of conflict resolution. In general, Practitioners reported that theory did not affect conflict resolution practice, stating many reasons why there is little use for theoretical ideas in such practice. Popular themes were that practitioners are not interested in, nor understand, theory. However about 90% of Practitioners felt that there was consensus about theories and processes that underlie conflict resolution. This finding highlights a fundamental difference in the approaches of practitioners and researchers in the way that they construct the meaning of theory.

For practitioners "consensus about theory" seems to mean "consensus about how we do practice". That is, a shared acceptance of practice methods. This was supported by the unanimous Practitioner reports that issues relevant to practice were more important than any understanding of the theoretical basis of conflict resolution. Practitioners felt that the most important theoretical issue was "how they do practice". This very applied approach does not necessarily mean that what they do is not based on any theoretically justified model, but it does suggest a different epistemological position to the researcher perspective. While Researchers traditionally supported the development of practice models through properly implemented theories that have undergone acceptable scientific development, the main objective for Practitioners was to first use whatever
seems to work, and then perhaps try to understand it later. This is in contrast to the processes suggested by the idealised scientist-practitioner model.

Practitioners reported that having the same type of training as their practitioner colleagues is an advantage because it allows communication through a common language and the increased likelihood of shared values and philosophy. In contrast, these issues were not raised by any of the Researchers interviewed. Rather, while they all reported experiencing consensus with their colleagues about the theories and processes that underlie conflict resolution, they emphasised that an inevitable part of the research process is to reach points of disagreement, and that debate around theoretical issues was healthy. Clearly this is different to the approach of Practitioners who expressed nothing about debate or disagreement as a positive phenomenon for the development of the field. This suggests that the Researchers commonly have the verbal skills and language capacity to engage in such discussions. On the other hand, Practitioners gave the impression that they lacked the confidence to question the status quo of conflict resolution practice. This may be another effect of limited exposure to the scientific research tradition, and because they are unsure of the validity of their approach in scientific terms. Additionally, because conflict resolution practice is in a state of change with the advent of professionalisation, the high degree of uncertainty among practitioners is such that any form of criticism is avoided.

Researchers generally felt that practitioners had very little understanding of the theoretical underpinning of conflict resolution. Further, it was commonly felt by Researchers that practitioners have made no effort to try to understand research or theoretical developments in conflict resolution, and that they simply emphasise people
skills as more important than the validity of what they are doing in practice. The Researchers interviewed felt that practitioners should be more receptive to the theoretical development and research in the field because it is vital for the future of the field. In particular, Researchers asserted that it was the establishment of a theoretical foundation to the field that has contributed to its public acceptance through scientific validation. This issue will be discussed at length in Section 13.3.12. Further, Researchers seemed perturbed that practitioners did not seem to treat the scientific approach, and the knowledge that it generates, with a suitable degree of deference. These findings provide further evidence for Researchers’ adherence to, and expectation of, a scientist-practitioner model of practice for conflict resolution. The fact that Practitioners rejected such notions is evidence for the inadequacy of such models.

13.3.11 Relationship between research and practice

Although most of the Practitioners and half of the Researchers reported that the relationship between research and practice was poor, half of the Practitioners and all of the Researchers reported being positive about the potential for improvement in the relationship for the future. This finding implies that an awareness of the polarisation of research and practice does exist and most of the parties are willing to work towards its improvement. More specifically, Researchers emphasised the need for greater communication between research and practice. Associated with the need for increased communication was an emphasis on the efforts that researchers have initiated in the hope of improving relations, and the assertion that research had significantly contributed to, and even driven, the professionalisation of the field. An assumption of an empiricist approach, and the scientist-practitioner model, is that research is essential for the development of a field. Researchers believe in the epistemic authority of research as a
way of validating conflict resolution practice. Interestingly, these themes were not
raised in the interviews with Practitioners, implying that they do not subscribe to these
views.

The reasons reported by both Researchers and Practitioners to explain the poor relations
between research and practice included poor communication, the fact that researchers
and practitioners do different things, and the differing value base for research and
practice. These findings support the results of the quantitative study that differences in
activities, the lack of cross-over in roles, and differences in values about the doing of
research and practice (epistemological differences) contribute to the polarisation of
research and practice in conflict resolution.

There were notable differences between Researchers and Practitioners regarding the
reasons for the poor relationship that were specifically attributed to the attitudes and
behaviour of practitioners. In general, Practitioners were quite open (and some were
even defiant) about their lack of interest in research about conflict resolution. The
majority of Practitioners interviewed believed that research is irrelevant to practice, and
that they did not expect to gain anything from trying to keep up with theoretical
developments. All of these issues highlight that practitioners in conflict resolution are
not operating from the epistemological position that is required by an empiricist view of
relations between research and practice. The scientist-practitioner approach assumes
that practitioners both want and need to be informed about research findings to improve
their practice. In contrast, some of the Practitioners interviewed claimed to be "anti-
research"; attempting to completely distance their conflict resolution activities from any
form of research based endeavour. An integral part of this rejection of research was
based on a rejection of the values and philosophy of a scientific approach and as a way of protesting the professionalisation of the conflict resolution field (which they felt was being led by researchers).

In contrast, Researchers assumed the fundamental importance of research in validating the conflict resolution field. They acknowledged that some practitioners did not like or understand research, but asserted that this was because practitioners did not yet understand the value of research and its importance for the development of the field. Again this kind of approach does not acknowledge the philosophical reasons that practitioners might have for rejecting research, and assumes that if they understood the need for it, practitioners would be involved.

The interview data was also considered in terms of reasons for the poor relationship between research and practice that could be attributed to the activities and/or attitudes of researchers. The most important finding in this section was that only one of the Researchers interviewed acknowledged that researchers may negatively contribute to the poor relationship between researchers and practitioners. All of the other Researchers interviewed made no consideration of their own role in the difficulties between research and practice. The lack of self analysis on the part of researchers is another symptom of the privileged position of researchers and their belief that as neutral, disinterested observers of the field, it is natural that their actions would not contribute to any problems in the field.

In contrast, Practitioners complained that researchers did not understand the needs of practitioners and resented the fact that researchers consistently appeared to be "telling
practitioners what to do" or "how they should be doing their job". The researcher appears to believe that it is his/her duty to inform practitioners about the best way to do practice, as this is part of his/her disinterested, expert role. Many Practitioners clearly do not accept such a hierarchical distinction, and they are resentful of such behaviour. Additionally, Practitioners tended to report that researchers in conflict resolution were too self interested. This theme was founded on the Practitioners' belief that researchers sought to gain much more from a cooperative relationship between researchers and practitioners than they would. This was typically because Practitioners felt that they could help researchers with their research (and this was also acknowledged by the majority of Researchers who admitted that they needed the input of practitioners to do their work effectively), but research findings would not help them in any way. This perspective is also indicative of the Practitioners' desire to be considered more equally by researchers, as more than half also reported that they felt that researchers did not value the potential input and experience that practitioners could offer.

13.3.12 Professionalisation of the conflict resolution field.

Researchers, who commonly reported more empiricist epistemic values, assumed that the obvious next step in the development of the conflict resolution field is for it to be professionalised. This assumption motivates their desire to develop and test models of practice in order to demonstrate the efficacy of conflict resolution approaches. This entails the further assumption that it is, in fact, possible to test the efficacy of practice using empiricist methodology, and even that it is a requirement of good practice that it conforms to some theoretical model. On numerous occasions during the interviews, Practitioners rejected such notions, claiming that in most cases conflict resolution
research was completely irrelevant to the day to day activities of conflict resolution practitioners.

In general the majority of Practitioners tended not to support the professionalisation of the field, primarily because they felt it would change the nature of the conflict resolution practice. The general consensus was that the introduction of too many rules, requirements and evaluation methods would upset the creative and intuitive approach to conflict resolution practice and deny an exploration of the intrapersonal conflict experienced by disputants. The emphasis on the importance of the feelings and beliefs of disputants, and their conviction that researchers and theoretical models did not value the importance of such variables, was another source of tension for Practitioners.

On the other hand, Researchers argued the need for a scientific approach and the standardisation of training, in order to establish conflict resolution as a profession. They asserted that practitioners should understand the need for conflict resolution to be publicly validated as a scientifically sanctioned enterprise made up of professionals who were well trained in proven techniques. On a number of occasions, Researchers asserted the professional benefits that practitioners would enjoy if their practice was validated as scientific. In addition, Researchers stated that those practitioners who rejected such moves towards professionalisation and the associated involvement of researchers, were clearly doing so because they were concerned about their ability to qualify to the required standards, and that they rejected a scientific approach because they were afraid of being exposed.
Researchers came to these conclusions with no consideration of the validity of the philosophies or concerns of anti-professionalisation practitioners. Further, Researchers gave no consideration to what aspects of conflict resolution practice professionalisation might jeopardise (e.g., emotional factors). Rather, Researchers maintained a blind commitment to professionalisation as if it was the only natural step forward. Obviously these issues are based on the epistemic values of those involved in research.

13.3.13 Summary of qualitative findings about researchers and practitioners

In summary, the findings of the interviews support the conclusions drawn from the quantitative study. That is, researchers and practitioners tend to be in conflict because they do fundamentally different things, they have disparate views about the future development of the conflict resolution field, and that the majority of these differences can be explained by differences in the epistemic values of each group. In general, Researchers reported utilising an empiricist framework that relies inherently on the expectation that a scientific approach would validate the conflict resolution field. In contrast, Practitioners rejected such notions on two grounds: (1) on the basis of their opinion that research seems irrelevant to their everyday practice; and (2) that professionalisation (which they assume is being driven by researchers) will negatively change the emphasis of conflict resolution practice, particularly in the importance currently given to the feelings and emotions of disputing parties.

13.4 Research findings about interest groups

The analysis of data according to interest groups was detailed in Chapters 10 and 12. This comprised a consideration of the data in terms of the interests of practitioners from therapeutic, community or legal backgrounds, and researchers from either applied or
theoretical research backgrounds. The aim of this approach was that a more detailed exploration of the data would enable more specific understanding of the relationship between researchers and practitioners in conflict resolution.

In general, the findings justified this approach. It was apparent from the data that an analysis of the views of different kinds of researchers and practitioners reveals important information for an understanding of the relationship between research and practice. This is most evident in the area of epistemic values. Therefore the discussion of interest groups will focus primarily on points of epistemic differences between interest groups. The discussion is divided according to a consideration of quantitative data (Section 13.4.1) and qualitative data separately (Section 13.4.2). Section 13.4.3 summarises these discussions.

13.4.1 Quantitative findings

The quantitative study revealed consistent findings about interest groups. In most cases the Therapeutic and Community interest groups responded equivalently. Similarly, but less frequently, the Applied and Theoretical Research groups produced relatively congruent results. The Legal interest group provided the highest amount of variability in results, aligning with the other practitioners on some issues, and with the researchers on other issues.

The similarity between the Therapist and Community interest groups was apparent in their consistently similar responses across all four domains of the quantitative survey. There was, for example, a high degree of similarity between these two interest groups for activities and information sources. A point of interest was that these groups
recorded a higher level of religious affiliation than the other interest groups, and that they identified emotionally focussed advantages, and spiritual figures, in the advantages and influential figures reported. These examples illustrate the importance of values based motivations in many conflict resolution practitioners, especially those drawn to work in community and therapeutic settings.

As was documented in Chapter 4, the development of the conflict resolution field was influenced to a large degree by religious groups (e.g., Quakers) and social consciousness movements (e.g., the peace movement). These influences are evident in the values systems of the Therapeutic and Community interest groups. While the analyses of values at the level of Researchers versus Practitioners revealed few differences, the interest group analyses provided more informative data. For example, the Therapeutic and Community interest groups measured much higher than Lawyers, Applied Researchers and Theoretical Researchers on the Benevolence of others and Benevolence of the world factors of the World Assumptions Scale. The same pattern was demonstrated by the findings of the Social Interest scale indicating a significantly higher degree of empathy and concern for others. In addition, Therapists and Community workers recorded higher levels of Benevolence on the Schwartz Values Survey. These results confirm that practitioners involved in conflict resolution for therapeutic and community work applications are particularly motivated by genuine concerns for their fellow man. In contrast the Legal, Applied and Theoretical Research interest groups recorded consistently lower levels of Social Interest, and were characteristically more Power and/or Achievement orientated in their values. The Legal interest group recorded significantly lower levels of belief in the Benevolence of others and the Benevolence of
the world. Therefore analyses according to different interest groups provide a useful insight into the motivations of those involved in the field.

These trends also appeared in the measures of personality that were included in the survey. The Therapeutic and Community interest groups reported higher levels of Extroversion, and Pleasantness, and lower levels of Conscientiousness, than the Legal interest group and both the Applied and Theoretical Researchers. These three interest groups were typically less Extroverted, less Pleasant, and more Conscientious. In addition, Therapists and Community workers rated as significantly more creative than the Legal and both Research groups. In summary, the Legal interest group aligned with Researchers on most general values and personality measures.

These findings provide a more useful contrast than those of the analyses conducted purely between Researchers and Practitioners. The Legal interest group appeared to account for much of the variation among practitioners, and this suggests that they are a driving force in the movement towards a more conservative approach to practice in conflict resolution. For example, the Legal interest group consistently rated mediation as a "science" even to the same extent as Theoretical Researchers. This is in contrast to results for the Therapeutic and Community interest groups, where mediation was rated as an "art" as expected. Similarly, the Legal interest group took a more pragmatic approach to the advantages of conflict resolution, which was more similar to the Applied and Theoretical Researchers than the other Practitioner interest groups.

These trends imply that the attitudes and values held by members of the Legal interest group are more similar to those of researchers than other practitioners. This effect was
most clearly demonstrated in the quantitative study that aimed to measure the issues relevant to the scientist-practitioner debate, and the measure of beliefs about mediation. The Legal interest group agreed with the research interest groups that intuition had no role in mediation practice and that the professionalisation of the conflict resolution field was a desirable outcome. This was in contrast to the assertions of the Therapeutic and Community interest groups that were intuitively focussed and opposed to the professionalisation of the field. This finding suggests major epistemic differences between practitioner interest groups. However, the fact that the Legal interest group aligned with the Therapeutic and Community interest groups in their mutual negative regard for the need to review the conflict resolution field (as opposed to the Applied and Theoretical Research interest groups that were pro-review), suggest that the Lawyers are also motivated by other concerns. Their anti-review stance implies that they, like the majority of other practitioners, are satisfied with the current level of conceptual development in the field. It can be argued that the Legal interest group may be responding in this way primarily because of their relatively high degree of mastery or dominance over current concepts, rather than because of specific epistemic concerns. Evidence for this perspective is further discussed in Section 13.4.2, however it is essentially an issue of power-knowledge (refer to Section 5.2). As the Legal interest group claims to have the highest level of knowledge, they also occupy a position of relative power as practitioners. Attempts to redevelop the field at a conceptual level may therefore be interpreted as threatening this position.

With regard to the issues relevant to the scientist-practitioner debate, the Legal interest group tended to align once again with the Research interest groups rather than with the other Practice groups. This domain was most obviously related to the epistemological
orientation of interest groups. For example, the Krasner and Houts Values Survey identifies the Legal interest group as having essentially the same epistemic values as Researchers. These are associated with an empiricist approach to science with high levels of Social Darwinism, Neutrality, Liberal political philosophy and Atheism. The opposite effects were recorded for Therapeutic and Community practitioners, who were shown to be opposed to such values and attitudes.

This theme was also reinforced by the results of the Epistemological Style Questionnaire where the Therapeutic and Community interest groups were categorised as highly Intuitive and Anti-empiricist in their approach to science. In contrast, the Legal and both Research interest groups described more traditional epistemologies, being more Objective and Empiricist in their approaches. On the measure of Epistemological Style, the Legal interest group also matched the Theoretical Research interest group in their high levels of Reductionism, which is further evidence of an empiricist paradigm guiding the practice of lawyers in conflict resolution.

Finally, the results of the Theoretical Orientation measure also confirm the divergent epistemologies between interest groups. Interestingly, the most empiricist results were recorded by the Legal interest group. They achieved high scores for Factual orientation, Behavioural content, Elementarism and Quantitative orientation, and moderate scores for Biological determinism and Physicalism, all of which separated them from the other practitioner interest groups, and aligned them closely with the Theoretical Researchers. An interesting point related to these issues was the fact that the Applied Research interest group was clearly more liberal than the Theoretical Researchers in their epistemic orientation. This issue is discussed in detail in Section 13.4.2.
These findings raise some very interesting questions and discussion points regarding the relationship between different types of practitioner interest groups. The data from the quantitative study clearly indicate that the Legal interest group differs from the Therapeutic and Community interest groups on nearly all of the domains researched, with the most substantive differences being in the areas that directly measured epistemic values. As documented in Chapters 3 and 6, the tenets of professional legal practice are derived from an empiricist framework (Fuller, 1969). For the majority of legal personnel involved in conflict resolution, regardless of its origins, a dispute will be transformed and approached in terms of a legal positivist approach (Menkel-Meadow, 1984; 1985). While some authors claim that the introduction of mediation and alternative dispute resolution strategies have led to changes in the culture of legal positivism (e.g., Posner, 1990), it seems from the current research that these proposed changes are slow to emerge.

13.4.2 Qualitative findings

Closer analysis of the interview data suggests that while differences in epistemic values may indeed be characteristic of interest groups, the functions of these differences are quite distinctive. Therefore each interest group is discussed below in terms of their epistemic values, and the postulated reasons that they either support or reject empiricist epistemology.

A distinctive feature of the Therapeutic interest group was their awareness of the aims and assumptions of empiricist approaches. In fact, on numerous occasions throughout the interviews, they noted they understanding such issues, but actively rejected them. Further, they asserted that their own approach was a valid and successful means for the
practice of conflict resolution, and they resented the intrusion of researchers into practice. Their basic message was that Therapeutic practitioners had developed effective practice methods and experiential training procedures that valued intuitive processes above scientific approaches. The Therapists were resentful of attempts by researchers to evaluate and regulate their work. They considered these efforts by researchers as strategies employed to control and take over the field, or at least to assert their authority. Therefore they considered empiricist approaches to practice, and the associated efficacy research, as political tools. Also, they considered that attempts to professionalise the field were led primarily by researchers who were trying to assert their authority and secure their own positions.

Members of the Therapeutic interest group were motivated by their desire to help disputants transform their experience of conflict, not only for problem resolution, but also for personal growth. They emphasised the importance of the cognitive and affective aspects of conflict resolution, and presented what was essentially a constructivist position about how conflict should be approached. The Therapeutic interest group feared that the trend towards professionalisation would limit their ability to practice in this way and were therefore motivated to oppose approaches that were based on empiricist assumptions.

The Community interest groups were less openly opposed to empiricist approaches to practice than the Therapeutic interest group. However, they appeared to know very little about the assumptions and aims of such approaches. Therefore they seemed to accept the idea of professionalisation, and hoped to gain in some way from such developments, but they still rejected the concept of research about practice. It seemed that they
rejected research because it was different, but didn't seem to know why they felt research was not desirable. It is likely that this was because they lacked the training and language required to facilitate discussion about matters philosophical.

This tendency was also apparent in the way that members of the Community interest group appeared to single-mindedly support their own approach to practice. They seemed to discuss the issues without any real sense that one might be criticised for having no formal training or perhaps that intuition is not widely considered as a totally acceptable approach. In this respect, they differed from the Therapeutic group. As mentioned above, the Therapeutic group seemed to know that their approach was not acceptable in the light of empiricist criteria, and they were clearly rejecting empiricist approaches on philosophical grounds. The Community interest group seemed unaware of this distinction. Rather, the Community interest group appeared to reject research simply because it was different to practice, and because it threatened to raise questions about the quality of their approaches. Interestingly, members of the Community interest group also reported that they were in fact in support of research that could help to professionalise the field and help to justify their own importance in the field.

The Legal interest group provided a third perspective. As highly trained practitioners using conflict resolution techniques for very specific purposes, they were unperturbed by researchers' interest in the field. Unlike the other practitioners, they reported that increased research and the introduction of standards and fixed methodologies for practice were positive developments for the conflict resolution field. There are three broad reasons for this. First, it is well established that the philosophical tenets of conventional legal training are essentially positivist, and therefore based in empiricism,
which values professionalisation. Second, the socialisation processes experienced by
lawyers are closely aligned to a professional approach to practice and the associated
epistemic gains of professionalisation. This is in contrast to the socialisation processes
experienced by therapeutic and community oriented practitioners that does not
emphasise the same professional values. In fact, legal conflict resolution practitioners
are likely to have experienced a very similar professional socialisation process to that
experienced by scientists. Third, the fact that lawyers are already in a very strong
professional position make them virtually invulnerable to any scrutiny from research
into the field. Therefore, while Therapeutic and Community practitioners are upset by
the increased interest in conflict resolution practice by researchers, the Legal
practitioners welcome it, because it will contribute to the further professionalisation of
the field, and thereby strengthen their position as the most highly trained practitioner
group.

The Legal interest group provided many examples in the interviews that supported their
already established professionalism. They typically achieved this by asserting the depth
of their training and the rigour of their techniques, and expressing negative views about
the training and skill level of non-legal conflict resolution practitioners. However, on
questioning, it was clear that specific knowledge of practice methods was no better
among members of the Legal interest group than it was in any other group. The Legal
interest group gave the impression that their approach was much more behaviourally
focussed than the Therapeutic and Community interest groups, and therefore more
scientific. This issue is a powerful discriminator between interest groups. The
Therapeutic and Community interest groups assert the importance of intuition and other
subjective, cognitive practice processes because they focus so closely on the mental
events and emotional concerns of their clients. In contrast, the Lawyers were typically concerned with behaviour through negotiating different positions, reporting that they do not normally consider the beliefs or feelings of clients. It is likely that these differences are also representative of epistemic differences.

The differences between Applied and Theoretical Research interest groups were also highlighted through analyses of the interview data. The Applied Research interest group reported fewer empiricist ideas in their interviews. They appeared to take a very realistic and sensitive approach to research about conflict resolution practice. They appeared to be very aware of possible philosophical differences between researchers and practitioners, and were aware of the concerns of practitioners about traditional approaches to practice orientated conflict resolution research. In addition, the Applied Research group asserted the importance of qualitative research methodologies to achieve their aim of creating a better understanding of how conflict resolution practitioners work.

In this sense the Applied Researcher interest group can be conceived as engaged in "advocacy" research. They openly acknowledged that they were trying to better understand conflict resolution practice as it exists, and to assist practitioners with their work. Applied Researchers seemed to be engaged in discovering the value of different practice techniques, and were concerned with facilitating an improved understanding of conflict resolution practice without necessarily wanting to change it.

In contrast, the Theoretical Researchers were concerned purely with efficacy, with no demonstrated interest in promoting the value of existing conflict resolution practice
methodologies. Therefore, Theoretical Researchers are best conceived as engaging in "disinterested" research, which is more closely aligned with an empiricist epistemology. Another interesting finding was that Theoretical Researchers claimed that the effort of researchers was responsible for the validation of conflict resolution, and therefore the popularity it now enjoys, further reinforcing Theoretical Researchers' complete acceptance of empiricist approaches to practice.

13.4.3 Summary of interest group findings

As in the case of the dichotomous research-practitioner group differences, many of the differences between interest groups can be related to epistemic authority. At one end of the spectrum are the Theoretical Researchers who take what is essentially an empiricist approach. They assert that their views are based on a privileged scientific position and expect all other interest groups to abide by their authority. The Legal interest group is arguably the second most empiricist group as its philosophy is aligned with the Theoretical Researchers. They are relatively disengaged from any particular struggle for authority because the legal profession already sanctions them.

According to the findings of the quantitative studies, the Applied Research group are also empiricist in their epistemic values. However, in practical situations they appear to take the middle ground in order to advocate for the future of conflict resolution practice. In doing so they are relatively less empiricist in terms of epistemology, and have a high degree of "street credibility" with practitioners who see them as offering the only positive form of research or structured inquiry into conflict resolution practice. Therefore applied researchers could form a vital link between research and practice, as
they seem to occupy the middle ground in relation to the epistemic spectrum being discussed.

Next is the Community interest group, which is essentially equivalent to the Therapeutic groups in terms of epistemic values, but appear less certain in their assertions related to establishing an authoritative position. Clearly, they are not as well informed as the Therapeutic interest group, and are therefore less open in their condemnation of empiricist approaches to practice. Finally, at the opposite end to Theoretical Researchers is the Therapeutic interest group. These practitioners plainly reject the assumptions and approaches of empiricist researchers. The Therapeutic interest group rejects empiricist approaches on philosophical grounds, and is informed by postmodern ideas and/or alternative epistemologies. Additionally, they are motivated to help disputants express intrapersonal aspects of conflict and find meaning in their experience of conflict through a constructivist approach. In regard to epistemic authority, they seem confident that their position is as valid as that of the Theoretical Researchers, and they were irritated that researchers seemed to be taking credit for the success of the conflict resolution field.

These results confirmed and further explained the findings about the research-practice dichotomy (Section 13.3) and demonstrated the need to also consider differences between types of researchers and practitioners. The interest group analyses (particularly the interviews) allowed more specific investigations to be made about the nature of the relationship between research and practice in conflict resolution. In summary, the interest group findings highlighted that the differences in the cultures of research and practice in conflict resolution are principally related to epistemic values,
the struggle for epistemic authority, and opinions about the professionalisation of the field. It can be concluded that the traditional scientist-practitioner model of relations between research and practice is inadequate in conflict resolution.

13.5 Limitations and suggestions for future research

In general, this thesis can be criticised on three major grounds. A discussion of these limitations will constitute this section. Section 13.5.1 discusses the extent to which the original aims of the studies were successfully translated into research questions. Section 13.5.2 raises questions about the extent to which the results can be generalised. Section 13.5.3 discusses the extent to which the findings of the thesis can be translated from theoretical constructs and scales, back into the meaningful concepts described by individuals involved in the field. Finally, Section 13.5.4 proposes a number of possible future research questions that might guide future work in this area.

13.5.1 Translation of original aims into research questions.

In all social research the extent to which the original aims of the studies can be translated into meaningful research questions is an issue of concern. In this thesis, the most notable question is: Do the various scales and measurements used in the quantitative study adequately address the issues of differences between research and practice in a meaningful way? It is acknowledged that the reduction of broad questions to specific scales is problematic, and possibly limits the extent to which research can address practical questions. Therefore this issue was addressed in two ways. First, the use of the focus group to generate research questions and contribute to the content of the survey instrument was paramount in the quantitative methodology. Second, the extensive piloting of the survey provided an opportunity to discuss with researchers and
practitioners possible difficulties of this nature. Both of these approaches contributed to the confidence with which one can assert that meaningful research was conducted. To further address these issues, the conclusions drawn form the various results sections were relatively conservative, and the qualitative data was used to confirm the findings of the quantitative study.

13.5.2 Generalisability of findings

The extent to which the results obtained from this thesis can be generalised to other populations is perhaps the most likely criticism and is clearly arguable. It is fully accepted that since these studies focussed only on the British experience of the conflict resolution field, the results are limited in their generalisability. The relatively small sample size is an issue of some concern, however, the study population represented the majority of the eligible people in the sample population. The results gained from both quantitative and qualitative means can be used to suggest important research questions to guide further studies in other samples. Also, when considered in conjunction with the non-empirical research detailed through the literature reviews in the first half of this thesis, the research findings constitute a useful addition to the understanding of the conflict resolution field.

13.5.3 Translation of findings to practical significance

The extent to which the findings of the qualitative and quantitative studies can be translated back into the meaningful concepts described originally by individuals involved in the field is also an important question. The first step in ensuring the relevance of findings was to ensure that the constructs that were investigated were meaningful. The use of practitioners and researchers to construct the goals and to test
the method of measurement for this program of research was an attempt to maintain a desirable level of reliability. Also, the use of both quantitative and qualitative research methodologies strengthens the likelihood of practical, reliable findings (van Dijk, 1997).

However, it is acknowledged that the direction taken in discussing results primarily around epistemological concerns could be conceived as lacking in practical relevance. This is a criticism often used against any philosophically orientated discussion, but it is especially relevant for the discussion of differences between the cultures of research and practice. Until now, very little research had tried to address the issues relevant to this thesis. In the past the literature has comprised personal opinions and anecdotal assertions. Therefore this study attempted to establish empirical evidence of the differences between researchers and practitioners in conflict resolution.

13.5.4 Suggestions for future research

A number of suggestions for future research in this area can be made. First, it is recommended that comprehensive studies of the relationship between research and practice in conflict resolution be conducted in other countries. These efforts should be aimed at countries or populations where the conflict resolution movement is presently more significantly advanced (e.g., USA, Australia). In the current study there were not enough participants to reliably conduct analyses of researchers and practitioners, or interest groups, by gender. Future studies might attempt to increase the number of participants so that such detailed investigations are possible. Presently the conflict resolution field is more developed and an increased number of participants are probably available. Also, it is recommended that in future years a follow up study be conducted
to investigate if professionalisation of the field has had any affect on epistemic values and practical behaviours.

A related suggestion would be to investigate whether efforts to improve communication between researchers and practitioners (and even interest groups), actually made any lasting impact on the relationship between groups, and led to positive developments for the field. It is naturally assumed that good communication is desirable, but given epistemic differences, it may not be practically possible. It would also be desirable to develop a better understanding of the epistemological position of practitioners. At the moment it is known as "not- empiricist", perhaps constructivist, but this issue needs greater clarification. The over-use of terms like "constructivist" and "postmodernism" has rendered them relatively meaningless for definitional purposes. It would be useful to develop a more specific, practical understanding of practitioner epistemologies. Similarly, greater awareness of applied researcher epistemologies would provide a useful direction for other conflict resolution practice research.

Conflict resolution practice would also benefit from an increased amount of research. An ideal situation would be to pursue efforts that encourage practitioners to be involved in research endeavours. It is acknowledged that this runs counter to the findings that suggest practitioners are not particularly interested in research and do not value the findings of research endeavours. However, it is suggested that the values and concerns of practitioners should guide such research. This input could be removed from the scientist-practitioner approach, aimed at understanding the skills and unique abilities of conflict resolution practitioners, particularly from the perspective of any alternative epistemological position that they might suggest. It should also be noted from the
results of this research program that meaningful quantitative and qualitative research is possible when appropriate consultation with practitioners has been undertaken.

It is clear from the current findings that the traditional approaches of researchers antagonise practitioners, and do not facilitate communication. Therefore researchers should make efforts to utilise methodological approaches that are more aligned to epistemic values of practitioners. For example, they might consider using qualitative techniques where possible. Furthermore, researchers should be aware of practitioners' general perceptions of research and try to be more relatable and understanding in their dealings with practitioners.

13.6 The future of the relationship between research and practice in conflict resolution

This thesis has provided data about the relationship between research and practice in conflict resolution. It has been shown that difficulties lie in the vastly different epistemological positions of researchers and practitioners, and the struggle for epistemic authority among interested parties involved in the field. The future of the relationship between research and practice in conflict resolution requires that these epistemological differences be addressed.

The standard view of how research and practice should relate is based on a empiricist epistemology and the idealised views of the scientist-practitioner model. This is in contrast to the practice oriented conception of conflict resolution practice as an art form. In understanding the relationship between the art and science of conflict resolution, it is interesting and informative to briefly explore the origins of the tension
between cultures of art and science. Historically "science" did not exist as a "profession" until the 19th Century. It originally developed from "natural philosophy" which was established in the 17th Century as the pursuit of gentlemen (Schwartz, 1992b). Therefore to do science was to be distinguished. The activity of science was high in status, as it was in pursuit of a superior level of knowledge. The rational man was the cultured man, and thus science was an integral part of the class system.

The activities of those involved in the natural sciences were distinguished from those involved in trades, which was considered to be the realm of artisans. Artisans were seen to ignore theory, drawing on practices that were handed down, oral traditions, or previous examples of works completed. Usually these were not written down or developed into any advanced theoretical model. A fundamental distinction is that the activities of an artisan are based on tradition because they have been shown to work. However, the guiding principles of these practices are implicit rather than explicit. In contrast, the guiding principle in science is for the scientist to be explicit. Therefore the aim of scientific researchers is to make the implicit processes associated with the work of artisans more visible or explicit.

The work of conflict resolution practitioners could easily be conceived as "artisanry" or a "craft". They claim to use conflict resolution practices because they work, and at a broad level these practices are implicit. Researchers feel that they need to make such processes explicit. To ask if conflict resolution is an art or a science is therefore not appropriate; rather there are different goals to each perspective. On the basis of the literature reviewed in this thesis (e.g., Menkel-Meadow, 1993; Saposnek, 1993), and the findings of the empirical research, it appears that conflict resolution is best
conceived as both art and science. Art and science are not necessarily opposites; to think that they are is to be restricted to the empiricist framework that prevails the researcher view of conflict resolution practice. In the field of conflict resolution, theory alone does not provide a suitable foundation for practice. However, theory does provide a set of terminology or discursive practices that are progressive and valuable. The use of standard terminology helps to advance those ideas that have previously been unclear or unarticulated. That is, a scientific approach can assist in the externalisation of the practices of practitioners so that they are understood by more people through a common language. Also, different theories provide different ways of explaining phenomenon, and therefore assist in progression towards a common language.

It is possible that the conflict resolution field has been drawn into a way of thinking about art and science that has not been productive. This is mainly because the traditional models (e.g., the scientist-practitioner model) of relations between practice (art) and theory (science) are highly idealised. The challenge for the future of conflict resolution is to find better ways for relations between research and practice, and to introduce new ways of thinking about applied technologies like conflict resolution. During these processes it should be accepted that there will be different approaches that will be outside of conventional views of the scientist-practitioner. This is elucidated by Menkel-Meadow, (1993, p.325):

"... An art is best observed, and the effort to specify the criteria for watching art is a worthy enterprise. Like all "art criticism", however, it is not clear to me that we will always have convergence in our evaluations ..."
Such changes require a new conception of the artistic aspects of practice. While in the past the "tacit knowing" and "intuition" of practice have been harshly treated by the empiricist paradigm, they remain the substance of conflict resolution practice that aims to help disputants uncover their core values and motivations and come to a resolution where essential needs and interests are met (Burton, 1990; Fisher, 1997; Mitchell & Banks, 1996; Rothman, 1997). The conflict resolution practitioner is called upon to process and understand the disputants' constructions of reality, and at the same time facilitate the negotiation. Therefore they are involved in the exercise of intuitive and analytical skills at the same time. That is, the conflict resolution practitioner's role is the ongoing integration of subjective factors (e.g., "systematic intuition") and objective aspects of a conflict (Benjamin, 1990). An acceptance of both the subjective and objective components of conflict resolution practice is very important for the future of the field. This is true for both practice and research, for without conflict resolution practice there would be no need for conflict resolution research.

The importance of alternative conceptions of practice, like the approaches suggested by Schön (e.g., 1983; 1987; 1991) are vital to the future understanding of conflict resolution practice. Empiricist conceptions like the scientist-practitioner model are not workable. A conflict resolution practitioner's job requires the sort of reflective practice that is outlined in Schön's approach that addresses the uncertainty and complexity of conflict resolution practice. In an empiricist approach to conflict resolution, the practitioner is a third party expert. In contrast, in Schön's approach, the practitioner evaluates not only the issue at hand, but also his or her own affect on the process, and presuppositions of neutrality and objectivity are abandoned.
There have been a number of attempts at incorporating the concept of a reflective approach in conflict resolution. These have included an awareness of the importance of the reflective practitioner (Keller, 1997), and the need to approach conflict resolution practice from the perspective of reflexive dialogue (Rothman, 1996). These approaches have also filtered into approaches to research into conflict resolution practice. For example, the notion of using a reflective research paradigm (Kressel, 1997), and action research approaches (Rothman, 1997), have emerged of late. Central to such approaches is that the contributions of practitioners need to be included in understanding of conflict resolution. While typically researchers resist the extra effort required to achieve such aims, it should be noted that the lay contributions of practitioners who do not use theoretical explanations are considered by some authors as equally valid as any scientific interpretations (Semin & Gergen, 1990).

As it was widely documented throughout the thesis, the issues of research and practice in conflict resolution have mirrored the issues relevant to other fields with a strong practice orientation. These fields have undergone similar problems and have attempted to address the major philosophical and practical problems of the scientist-practitioner model. It is suggested that the future of conflict resolution would be advanced through a consideration of such approaches. For example, in social work it has been proposed to reframe practice research in order that the pre-eminent role of the practitioner is recognised, and that qualitative research methodology (either to complement quantitative methods, or to stand alone) is used to evaluate practice outcomes (MacEachron & Gustavsson, 1997).
In the discipline of psychology the action research paradigm has been promoted as a more appropriate guiding metaphor for inquiry into issues of research and practice, because it has value in promoting a culture of inquiry based on collaborative norms and the reciprocity of theory and practice (Hoshmand & O'Byrne, 1996). However these methodological changes (and associated changes in epistemology), are heavily reliant on the researchers' willingness to engage in new approaches. Therefore alternative epistemologies are suggested to be used to address practice research. For example, the adoption of a constructivist epistemology in research may circumvent some of the problems traditionally ascribed to the supposed research/practice gap (Fourie, 1996). It is suggested that making the epistemology of psychological research and practice include a meta-methodological understanding will have significant benefits for researchers and practitioners (Hoshmand & Martin, 1994).

These approaches should be applied in future efforts to advance cooperation between research and practice in conflict resolution. However, such initiatives will be difficult to sustain because of the emerging professionalisation of the field involving the re-embracing of empiricist epistemology. Professionalisation is the primary method used to institutionalise expertise (Abbott, 1988), and this elevates the practitioner to the unrealistic position of the professional who as an expert, uses a tested body of knowledge and proven skills to solve problems. However, it would be a regressive step to simply attempt to make conflict resolution practice more authoritative. The emphasis should not be on merely professionalising practice, but rather on understanding and enhancing conflict resolution practice.
The professionalisation of conflict resolution can also be considered from a Foucauldian perspective of power-knowledge (Pinzon, 1996). Considering conflict resolution as a profession means that it will generate its own field of knowledge, become more immersed in the power networks that condition the generation of that knowledge, and be immersed in the process of self-promotion. Foucault (1982) identified "professionalisation, institutionalisation and compensation" as three common effects of power on the construction of knowledge. It is now broadly accepted that these effects have been experienced in conflict resolution (Pinzon, 1996; Silbey, 1993).

Therefore, if the conflict resolution field is to advance in any stable and meaningful way, three components are required. First, new methodologies and philosophies with which to understand practice are needed. Second, practitioners need to be included in inquiries into the dynamics of practice. And third, a suitable degree of resistance to the persuasive arguments for professionalisation that are couched in empiricist epistemology needs to be maintained. This is in order that the implicit skills of practitioners are not lost or misrepresented, as the field becomes institutionalised. Finally, it is suggested that researchers and practitioners are mutually responsible for resolving the difficulties associated with working under competing epistemologies.

13.7 Conclusions

Ironically this thesis has been concerned with conflict between communities in the field of conflict resolution. It has constituted an in-depth analysis of the field, and in particular, the relations between researchers and practitioners. It was shown that a considerable degree of tension and unrest exists between the cultures of research and practice.
The first six chapters addressed the thesis aims to conceptually analyse the various influences on the emergence of the conflict resolution field, and the associated tension between research and practice in conflict resolution. The remainder of the thesis was directed at empirical investigations, exploring the relationship between research and practice in conflict resolution. These also demonstrated that the anecdotal evidence and assertions made by practice oriented authors about differences between the communities of research and practice are well founded.

Overall clear differences between researchers and practitioners were found to exist. It was demonstrated that these differences could be explained through an understanding of the epistemological differences in the communities of research and practice. Differences also existed between groups with different professional interests in the field, and could also be explained by differences in epistemology and efforts to assert authority in the field.

In summary, the specific aims of the thesis have been addressed. The broader objective was to add to the existing knowledge about conflict resolution, in particular the relations between research and practice communities. The thesis provides a clearer understanding of the factors that have affected the formation of the conflict resolution field, and the issues that are paramount to its continuing development.
APPENDIX A

SURVEY INSTRUMENT
University of Adelaide
Department of Psychology

Conflict Resolution Survey
Conflict Resolution Survey

Conflict Resolution is, as you are no doubt aware, a field of rising popularity. Different forms of Conflict Resolution are now being used in a diversity of areas. In the survey, the terms Conflict Resolution, Alternative Dispute Resolution, and Mediation, although they are different processes, will be considered as interchangeable for the sake of simplicity.

The purpose of this questionnaire is to survey people from a variety of different backgrounds, who are involved in Conflict Resolution. You will be asked to respond to questions regarding your experiences in, and your attitudes about, Conflict Resolution. Questions will also be asked that relate to your attitudes, your values and your personality. I feel that this information will be useful with regard to our research which concerns the development of Conflict Resolution, and the relationship between research and practice.

Please understand that this questionnaire is anonymous and the information in individual questionnaires is strictly confidential. Names will not be taken under any circumstances. Individual data will not be divulged in any form. Analyses will be based on group data, which will not allow any person's individual response to be identified. Similarly, the results of the survey will be published in a form which will not allow any person's individual response to be identified.

I would like you to place your completed questionnaire in the envelope provided and then post it directly to the University. The envelope is pre-addressed. Unfortunately I am unable to pay the postage as you will be sending completed questionnaires from overseas. I will be extremely grateful if you would place the appropriate stamp over the "postage paid Australia" stamp and send the completed questionnaire to me. I understand that there will be some small cost incurred by you in doing this, but I hope that it does not deter you from being a part of this study.

Please answer all questions openly and honestly, bearing in mind that we have good reason for asking all of them. If we can obtain the clearest picture possible of your own views and feelings the results of the survey will be more useful.

If you have any questions or comments about the survey please don't hesitate to write them down, or you are welcome to contact me at the University of Adelaide, Psychology Department, GPO Box 498, Adelaide 5000, AUSTRALIA, phone (08) 2285693. Thankyou for your co-operation,

Andrew McDowell,
Postgraduate Student.

When you are ready please begin. Please note that there are questions on both sides of the page. It is important that you complete all the items if possible. However it is not necessary to complete the whole survey in one sitting. If you feel more comfortable, take breaks between sections of the survey.
SECTION 1: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. What is your age? __________ years

2. What gender are you? Male / Female

3. If you consider yourself to be religious, please state your religious preference, otherwise write N/A _______________

4. What is your nationality? _______________

5. What is your marital status? (please circle the category/s that apply to you).
   1. Married
   2. Single (never married)
   3. Defacto relationship (living together)
   4. Divorced
   5. Steady relationship

6. What is the highest level of education you have completed?
   1. Primary school
   2. Secondary school
   3. Normal Bachelors degree
   4. Bachelor degree and fourth year qualification
   5. Masters degree
   6. Doctorate

7. If you have been to University please indicate the type degree you have attained
   1. Arts
   2. Science
   3. Law
   4. Social Work
   5. Psychology
   6. Education
   7. Other (please specify) ____________________
SECTION 2: WHAT DO YOU DO IN CONFLICT RESOLUTION?

1. Please indicate whether you consider yourself primarily as a 'researcher', or primarily as a 'practitioner' in this field. If you consider yourself to be a combination of the two, please indicate which is your main orientation. If you find it too difficult to decide, you may circle 'both'.

Please circle one
1. Practitioner
2. Researcher
3. Both

2. Please indicate which of the following activities describe the type of work you do in conflict resolution. Then estimate the average number hours you spend each week, on each activity (please note you may rate any number of activities).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Hours / week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Academic teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Consultancies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Please indicate the terms that you use to describe the process of Conflict Resolution that you are involved in (please note that you may tick any number of terms). If there is a specific, (well known) model that you use please specify in the space next to the term, the name of the model that you use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Name of model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Conflict Resolution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mediation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Conciliation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Dispute Settlement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Alternative Dispute Resolution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Arbitration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Negotiation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. How long have you been involved in the conflict resolution field?
   ____ years ____ months
5. With respect to your involvement in conflict resolution, please specify what you consider your professional title to be.
   1. Social Worker
   2. Psychologist
   3. Mediator
   4. Lawyer
   5. Academic
   6. Community worker
   7. Volunteer worker
   8. Other (please specify) ____________________

6. If you have undertaken any specific training to assist your work in this field please indicate the highest level of training you have undertaken
   1. Workshops
   2. A one week long training course
   3. A four week long training course
   4. A professional training course (greater than 4 weeks in duration)
   5. A university qualification

7. If you are currently undertaking training to assist your work in this field please indicate the level of training you are undertaking
   1. Workshops
   2. A one week long training course
   3. A four week long training course
   4. A professional training course (greater than 4 weeks in duration)
   5. A university qualification

8. Please describe your primary work setting. (e.g. Community Mediation Center, Legal Firm, University Department. It is not necessary to identify names of organisations).

9. Please describe the specific area of this field in which you work. (e.g. Family Mediation, Peace Research, Corporate Dispute Settlement).

10. Please list all of the Professional Associations (and divisions within these associations) of which you are a member.

   ______________________________________
   ______________________________________
   ______________________________________
   ______________________________________
   ______________________________________
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SECTION 3: CONFLICT RESOLUTION ACTIVITIES

1. How often do you read articles containing quantitative data (i.e. research based on statistical data, outcome studies, evaluation of practices, theoretical papers).
   1. Never
   2. one / 6 months
   3. one / month
   4. one / week
   5. one / day

2. On the scale below, please rate how important you think quantitative research is to the development of this field. (Where 1 indicates 'not at all relevant' and 7 indicates 'extremely relevant').

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   not at all relevant  extremely relevant

3. How often do you read articles containing qualitative data (i.e. research that is not based on statistics such as case-studies and personal accounts).
   1. Never
   2. one / 6 months
   3. one / month
   4. one / week
   5. one / day

4. On the scale below, please rate how important you think qualitative research is to the development of this field. (Where 1 indicates 'not at all relevant' and 7 indicates 'extremely relevant')

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   not at all relevant  extremely relevant
5. Using a scale of 1 (not at all useful), to 7 (extremely useful), please rate (by circling the appropriate number) how useful you find the following sources of information about conflict resolution. If you have not used an information source listed below, please rate it on how useful you would expect it to be for you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>not at all useful</th>
<th>useful</th>
<th>extremely useful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Articles about the theory of conflict &amp; conflict resolution</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books about the theory of conflict &amp; conflict resolution</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empirical research books (e.g. containing the results of outcome studies)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empirical research articles (e.g. containing the results of outcome studies)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-research books</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-research articles</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion with colleagues about theoretical issues</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion with colleagues about practice issues</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical (How to) books on research</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical (How to) books on practice</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminars/Presentations</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your own experiences</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Please respond to the same scale below in the way that you would expect the **typical researcher** to respond.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>not at all useful</th>
<th>useful</th>
<th>extremely useful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Articles about the theory of conflict &amp; conflict resolution</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books about the theory of conflict &amp; conflict resolution</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empirical research books (e.g. containing the results of outcome studies)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empirical research articles (e.g. containing the results of outcome studies)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-research books</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-research articles</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion with colleagues about theoretical issues</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion with colleagues about practice issues</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical (How to) books on research</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical (How to) books on practice</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminars/Presentations</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your own experiences</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Please respond to the same scale below in the way that you would expect the **typical practitioner** to respond.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>not at all useful</th>
<th>useful</th>
<th>extremely useful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Articles about the theory of conflict &amp; conflict resolution</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books about the theory of conflict &amp; conflict resolution</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empirical research books (e.g. containing the results of outcome studies)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empirical research articles (e.g. containing the results of outcome studies)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-research books</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-research articles</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion with colleagues about theoretical issues</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion with colleagues about practice issues</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical (How to) books on research</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical (How to) books on practice</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminars/Presentations</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your own experiences</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. How many chapters (in books) or books on conflict resolution have you published? ________

9. How many journal articles related to conflict resolution have you published? ________

10. How many conference papers about conflict resolution have you given? ________

11. Please list the journals related to conflict resolution that you read regularly.

_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________

524
12. Answer this question only if you have published articles about conflict resolution. For your 3 most recently published journal articles, please describe the “type” of article by ticking the appropriate places (if less than 3, specify for 1 or 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Article 1</th>
<th>Article 2</th>
<th>Article 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical and empirical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodological</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of a practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive case study/s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>__________</td>
<td>__________</td>
<td>__________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Please list the journals in which these articles were published.

Article 1 ________________________________
Article 2 ________________________________
Article 3 ________________________________

14. Please indicate on the scale below the extent to which you think conflict resolution is best characterised as an art (a creative ability) or as a science (the application of standard techniques).

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Pure Art

15. Please respond to the same scale in the way that you would expect a “typical researcher” to respond.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Pure Art

16. Please respond to the same scale in the way that you would expect a “typical practitioner” to respond.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Pure Art
17. In your opinion, what are (up to) five of the major advantages that conflict resolution or alternative dispute resolution has over traditional forms of dispute settlement. Please list these in order of importance.

Advantage 1
Advantage 2
Advantage 3
Advantage 4
Advantage 5

18. Please list, in order of importance, (up to) five people (other than friends and family) who have influenced your work in this field (e.g. authors, researchers, famous mediators etc.).

Influence 1
Influence 2
Influence 3
Influence 4
Influence 5
SECTION 4: BELIEFS ABOUT MEDIATION

Below are 26 statements that are related to Conflict Resolution, and in particular, to Mediation. Please circle the number on the scale next to each statement, to indicate the extent to which you either agree or disagree with the statements.

**answer scale:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>slightly disagree</th>
<th>neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>slightly agree</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mediation has a sound theoretical base.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>It is not necessary for mediation to have a sound theoretical base.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mediation can take place independent of theory.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>As a practical technology, mediation is independent of any specific ideology.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The field of mediation would benefit from more theoretical exploration.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The field of mediation would benefit from more practical development.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Practitioners of mediation need only basic practical training.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Practitioners of mediation should understand theoretical issues in order to practice mediation.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The quality of a mediator depends on innate skills rather than on training.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>People have a special aptitude for being mediators.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Poor mediators can learn to be good mediators.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The extent to which mediation has been successful can be determined using objective criteria.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>The extent to which mediation has been successful can be determined intuitively by the mediator.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>At times mediation may be unsuccessful, but it is never damaging.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15.</strong></td>
<td>The mediator can be neutral.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16.</strong></td>
<td>A mediator should endeavour to balance power in a situation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17.</strong></td>
<td>A mediator should not intervene in the mediation process.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>18.</strong></td>
<td>The fields of mediation and alternative dispute resolution have expanded so quickly that some issues have been left unanswered.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>19.</strong></td>
<td>The fields of mediation and alternative dispute resolution have expanded so quickly that their destination is unclear.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>20.</strong></td>
<td>The practice of mediation should be restricted to professionals.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>21.</strong></td>
<td>In order to practice mediation a level of basic requirements and qualifications should be met, e.g. appropriate courses.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>22.</strong></td>
<td>Mediation is a profession in its own right.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>23.</strong></td>
<td>There should be a professional code of ethics for mediators which is independent of the ethical code of the mediator's original field.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>24.</strong></td>
<td>Mediators should be void of liability in a dispute settlement.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>25.</strong></td>
<td>Any information given to a mediator in the course of his/her work should be confidential.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>26.</strong></td>
<td>Mediators should not be legally bound to reveal confidential information in a court.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please answer True (T) or False (F) to the following statements by circling the appropriate letter.

1. I do not believe that I have any artistic ability. T F
2. Sometimes people think I'm a bit weird because my ideas are so novel. T F
3. I have often thought that poetry was the best way to express my thoughts. T F
4. I always seem to be coming up with new ideas. T F
5. I see many problems to work on, much work to do. T F
6. I have a feeling of excitement when an idea I am working on begins to jell. T F
7. I never pay much attention to "crack-pot" ideas. T F
8. I am fascinated by new ideas, whether or not they have practical value. T F
9. I am apt to pass up something I want to do when others feel that it isn't worth doing. T F
The statements below represent a wide range of issues pertaining to theory and methods in psychology as well issues in the philosophy of science. Please indicate the extent of your agreement or disagreement with each one by circling the appropriate answer. There are no right or wrong answers. Your answers should reflect your own personal attitudes and inclinations. You may feel that some of the items are vague, obscure, or improperly stated, but try to decide in each case whether you agree or disagree with the item. Use the cannot say category no more than necessary. Feel free to make comments directly on these pages.

**answer scale:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD = strongly disagree</th>
<th>D = disagree</th>
<th>? = cannot say</th>
<th>A = agree</th>
<th>SA = strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. A science is most likely to progress most rapidly if researchers devote themselves primarily to the systematic gathering of factual information and engage in little elaborate speculation or theory building.  
   SD  D  ?  A  SA

2. Human behavior is characterised in all aspects by lawful regularity and thus, in principle, it is completely predictable.  
   SD  D  ?  A  SA

3. All behavior, except for simple reflexes, is learned.  
   SD  D  ?  A  SA

4. Psychologists should be as concerned with explaining private conscious experience as they are with explaining overt behavior.  
   SD  D  ?  A  SA

5. For many research purposes, it is best to permit many relevant variables to interact in a natural fashion and then analyze the results, rather than try to effect strict control.  
   SD  D  ?  A  SA

6. Individual differences in personality are governed by a high degree by heredity.  
   SD  D  ?  A  SA

7. All concepts used in psychological theory should be explicitly definable in terms of observed physical events.  
   SD  D  ?  A  SA

8. The use of mathematical models and equations in theory often serves to create a false impression of scientific respectability instead of furthering our understanding.  
   SD  D  ?  A  SA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>It is just as important for psychological researchers to formulate theoretical interpretations as it is to accumulate specific facts about behavior.</td>
<td>SD D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>In principle, human behavior cannot be completely predicted, because people can choose to act in ways that we have no basis for expecting.</td>
<td>SD D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Except for a few elementary drives like hunger and thirst, all human motives are learned.</td>
<td>SD D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The individual subject's personal account of his/her private conscious experience is one of the most valuable sources of psychological data.</td>
<td>SD D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Highly controlled experiments often give a misleading picture of the complex interactions that actually occur under natural circumstances.</td>
<td>SD D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>The direction of human behavior is governed to a considerable extent by inborn predisposition.</td>
<td>SD D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>It is best to define perception just in terms of stimulus-response relationships, rather than in terms of internal events that cannot be publicly observed.</td>
<td>SD D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>As this science progresses, psychological theories will tend increasingly to be composed of abstract mathematical or logical equations.</td>
<td>SD D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>A theory should consist mainly of inductive generalizations based on observations, with little in the way of constructions or hypothetical formulations contributed by the theorist.</td>
<td>SD D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Human actions are just as strictly determined by whatever causes are operating as all other physical events are.</td>
<td>SD D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Nearly all individual differences in human behavior can be accounted for in terms of past reinforcements.</td>
<td>SD D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Psychologists can gain many valuable insights through meditation and other procedures designed to expand or illuminate private experience.</td>
<td>SD D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
answer scale:

SD = strongly disagree    D = disagree    ? = cannot say    A = agree    SA = strongly agree

21. In the long run researchers can achieve most if they devote each individual study to a very specific, circumscribed problem.  SD  D  ?  A  SA

22. Much of the variation in human temperament is governed by inborn constitution.  SD  D  ?  A  SA

23. Any meaningful statement about mental events can be translated into a statement about behavior with no serious loss of meaning.  SD  D  ?  A  SA

24. A strong insistence on precise measurement and qualification is likely to cause psychologists to neglect important areas of research.  SD  D  ?  A  SA

25. The most valuable theories are ones involving speculation that goes well beyond established facts and points the way to future discoveries.  SD  D  ?  A  SA

26. In principle, an individual's choice or decision can never be fully predicted from antecedent conditions or events.  SD  D  ?  A  SA

27. Nearly all the behavioral tendencies that have been called instinctive in people are actually products of learning.  SD  D  ?  A  SA

28. The primary goal of psychologists should be the explanation of observable behavior, rather than the explanation of conscious events.  SD  D  ?  A  SA

29. We would gain more valuable information if researchers spent more time studying total action patterns in relation to the total influencing environment and less time relating single responses to a few specific stimuli.  SD  D  ?  A  SA

30. An individual's pattern of relative strengths and weaknesses in verbal, mathematical, and perceptual abilities is governed to a great extent by genetic factors.  SD  D  ?  A  SA

31. As far as possible, the stimulus and response variables used in psychological theory should be defined in strictly physical terms.  SD  D  ?  A  SA

32. A good indicator of the maturity of a science is the extent to which its explanatory principles are stated in a precise quantitative form.  SD  D  ?  A  SA
<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33. Observation of raw data is both prior to and independent of theory.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. However interesting they might be, courses in the liberal arts and humanities really contribute little to the solution of scientific problems.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. All scientific theories contain hypothetical constructs whether explicitly stated or not.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Terms must have an observable referent to be meaningful.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Intuition is central to good science and scientific method.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Scientific theories can only be true in a probabilistic sense.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Science can never prove any theory conclusively true.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Psychology is in its infancy as a science and will eventually achieve the elegance and exactitude of physical science.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Scientific theories necessarily make metaphysical assumptions.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Science can only conclusively prove a theory false.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. The universe is fundamentally chaotic.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Having a feel for one's subject that goes beyond existing data contributes little to scientific progress.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Psychology cannot in principle be reduced to physical science (e.g., biochemistry).</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. The philosophy of science has little, if anything, of significance to contribute to the actual practice of science.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Psychologists should not adopt the methodology of the physical sciences to investigate human behaviour.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Determinism is a correct assumption; all events have a cause.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Knowledge of people achieved through literature is more profound than any knowledge of people that can be achieved by scientific method.</td>
<td>SD   D ? A SA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Scientific observation provides us with hard data that are independent of our subjective desires, wishes, and biases.</td>
<td>SD   D ? A SA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Scientists are so engrossed in procedural detail that they lose track of the basic meaning of their subject.</td>
<td>SD   D ? A SA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Hypothetico-deductive method is superior to inductive method as an approach to sound scientific knowledge.</td>
<td>SD   D ? A SA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>The primary criterion for assessing the validity of a scientific theory is not formal logic but prediction of observable events.</td>
<td>SD   D ? A SA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>To warrant the description &quot;scientific&quot; a theory needs not define hypothetical constructs in terms of observable operations.</td>
<td>SD   D ? A SA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Scientists change their scientific opinions more in response to hard scientific evidence than in response to colleague's opinions.</td>
<td>SD   D ? A SA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Knowledge is advanced primarily by collection of data and not by logical deduction from correct axioms.</td>
<td>SD   D ? A SA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 7: YOUR WORLD VIEW

Please indicate your responses to the following questions using the scale below. Write the number which corresponds with your choice in the space to the left of each question.

answer scale:

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 \\
\text{strongly disagree} & & & & & \text{strongly agree}
\end{array}
\]

Response

____ 1. Misfortune is least likely to strike worthy, decent people.

____ 2. People are naturally unfriendly and unkind.

____ 3. Bad events are distributed to people at random.

____ 4. Human nature is basically good.

____ 5. The good things that happen in this world far outnumber the bad.

____ 6. The course of our lives is largely determined by chance.

____ 7. Generally, people deserve what they get in this world.

____ 8. I often think I am no good at all.

____ 9. There is more good than evil in the world.

____ 10. I am basically a lucky person.

____ 11. People's misfortunes result from mistakes they have made.

____ 12. People don't really care what happens to the next person.

____ 13. I usually behave in ways that are likely to maximise good results for me.

____ 14. People will experience good fortune if they themselves are good.

____ 15. Life is too full of uncertainties that are determined by chance.

____ 16. When I think about it, I consider myself very lucky.

____ 17. I almost always make an effort to prevent bad things from happening to me.

____ 18. I have a low opinion of myself.

____ 19. By and large, good people get what they deserve in this world.
<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Through our actions we can prevent bad things from happening to us.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Looking at my life, I realise that chance events have worked out well for me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. If people took preventive actions, most misfortune could be avoided.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I take the actions necessary to protect myself against misfortune.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. In general, life is mostly a gamble.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. The world is a good place.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. People are basically kind and helpful.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I usually behave so as to bring about the greatest good for me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I am very satisfied with the kind of person I am.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. When bad things happen, it is typically because people have not taken the necessary actions to protect themselves.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. If you look closely enough, you will see that the world is full of goodness.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. I have reason to be ashamed of my personal character.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. I am luckier than most people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 8: PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS THAT YOU VALUE

Below are a number of pairs of personal characteristics or traits. For each pair, underline the trait which you value more highly. In making each choice, ask yourself which of the traits in that pair you would rather possess as one of your own characteristics. For example, the first pair is "imaginative-rational." If you had to make a choice, which would you rather be? Draw a line under your choice in each of the pairs. Some of the traits will appear twice, but always in combination with a different other trait. No pairs will be repeated.

"I would rather be...."

1. imaginative - rational
2. helpful - quick witted
3. neat - sympathetic
4. level-headed - efficient
5. intelligent - considerate
6. self-reliant - ambitious
7. respectful - original
8. creative - sensible
9. generous - individualistic
10. responsible - original
11. capable - tolerant
12. trustworthy - wise
13. neat - logical
14. forgiving - gentle
15. efficient - respectful
16. practical - self-confident
17. capable - independent
18. alert - cooperative
19. imaginative - helpful
20. realistic - moral
21. considerate - wise
22. sympathetic - individualistic
23. ambitious - patient
24. reasonable - quick-witted
In this section please ask yourself:

What values are important to ME as guiding principles in MY life,
and what values are less important to me?

Your task is to use the rating scale presented below to describe how important each one of a series of values is to you. The rating scale we would like you to use is as follows:

To help you further, the following descriptions are provided for some of the points on the scale:

use -1 for any values which are opposed to the principles that guide your life;
use 0 for values that are not at all important, or are not relevant as guiding principles for you;
use 3 for values that are important guiding principles in your life;
use 6 for values that are very important guiding principles in your life;
use 7 for values that are of supreme importance as guiding principles in your life; (ordinarily there are no more than two such values).

There are two lists of values that we would like you to rate separately. In the space provided before each value, write the number (-1, 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7) which best indicates the importance of that value for you, personally. Try to distinguish as much as possible between the values by using all the numbers. You can of course use numbers more than once.

**AS A GUIDING PRINCIPLE IN MY LIFE, this value is:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>opposed to my values</th>
<th>not important</th>
<th>important</th>
<th>very important</th>
<th>of supreme importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Values List 1**

Read through the values numbered 1 to 30 on the next page. Choose the one that is most important to you and rate its importance. Next, choose the value that is most opposed to your values and rate it -1. If there is no such value, choose the value least important to you and rate it 0 or 1, according to its importance. Then rate the rest of the values in List 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values List 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AS A GUIDING PRINCIPLE IN MY LIFE, this value is:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>opposed to my values</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>very important</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>of supreme importance</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. ___ EQUALITY (equal opportunity for all)
2. ___ INNER HARMONY (at peace with myself)
3. ___ SOCIAL POWER (control over others, dominance)
4. ___ PLEASURE (gratification of desires)
5. ___ FREEDOM (freedom of action and thought)
6. ___ A SPIRITUAL LIFE (emphasis on spiritual not material matters)
7. ___ SENSE OF BELONGING (feeling that others care about me)
8. ___ SOCIAL ORDER (stability of society)
9. ___ AN EXCITING LIFE (stimulating experiences)
10. ___ MEANING IN LIFE (a purpose in life)
11. ___ POLITENESS (courtesy, good manners)
12. ___ WEALTH (material possessions, money)
13. ___ NATIONAL SECURITY (protection of my nation from enemies)
14. ___ SELF RESPECT (belief in one's own worth)
15. ___ RECIPROCATION OF FAVOURS (avoidance of indebtedness)
16. ___ CREATIVITY (uniqueness, imagination)
17. ___ A WORLD AT PEACE (free of war and conflict)
18. ___ RESPECT FOR TRADITION (preservation of time-honoured customs)
19. ___ MATURE LOVE (deep emotional and spiritual intimacy)
20. ___ SELF-DISCIPLINE (self-restraint, resistance to temptation)
21. ___ DETACHMENT (from worldly concerns)
22. ___ FAMILY SECURITY (safety for loved ones)
23. ___ SOCIAL RECOGNITION (respect, approval by others)
24. ___ UNITY WITH NATURE (fitting into nature)
25. ___ A VARIED LIFE (filled with challenge, novelty and change)
26. ___ WISDOM (a mature understanding of life)
27. ___ AUTHORITY (the right to lead or command)
28. ___ TRUE FRIENDSHIP (close, supportive friends)
29. ___ A WORLD OF BEAUTY (beauty of nature and the arts)
30. ___ SOCIAL JUSTICE (correcting injustice, care for the weak)
**Values List 2**

These values (numbered 31 to 56) are phrased as ways of acting that may be more or less important to you. Choose the one that is most important to you and rate its importance. Next, choose the value that is most opposed to your values and rate it -1. If there is no such value, choose the value least important to you and rate it 0 or 1, according to its importance. Then rate the rest of the values in List 2.

**AS A GUIDING PRINCIPLE IN MY LIFE, this value is:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>opposed to</th>
<th>not important</th>
<th>important</th>
<th>very important</th>
<th>of supreme importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>my values</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INDEPENDENT (self-reliant, self-sufficient)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MODERATE (avoiding extremes of feeling and action)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOYAL (faithful to my friends, group)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AMBITIOUS (hard-working, aspiring)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BROADMINDED (tolerant of different ideas and beliefs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HUMBLE (modest, self-effacing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DARING (seeking adventure, risk)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PROTECTING THE ENVIRONMENT (preserving nature)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INFLUENTIAL (having an impact on people and events)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HONOURING OF PARENTS AND ELDERS (showing respect)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHOOSING OWN GOALS (selecting own purposes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HEALTHY (not being sick physically or mentally)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAPABLE (competent, effective, efficient)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACCEPTING MY PORTION IN LIFE (submitting to life's circumstances)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HONEST (genuine, sincere)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRESERVING MY PUBLIC IMAGE (protecting my “face”)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OBEDIENT (dutiful, meeting obligations)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INTELLIGENT (logical, thinking)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HELPFUL (working for the welfare of others)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENJOYING LIFE (enjoying food, sex, leisure, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DEVOUT (holding to religious faith and belief)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RESPONSIBLE (dependable, reliable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CURIOUS (interested in everything, exploring)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FORGIVING (willing to pardon others)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUCCESSFUL (achieving goals)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CLEAN (neat, tidy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 10: SOCIAL VALUES

The statements below represent a wide range of issues pertaining to social values. Please the extent of your agreement or disagreement with each one by circling the appropriate answer. There are no right or wrong answers. Your answers should reflect your own personal attitudes and inclinations. You may feel that some of the items are vague, obscure, or improperly stated, but try to decide in each case whether you agree or disagree with the item. Use the cannot say category no more than necessary.

answer scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD = strongly disagree</th>
<th>D = disagree</th>
<th>? = cannot say</th>
<th>A = agree</th>
<th>SA = strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Science is about facts, not values.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>A researcher should know what is done with the results of his/her research.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Theological matters are irrelevant for science.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>All things considered, competition is the best relationship between people in a society.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Private property and private ownership of production are necessary to have optimal personal freedom.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Quality will suffer if the government intrudes into the health care delivery system.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Science and technology should be utilized to solve environmental problems.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>The voluntary consent of the human subject is the sine qua non of human experimentation.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Health care is neither a right or a privilege, but a service that the professional may dispense according to his/her own set of values.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Goods and services are best provided by centralized government agencies as opposed to local agencies and private corporations.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Material and class equality are idle dreams.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Scientists should not allow personal or social values to distort their pursuit or scientific knowledge.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>&quot;Survival of the fittest&quot; should be a guiding principle of a just social order.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
answer scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD = strongly disagree</th>
<th>D = disagree</th>
<th>? = cannot say</th>
<th>A = agree</th>
<th>SA = strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>A researcher should be held personally responsible for uses of his/her research.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>It is important to preserve religious-moral tradition even if scientific progress is impeded.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>We are all morally obligated to reduce pain and suffering in the world.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>The government should regulate the structure and cost of health care.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>The subject of an experiment is entitled to full and frank disclosure of all the facts, probabilities, and opinions which a reasonable person might consider before giving his/her consent.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>The proposal for undertaking human research which fails to consider all reasonable possibilities of harm is morally irresponsible.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Goods and services are best provided by private corporations as opposed to government agencies.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>The solution to the environment crises requires new values, new social systems, and new political structures.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Compensation to volunteers in human experimentation should never be so much as to constitute an undue inducement.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Every species in an environment has the right to continued survival.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>The acquisition of new knowledge is an ultimate criterion for carrying out research.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>The affluent of the world have a moral obligation to respond to the needs of the less well-off.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>All citizens should be guaranteed access to adequate and necessary health care.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>People who care about the environment must live lives that show their concern.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Freedom to do scientific research is not absolute but must be constrained by ethical and social considerations of the society where the research is done.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
answer scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>A = agree</th>
<th>SA = strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Scientists, as scientists, should not endorse ethical standards.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>It is incumbent on the researcher to prove that a proposed experiment is ethical in all of its aspects.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>There should be laws protecting all aspects of the environment.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Capitalism should be eliminated.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Individual liberty should take precedence over social goals and collective restraints on liberty.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Those most qualified to control poverty and resources are those who have survived the competitive struggle.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Scientific research should have a clear social utility as defined by a majority of people.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Belief in deities is inconsistent with a scientific worldview.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Agnosticism is the most reasonable position with respect to the question of an original creator or God.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Scientists should not retain from the public any information about the adverse uses that can be made of their research outcomes.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>In science as in life, the best results follow when one is engaged in a competitive struggle for knowledge and resources.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Socialism is a desirable goal.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>No experimentation that does not directly benefit the patient should be performed on patients who are ill.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Scientists should not pursue their scientific work if it clearly endangers the general welfare of humanity.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>The lawfulness of nature reflects the existence of an original creator.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 11: HOW ACCURATELY CAN YOU DESCRIBE YOURSELF?

Please use this list of common human traits to describe yourself as accurately as possible. Describe yourself as you see yourself at the present time, not as you wish to be in the future. Describe yourself as you are generally or typically, as compared with other persons you know of the same sex and of roughly your same age.

Each of the following rating scales has two poles.

For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>Tall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you see yourself as very tall in relation to others of your sex and approximate age, you should circle the number 9. If you see yourself as very short in relation to others of your sex and approximate age, you should circle the number 1. If you see yourself as almost exactly average (neither short nor tall), you should circle the number 5.

The other numbers should be used to indicate that you see yourself as moderately short (numbers 2, 3, or 4) or moderately tall (numbers 6, 7, or 8), as compared to others of your own sex and approximate age.

Please circle one number in each line.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introversion-Extroversion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>introverted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unenergetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>silent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unenthusiastic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>timid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unassured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>submissive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inhibited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unsociable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

544
Please circle one number in each line.

**Pleasantness or Agreeableness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cold</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unkind</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uncooperative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>selfish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rude</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disagreeable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distrustful</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stingy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inflexible</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unfair</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please circle one number in each line.

**Conscientiousness or Dependability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>disorganised</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>irresponsible</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>undependable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negligent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impractical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>careless</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lazy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extravagant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rash</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frivolous</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Very | Moderately | Neither | Moderately | Very
Please circle one number in each line.

**Emotional Stability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>angry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tense</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nervous</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temperamental</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>irritable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>envious</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unstable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discontented</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>insecure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emotional</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thankyou very much for completing the Conflict Resolution Survey. Your efforts are very much appreciated. Would you please place it in the pre-addressed envelope provided, and mail it to me at the University of Adelaide.
APPENDIX B

ETHICS PROPOSAL FOR QUALITATIVE STUDY
Aim

A questionnaire based study has recently been undertaken as a survey of researchers and practitioners involved in the fields of Conflict Resolution, Mediation and Alternative Dispute Resolution. The survey included measures of Creativity, Professional Orientation, Epistemological Style, Theoretical Orientation, Attitudes and Beliefs, Social Interest, Values, and Personality.

The proposed study will involve an investigation of the verbal behaviour of different professionals involved in the field. The means by which this will be approached will be within the meta-theoretical perspective known as Discourse Analysis.

The questionnaire based study is inherently quantitative, whilst in Discourse Analysis the words become the data and the results are purely qualitative. It is hoped that the accumulation of quantitative and qualitative data will approach a methodological pluralism which is consistent with the overall aim this research programme, a meta-view of the field.

Method

Audio-recordings will be taken of structured interviews with individuals involved in relevant professions. Transcripts will be made of the recordings.

Anonymity will be ensured by adherence to the following:
1). All identifying details will be edited from the transcripts.
2). The interviewee will be given the opportunity to view transcripts, and check the editing process.
3). Once the transcripts are completed, the tapes will be erased.

Analysis of the transcripts will be undertaken in the tradition of Potter and Wetherell (1987). Basically transcripts must be categorised and read many times, until hypotheses about their organisation can be identified. Hypotheses are then tested against their original transcripts.

Inconsistency and variation between episodes of discourse will help to identify differences in themes. The way in which variation can be accounted for will constitute the function of the discourse.

APPENDIX C
INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPTS
1. How long have you been working in the conflict resolution field?

Since about 1987.

That's about seven years?

Yeah, I've been a lawyer for about fifteen years, but I have only been doing mediation in the last six or seven of them.

2. There are many areas in the conflict resolution field. What is it that you actually do?

Well, as you know I am a lawyer. umm ... I work with ADR and mediation ... mainly with corporate law, legal clients of the firm ... those clients that have ... umm ... with settlement needs that can be handled much quicker with mediation than going with the courts.

Uh huh, can you explain specifically what you do?

Our firm has a special branch of ADR that works with our clients to resolve disputes involving business mainly. I do mediation for clients and ... er ... to see to it that we help solve their disputes with their business associates and other clients. We have also done some community work, and some work for small government organisations, but the majority is with business and I head up that division of our business.

So you are in charge of the mediation services offered at (says name of organisation)?

Yes.

Does that mean you actually do some of the mediations?

Well not as many as I would like, ... but yeah I still, yeah I still do some ... I have to manage the business side as well but I still am involved in the doing of it ... er ... we're only a small firm of about ten partners so its not so busy that I can't still be involved.

3. Okay thanks. Did you have any specific training for your work with mediation?

Ah ... I guess you wouldn't call it formal, but I have had a lot of training ... most of the skills I have picked up from other partners in the firm who have had experience in negotiation and ADR ... that's the main training I have for this.

Have you done any courses?

There's my legal training; and mmm, I have been to numerous workshops about conflict resolution skills and ADR ... and I've read just about every book written about it; er we actually use some of that sort of, that material, and give courses for other lawyers now ...

Do you some training in mediation?

Yes, just some workshops and courses for lawyers who want to get trained in ADR.

How are they going?

They are going very well ... training others has taught me a lot more about mediation you know ... and we are getting a lot of people who want to do the courses ...

How many people is your firm training?

Its not a lot ... no ... er ... we have only done three weekend courses so far. We do plan to run about three every year, and there's only about a dozen people in each of the courses. Its good to keep them small too because they tend to work better that way.
4. Okay yes, getting back to your background, do you feel that your own training, by learning from your colleagues has prepared you for practicing mediation?

Yes.

Can you tell me how?

I think the best way to learn ADR is by practicing it. I have been doing that for 7 years now, and the courses, ... and the mentoring at our practice, and now our training too makes us feel very well prepared for working with clients, which is more than I can say for most of the other forms of training for this work that I see out there. And the people we work with are usually very happy with what we do.

And you personally see clients?

Yes, everyone in our firm sees clients, even the senior partners like me (laughs)

Oh, okay, how many clients would you see per day, or per week?

About 5 a week, at different stages of the settlement process, I mean for different things ...

What do you mean?

Well usually my case load is about five clients ... with disputes that need ADR at any one time ... er ... but I usually concentrate on doing the mediation part one at a time. But cases are at different stages of development, so I might be setting up options for one client, setting meetings for another, be in the ADR process for another ... er ... and following up the details of another case all at the same time, in the same week.

It sounds like quite a lot to be doing all at the same time

Yes it is. I prefer to keep busy like this that means I can concentrate on different stages of the settlement at different times, and that helps to keep the processes moving. And we can see more clients that way cause each session usually is less than half a day, a couple of hours or so .... and a lot of the process, we or I, don't really have a lot to do, its just keeping things moving, you know what I mean? ... We keep the ADR moving so it doesn't get bogged down, its always moving at some stage or another, and that keeps everyone happy, it feels like something is getting done all the time on that case, and really it is.

For how long do you usually end up seeing a client, or how long does a case take?

It's various, it varies a lot from case to case. It depends on the circumstances of the case ... how complex it is, how many people are involved, umm ... you know, how agreeable the parties are, how willing they are to settle. Some last a couple of weeks, others go on for months on end ... I am working on a case that is 12 months old at the moment.

That's quite a while?

It's still quicker that going to court (laughs)

Really?

Yeah, yeah, sometimes they can last years and years, and we are talking about a great deal of money with a case like this. You have to realise and accept that most legal disputes last a long time to do properly, otherwise its just a bandaid measure. We're nearly finished that long one though -

Has it worked out positively?

Yes, yes, and of course you should also know that our clients stay with us for years, and we are always following up as a way of satisfying them and maintaining the relationship, that's part of this type of business, to make sure they use us next time as well.

Mmm, I suppose that is all part of doing good business. When you see clients, how much do you rely on what you learned from your training and how much are other factors like common sense involved?

A lot of people say it is common sense, that anyone could do mediation ... but we (says name of firm) think that's a very simplistic way of looking at it. I believe that you need to be trained to do it properly and that people need to have established a certain degree of maturity in the process of understanding how to do mediation properly. And um er it might seem simple, and it actually is as a process, but there are lots of traps for novices.

What sort of traps?
Well its hard to say exactly, but we are dealing with very big stakes in a lot of our work. Sometimes the mediation cases that we are doing are for amounts in excess of one hundred thousand pounds. You need training and experience to deal with that because there's so much money involved. Its not like mediating a fight between neighbours ... the stakes are much bigger.

**INT**

*So you think that you have to be trained and that is more important than any commonsense aspects of mediation?*

Yeah, people need to be trained no matter what they are doing in any type of conflict resolution, its very important that people know what they are talking about. ... But, commonsense is important too, er and luckily lawyers have been trained to um think in ways that facilitate this ... (laughs) Well most of us anyway (laughs).

**INT**

*Do you rely on any specific conflict resolution model in your work?*

I rely on models and my previous experience a lot ... but its much more than just commonsense ... but there's an intuitive element that will allow greater efficiency to the process if you can learn how to get it right.

**INT**

*What do you mean? Umm, tell me about the intuitive part?*

Well, the more mediation you do the more it feels like commonsense. Does that make sense? It becomes more intuitive in time and you can get a sense of where the dispute is at, and how to best tackle it, but you couldn't do that without training or a basic model to work with.

**INT**

*So you get more skilled in the intuitive part with time?*

Yeah, really its experience and training that counts, ... although I still think commonsense is important, not everyone can do mediation properly, even if they get all the training in the world, ... you have to be suited to it, ... like everything. Believe me, not every lawyer can do mediation, or should they be allowed to (laughs).

**INT**

*9. Do you think that the theories of conflict resolution affect practice?*

Well, um, they certainly effect my practice. Yes, ... er ... I'd say they definitely effect how I do what I do with mediation.

**INT**

*Can you say something more about that?*

Well I guess I'm fairly strict with what I follow, the models I use, but I know that lots of people in this field don't follow proper theories. It depends on the type of theory you mean, but most haven't a clue.

**INT**

*Uh huh, why do you think that has happened?*

I mean there is an new idea every few weeks, a new workshop, a new theory and people keep changing how they do what they do. There's um a new model that people latch onto and that lasts for a while ... yeah and then another one comes up as the er new thing to do and then er there is more changes so er people keep changing to try to keep up and do the latest thing but there is no time to actually er consolidate what they are actually talking about and really know how to use a technique ... and thats not even to say that a technique is actually based on any particular theory or um on anything thats been tested so its very fragmented as a a er ...

**INT**

*Why do you think it has become so fragmented er what actually has been the cause of that?*

Well there are so many people using mediation and conflict resolution ideas in whatever they are doing, that the er they get watered down, and most people don't even know what the standard conflict and legal theories are about. They are left with very little substance to their understanding of how it all works.

**INT**

*Do you think its important that they do know about those things?*

Of course, how can you use them properly if you don't understand them ... (laughs) ... I know I am biased, I think my way is right, but really I am concerned about how little training people have when they are let loose on the community ...

**INT**

*You don't think they are trained enough?*

That's right ... I mean some people do a weekend workshop and then think they are mediators, that can't be right, you know ... and they could do damage with it ... more harm than good I'd argue in most cases. I know most people have never studied the theoretical basis of these techniques.

**INT**

*But lawyers would have learned about the theoretical aspects?*
Well I guess the difference is that lawyers have been trained to follow theories and a lot of the people doing conflict resolution haven't.

Actually I don't think they should be allowed to use the name mediation unless they have been properly trained, they need stronger standards, ... but that's just my opinion.

Yes, definitely. I think there is growing concern in most areas about this, not just law, but for professional mediators who are properly trained too. You need to have a formal system of training, otherwise anyone can do it.

Okay thanks, I need to ask you about some other things, do you want to add anything else to that?

No I don't think so, um that's fine, I've probably said enough.

**10. Have you ever done any research in conflict resolution?**

Ah ... no not really, but we do experiment with different techniques ... I wouldn't call it proper research though, I wouldn't dare given what I have just said about theories (laughs).

**11. Could you briefly describe what your doing with the different techniques?**

Eventually we try different techniques for different cases and then we use those that work for similar cases that come up. Its very simple. And it's really about being efficient and getting better at what we do rather than doing real research.

**What's real research?**

You know like what you're doing, (laughs) ... scientific studies, rigorous stuff, ours is just guess work really ... but it has paid off, made us better at what we do.

**That's the objective of applied research I suppose**

Yeah

**12. How would you describe the nature of the relationship between research and practice in the conflict resolution field?**

Well its good and bad.

**Yes ah can you tell me about that?**

Yeah ah the good bit is that its a very applied sort of research - the proper stuff, that is. Case studies and theories are the best, they help our practice the most because we can relate to them. So er thats from that perspective the relationship is quite good.

**And the bad part?**

The bad part is that there is not enough time to do it properly, so not much is done in law, lawyers are so busy. We can't get enough time to do our cases properly, let alone do research.

**No, no its okay, I wasn't clear, I'm interested in both law and the general conflict resolution field.**

Okay, yes generally its the same, ... I think ... umm ... no, overall its probably not that not good. There isn't much research around in any area, and its generally hard to get hold of. I mean the stuff that is of any help to anyone.

**What do you mean?**

Well, most of the academic research seems quite irrelevant ... er ... of course its not really this clear cut ... but you know the negotiation and bargaining research is too specific ... peace research is nice but there's no take home message to apply to our work.

**Is any kind of research useful for your practice?**

Umm, some applied work on mediation is better, but most people don't listen to it. I know that most of my colleagues don't read it because they don't think it will do them any good, and they probably don't have enough time to.

**Do you read any of the research?**
I do yes I er read whatever I can get my hands on that's relevant to my work ... but um overall I'd have to say that research and practice haven't worked well together in the past, there hasn't been much that has been very useful that has come out of any attempt to work together and, but that doesn't mean it has to stay that way. It could easily get better if people tried to make it better.

13. You may have already answered this, but do you think that researchers and practitioners adequately assist each other in the mediation and conflict resolution fields?

Mmm, that's hard to answer because I don't know enough about it. I don't know really.

What do you think?

Well, my opinion, is that what you want?

Yes

Mmm, I don't really know, but I'd have to say no, not really.

Why would you say that?

Well as I said its only my opinion, but there really is er no er communication between the researchers and those of us that practice. We don't um help each other because of the lack of understanding about what should be said about er conflict resolution. So there is disharmony on both sides. Researchers don't think we use any theory - which is true in many, and we don't think theories are all that helpful which is also true most of the time considering what we do. We aren't very functional.

How do you mean about how you aren't very er functional?

Well there are so many different groups involved that its almost impossible to please everyone I suppose.

Well er what are the er groups or the people that have to er be pleased?

Oh you er, well ... there are many different groups involved. Law, social work, psychology, politics and all the applications in ADR ... mediation, community work, the victim, umm victim offender reconciliation work, is that what you mean?

Yes and what do you think of these broad applications?

I think it's good, so many good applications, conflict resolution in doing a lot of good things. I'm glad so many groups are using it.

14. Is there much consensus about the theories and processes that underlie conflict resolution among people you work with?

We all work pretty closely together, so I guess that we all have similar views about how we work with it.

Can you say more about how you know that?

Well we share ideas and successes and failures at team meetings, so we all keep pretty informed about how each other is going. I'm sure that ensures some consistency of methods and ideas. Most of us have done the same training and courses. I suppose we all agree on the theories, but its not our main focus, we prefer to focus on issues that affect our practice.
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001 INT 1. How long have you been working in the conflict resolution field?
002 C1 About twenty years. I was first involved in the mid seventies I think, ... yes, that would make it about twenty years.

003 INT And that has always been in conflict resolution?
004 C1 Yes, yes I have always worked in resolving conflicts.

005 INT 2. What is it that you actually do in conflict resolution?
006 C1 I work in, er I'm a community mediator. I work mainly with young people who have got into trouble with their community, ... or with the police, we get referrals straight from the community or another community agency, or from the police.

007 INT So what sort of problems are they?
008 C1 We get problems that have started from things like with community disputes, like petty crimes, arguments, disturbances...and other things like...ummm mm...theft and community decision making ... you know, community building and strengthening community relationships.

009 INT What role do you play in your agency?
010 I'm in charge of our organisation. I do do quite a lot of the mediation between parties and I also have to supervise other community workers to do the same in what they do.

011 INT So you actually do mediation?
012 C1 Yes I do do mediation

013 INT 3. Did you have any specific training for mediation?
014 C1 Well not really anything specific. Most of it I have picked up along the way. Ah ... occasionally I do courses and training groups at (names organisation) and I teach there and that has helped my understanding.

015 INT So you haven't done a special course yourself or anything like that?
016 C1 No I haven't done a course. But I've been around this sort of thing for a long time now and I feel that I have got a lot of training in mediation from doing mediations. I have done hundreds of mediations with lots of people in lots of different situations, for lots of reasons. That's my training. I'm trained by life I suppose, and its taught me a lot.

017 INT No, no that's fine, do you mean you have trained by doing it?
018 C1 Uh huh. That's right ... that's how learned it, you know is that okay?

019 INT Yes that's fine remember there isn't a right or wrong answer. I just want you to tell me your story with mediation, whatever happened with you is exactly what I want to hear, that type of training is valid and it is what you did, so its what I need to hear.

020 C1 Good, good I'll just say what happened in y experience

021 INT 4. Do you feel that your training adequately prepared you for practice?
022 C1 Yes, okay, absolutely. The only way to really learn in my opinion, is to do this sort of mediation, is to do it in the community. Its like a school of hard knocks that way. Life teaches you what to do by giving you different experiences. You, you can't learn to cope with violence, with abuse and physical conflict from books and studies, you can't, you have to see it and experience how people generally deal with it. The more you do the more you learn.

023 INT So you feel that this training was good preparation?
Uh huh. But it takes special kind of person ... umm, you have to be flexible, some people can’t do it. Recipes aren’t enough it has to be an emotional preparation too, they have to feel it. I help others prepare by doing it too, not just by courses and books learning, practice is the key part of learning to mediate and solve disputes.

So now you are teaching other people in the same way that you learned about mediation and conflict resolution?

Yes, I suppose that is right, but it’s because of the experiences that I have had that show me that this is the best way to do it. It’s not just because I had it that way that I think it is the only way.

Yes, of course, I didn’t mean to suggest that you thought of it that way.

No no, I know you didn’t.

5. Do you see clients?

Yes, all sorts of people.

6. How many do you see per day, or per week?

Well we work mainly at night when people are free. The volunteers are free then too and most of the people having trouble, ... the clients are best available then. Do you mean how many people does our service see, or just me?

Let’s start with your personal work load?

Okay, I personally would see, let me think, ... I’d see two or three cases a week, ... they’re at nights ...

But do you work during the day as well?

Yes during the day I answer a lot of inquiries during the day, setting up mediations an making the calls are all part of my role as the supervisor. And I see our volunteers to see how they are going, do some counseling ... you know, but I’m the only one who works full time.

7. Over what period of time do you see your clients, how long do they last?

Some only take the evening and then we work out some resolution that everyone is happy with. Others last much longer, some we never sort out. Most take a couple of sessions.

What would be an average?

Usually we see people twice. But there is a growing number of people that we are able to help in just one session.

So on average it would be one session or two?

I guess usually it is two.

How long does a session last?

A session is about three hours long on a Tuesday or Thursday night.

8. When you see clients, how much do you rely on what you learned from your training and how much are other factors like common sense relevant?

Well as I said that er I um, I prefer experience to formal training so I’m not really certain how I answer that one ... umm ....

How about the training from courses you run as compared to a purely common sense approach?

Of course I draw on some of the things from the theories and models and ideas that we use in the training, but umm, I’d like to say that, ... mmm ... the majority is from your experiences in the field, that’s where you learn about common sense. Learning what to do and when to do it is intuitive, it’s a intuitive process, ... and our people learn that over time.

So you’re saying its mainly intuition to get it right?

Look, intuition in this game is much more relevant than any theory you’ll see. Some expert about mediation might know what he is talking about in his er area and it, it might help and all that, but it’s not the truth. I mean it doesn’t mean that he’s right about it all, in all situations, it doesn’t work that way theories don’t really mean anything when your trying to sort out a problem in the real world.

What do you mean its not the truth?

I mean that nothing beats experience. A theory might sound like the truth and everyone might believe it, but that doesn’t mean it is. Some of them are nonsense, some are okay.

You sound somewhat pessimistic about theories?
Well, I guess that I am ... only because there are so many things that seem so irrelevant to what we do. You know once we had someone come to give a talk to one of our groups from (sings name of University) and they were giving details of some complex model for how mediation works ... and what mediators need to do to do to effect situations the right er way and how the disputants respond to it ... he just didn’t get it that he didn’t have to tell us how to do it.

And that is a common experience that you have had of people in research?

Well, I know not everyone is like that, but that really was bad. I tried to give that chap a chance but it was really bad. Mathematics and mediation don’t go together, I mean his model was all based in in equation that er looked like a maths formula. It seemed a shame that it went like that you know a waste of time about it all, it could have been a er good way to learn about each others ways of doing things ...

When you say it seemed a er a shame, do you mean that it would be good to work with researchers?

Yes it would. But there needs to be researchers from all areas involved.

What does that mean? Er do you mean reserachers from lots of different perspectives?

Well, um there needs to be researchers from a community work background ... from social work, from psychology and law too, there needs to be all kinds.

Why do you say that? How would that help?

Because they all have different ways of doing it and all value different types of insight and experience. It means that there would be a more useful product from it as well that everyone could actually get something out of er the results that would be um more practical.

9. Okay, so do you think that the standard theories of conflict resolution affect its practice?

Not especially (pauses and laughs).

Is there anything else you want to say about that?

No not really. It's kind of irrelevant to what we do, so we don’t really need to know about it. Of course as you know we teach models, but they don't necessarily change and effect what we do at a practical level and er most people disagree about what is the right sort of theory to follow anyway.

10. Do you do any research in this area?

No. We check out our processes and keep a track of successes and failures, but it’s not research as you would call it.

Alright, I just want to talk a little more about research and practice is that okay?

Yes, that fine.

12. Okay, how would you describe the nature of the relationship between research and practice in the conflict resolution field?

I don't know...(pause)

Well, what do you think the relationship is like?

It's hard to say it nicely, I hope it's okay to say for your research.

Of course, I'm really interested in what you think ...

Well put simply it doesn't work. Research is usually vague and irrelevant to what we need in ... at the grass roots level.

And that is because ...?

Because it never has been any good

Is that always how it is? Has it always been like that?

Yeah, basically its always been like that. Of course, occasionally you get or hear about a good account of something, like a community case study, that you might be able to use. But we're really not interested in most of it anyway.

Why not?

Testing things, you know theories and pieces like that is not useful to us. We, we just care about what works, and that only comes from practice. The university people that I've talked to don’t seem to understand that very well, I think they need to look at what they’re doing a bit more er cause now they’re just making a mess of things ... can you understand what I mean?

Well I can understand what you're saying. Can you say more about what you think happens?
I think it's as simple as we don't really like what they do and we, I mean they, don't like us either. We're coming from different places. That's all, it's not them, but what they try to tell us to do. They don't understand we are only interested in what works.

Would you mean, you come from different place?

I mean that we value different things.

What sort of things do you differently?

Well we think differently about what we are doing ... we have different ideas about what is needed and about what is valuable information. While researchers are concerned with how the technique works or how the intervention that we use is phrased, we care about how the disputants feel. It's a different focus.

So you say that they are more mechanical?

Mechanical is just one part of it it a whole way of thinking. They just can't get into our way of thinking. And I suppose we can't get into their's either.

So why is that the way it is.

It must have something to do with communication like everything it would come down to not understanding what each other's point of view is and what we both want out of the relationship ... but we have er never really pursued it.

Why haven't you pursued it?

It's as simple as that nobody is interested in talking about these things so there hasn't been any er useful dialogue cause we don't think it will do us any good anyway. We just have to get on with our jobs, its not going to er change anything ... I don't think it will ever change.

So would you say that researchers and practitioners adequately assist each other in this field?

Definitely not ... we just don't see eye to eye.

Can you say more about that?

Not really. We don't assist each other because our perspective's are so different. You can't co-operate when you're coming from such different places.

What do you mean when you say coming from different places?

You now, having different views of what is the right and the wrong way of going about things. What is acceptable and useful and what isn't. Do you know?

Yes, ah, maybe you could give me an example?

Okay okay its a different sense of how to go abut things and what we would find useful. I'm thinking of another time where this researcher guy from (says the name of an institution) came in to talk to us at a meeting we had about our community mediation work that was held last year.

Sorry, is this the same guy as before, or is this another person

Its another person

Okay, sorry to interrupt, go on ...

Well, the poor guy got a pretty hard time, but it was really his own fault. He had done research, about, research about mediation in group conflicts and had come up with a new model, a new practice that they said would help us all to get better results and more happy clients and all that stuff ... but when we looked at it it didn't say anything at all. I mean there was nothing in it that was new, it was what we've already been doing for years and they still try to tell us what to do. All the theoretical background and stuff is not necessary to get a system that works. He was only trying to do something good but it was totally inappropriate to try to tell us something that we already were doing. They didn't ask us they just told us what we should be doing.

It sounds like that annoyed you a bit?

Well me and the other fifteen or so mediators who were there. We were all mad at it, its just a total misunderstanding of what we are about. And what's worse is this guy didn't even have any experience of doing mediation. He had just tested the theories. He didn't actually do mediation. Can you believe that? Of course we were mad at that too.

So you are saying you can only do research about something that you actually practice

Yes, I do think that ... most mediators do. Well all of the ones I know. How can you tell us what to do when you haven't even had any experience, haven't even practiced mediation. There
was thousands of hours of experience in that room and we just don’t put our trust in theories made up by people who don’t know what they are talking about.

INT What annoys you the most? The fact that this person hadn’t done any practice, or that he assumed that you all needed his theory?

C1 He didn’t even ask our opinion. Its the whole attitude of researchers. Any one of us could have drawn up something up that sounded just as good as what he said, and it would have been based on the facts. Its a totally different way of looking at it, ... totally different.

INT What’s the main difference in your approach?

C1 Its about where you put your trust I suppose. We trust experience.

INT And researchers er who do they trust?

C1 Well they probably trust their experience too, but that’s in theories and statistics ... we don’t understand them and don’t want to understand them.

INT Why don’t you want to understand them?

C1 We don’t want to be like them, others, being academic isn’t appropriate for our work, we just have to focus on the facts and what helps people solve their problems. Other groups have other interests. It’s not our interest...(pause) ... those things aren’t relevant to making people feel better.

INT 14. Is there much consensus about the theories and processes that underlie conflict resolution among people you work with?

C1 Yeah. We all agree on what we use. It’s probably because I teach them all, (laughs) ... but again it’s more about what works. We all agree on what works.
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001 INT 1. How long have you been working in the conflict resolution field?
002 C2 About five and a half or... or at least five years now.
003 INT 2. There are many areas in the conflict resolution field. What is it that you actually do?
004 C2 Umm... Community mediation and victim offender mediation are my main areas of work.
005 INT What do you actually do in that?
006 C2 I mediate, ... I mean I'm the community mediator, ... I set up mediations and then, usually with someone else, ... I do them.
007 INT 3. Okay that's good, can you tell me about your specific training for doing mediation?
008 C2 Yeah, I did a social work course, and then there's been a number of victim-offender training courses that I've done.
009 INT How many, how long did they last?
010 C2 Usually only a weekend long, although I did a course that went over a few weeks. I think that one was about sixty hours all up... it says that on the certificate they give you (laughs). That was specifically about victim offender mediation. That's the most specific I have done.
011 INT And how many short courses have you done, the weekend ones?
012 C2 Probably five or six.
013 INT 4. Do you feel that this training adequately prepared you for practice?
014 C2 Yes
015 INT Can you say how?
016 C2 Well you learn what to do and what not to do when you are doing the actual mediation.
017 INT That sounds pretty straightforward
018 C2 Well I guess that is what training courses are meant to do.
019 INT 5. Okay, okay. Do you see clients?
020 C2 Yes.
021 INT 6. How many clients do you see per day, or per week?
022 C2 For normal mediation I'd see about four a week, and there's at least two victim offender mediations each week, that's where I'm heading with my work - I want to do more of that.
023 INT So you would see one person each day?
024 C2 Yes, when you have all of the research into the case and spoken to the relevant officials, like the social worker in charge of the case or the parole officer, or sometimes the family or police, then you have to spend time with both of the party's together before you can actually help with the mediation process.
025 INT And that would involve bringing together the victim and the offender?
026 C2 Yeah and then doing the mediation with them.
027 INT How long does that take?
028 C2 Usually the mediation process then takes a couple of hour... depends on the individuals... but usually it's two hours.
029 INT So did you actually do a training course in victim offender mediation?
030 C2 Yes it was one of the long course that I did, you know the 60 hours course that I said to you
before about.

031 **INT** And you would say that prepared you adequately?

032 C2 Yes that was really an excellent training.

033 **INT** 7. Over what period of time do you see clients?

034 C2 They're usually for two, about two sessions and then they each are for about two hours each.

035 **INT** And does that last over a couple of weeks or what?

036 C2 Yeah, usually it for two weeks, it normally takes one week to sort out the facts, and then a second week, or a second meeting, to iron out the details of the settlement.

037 **INT** 8. When you see clients, how much do you rely on what you learned from your training and how much are other factors like common sense relevant?

038 C2 It's both. I use the theories and learnings from my training, and at the same time I work on getting better at using my intuition, which develops pretty quickly when you're out there practicing what they preach in the courses.

039 **INT** What helps you to develop that side of yourself?

040 C2 I think it's just about being out there and being in touch with the people that I have been working with. Most of them have similar stories and most of them have had a pretty hard time of it. It's very difficult to say that they are all the same, clearly that is not the case, but it is fairly similar in most of the circumstances.

041 **INT** But how does that help you develop your intuition?

042 C2 I think it's um because intuition is really a mixture of knowing the facts well and also knowing more and more about the process.

043 **INT** What means the process?

044 C2 The more you know about mediation the quicker you can see things coming and I guess that is what intuition is about its the most important skill in my practice.

045 **INT** Hmm, that is interesting ... how long do you think it would take to develop intuition?

046 C2 I think the more you get experience the better you get. I certainly started noticing the effects when I had been doing it for about six month. Actually it becomes even more clear when you have a work experience person with you. The answer that you can see coming ... that they have no idea about, and that simply confirms this concept of intuition to me.

047 **INT** Is that what you found when you were first learning?

048 C2 Yes it was very much like that ... I served an internship for a few months before I really could understand everything that my mentor was seeing. But with time I started to notice as well, and that sort of experience is essential if you are going to work alone with people

049 **INT** 9. Do you think that standard theories of conflict resolution affect practice?

050 C2 If you let them (pauses) I think they effect practice through practitioners using them and how they have been taught to do mediation.

051 **INT** Um how do you mean?

052 C2 Most people I know who do victim-offender mediation don't care so much for the theories, but I find they give me a framework to work from. I allow myself to use them because I like the structure.

053 **INT** Can you say more about that?

054 C2 Can I ... well, it is important to me to make sure that what I am doing is grounded somewhere in theory. For me I need to feel that what I am doing is not simply from flying by the seat of my pants. I want to know that what I have done with people has a good chance of helping them because it is a theory or a practice that has been tested with other people and has been shown to work. But ar I don't know that everyone doing mediation needs to know about theories, er it should be up to them.

055 **INT** I know that a lot of practitioners have been quite pessimistic about theories ...

056 C2 Yes I am surrounded by that everyday. But I don't think that it is enough to just ignore something that you do not understand

057 **INT** Do you mean that the reason that other people don't follow theories is because they don't understand them?

058 C2 I suppose I am. The whole field really needs to be educated this.
10. Do you do any research in this area?

No.

12. How would you describe the nature of the relationship between research and practice in the conflict resolution field?

It's not as good as it could be.

Can you explain what you mean?

It should be better but most people involved in practice, like me, aren't interested in research. I think we should be. There's a lot to learn ... so much is not understood, it's unwise to dismiss research because it's umm ... because most practitioners aren't very well qualified so they think it's better to reject anything that sounds too scientific in case it gets too professional ... umm ... (pause).

Do you want to say more?

I just think most practitioners won't listen to research because they don't understand it, especially the untrained ones. They are frightened about not understanding ... that it will make them look bad. That's what I think.

Uh huh...

... those sort of practitioners are scared of being rejected by the establishment if they are unexposed as not really knowing enough about what they do.

Is that a realistic fear?

Yes I think it is very well founded. The field is becoming very professional very quickly. People want qualifications, and have every right to expect it... er ... I think it is much easier for the old school practitioner who has been around the field for a long time, or the new person with no qualifications, just to complain about the research and theories and say that they are irrelevant because that gives them a chance not to be invalidated by not knowing about it.

But are the practitioners non-theory based ideas valid in themselves.

Yeah, of course they are, I'm not saying they're bad ... but they are scared because the new ones seem very er objective, and er very scientific.

Is that a good thing or a bad thing. the objective nature of these theories

I think its not good or bad, its just the way that it is.

Do you think its realistic?

Yes and no ... umm ... its more realistic to try to get a model than to just say do what feels good, or to just use experiences that have worked before ... umm ... it is good to try to be a little more objective than the normal approach that most people use, but we don't like being told how to do it all the time.

Will that approach change the way conflict resolution is practiced?

The whole field is changing anyway, there is very little about it that will change the professionalisation of conflict resolution which is well and truly on its way.

And do you think that this professionalisation is a good thing?

I don't know ... its both I suppose ... there's some sort of payoff professionally for us you know ... it is good to have standards ... but its very important to have freedom in this sort of work. You have to have the freedom to encourage the empathic relationships that are so important for conflict resolution to really work. The objective theories and models could be a bit dehumanising ... and thats why we think most of the problems in the field are because of what researchers do ... I know that is what many people think.

13. Do you think that researchers and practitioners adequately assist each other in this field?

Well no, they don't. Its just a er a bad relationship both groups keep to themselves and that means they er don't help each other at all.

Do you want to add anything else?

No, just that it's both ways. Researchers don't seem to like practitioners any more than practitioners like them. Do you know what I mean?

Uh huh. I see what you're saying, anything else?

No.

14. Is there much consensus about the theories and processes that underlie conflict resolution
among people you work with?

088 C2  Most of the people I work with don't get into the theories so I er couldn't say there was much consensus about them.

089 INT  But what about the general principles that guide the practices that each of you are doing, do you all have the same sort of methodology or the same approaches.

090 C2  Most of us do our own thing, with the type of practice that we are doing, we talk about it a little bit, but it's not something that we discuss very much.

091 INT  So you er just don't talk about it?

092 C2  No, we do talk about it, but we don't go into any details.

093 INT  Yeah yeah okay sorry, er do you think that if you did go into it at any depth that there would be some sort of a consensus about the methods that you are using and the philosophy guiding those methods?

094 C2  No... probably not. I mean I know we don't all do the same thing in our mediations... we all use different approaches and that, and I know that we are all inspired by different therapeutic ideas, so we just don't go into any detailed discussion about the different approaches.

095 INT  Would you say that you don't discuss it because you know there would be differences?

096 C2  Well... it's easier than disagreeing about it all... umm... as long as we are getting results

097 INT  Mmm...

098 C2  ... if we keeping making it work and people keep being made happier with our work than I don't suppose it matters what we are doing differently or the same as each other, er the consensus that you said is that we make it work, that's what we're all trying to make happen.

099 INT  Maybe it's the getting of a er good results that is the common theme that bonds your approaches together

100 C2  Yeah probably.
INT 1. How long have you been working in the conflict resolution field?

002 L2 About five and a half years.

INT 2. Can you explain what it is that you do in the conflict resolution field?

004 L2 You know I'm a lawyer... so I do law work... ah... legal work...

INT And in conflict resolution?

006 L2 Yeah... in conflict resolution that's in the area of alternative dispute resolution and mediation - it's hard to define the difference really.

INT You don't think there's any difference between... between alternative dispute resolution and mediation?

007 INT 008 L2 There's no difference really in legal terms. I mean that basically they do the same things when it comes to use for the settlement of legal disputes, you know, I mean that there is no difference in functions with it. The only difference is in the way that people think about them. Really the idea of alternative dispute resolution is a fancy way of saying mediation. That makes it... it is more valid in legal terms. Though no real difference exists.

INT Okay, yeah, what exactly do you do in mediation?

009 L2 I conduct mediations between clients, help them sort out disputes before they get to the litigation stage. Mainly to do mediation with them.

INT And what sort of disputes do you usually deal with?

011 L2 They vary, but really it is about the normal things that you have legal problems with in business. That means stuff quite the unfair dismissals, um some kind of to... ah... dissatisfaction with the delivery of some prearranged agreement ah the difference between one person's view and another, um... it is a big list of different things really. Oh one of the other area that we have had a lot to do with in recent years has been in divorce settlement. We do mediation for couples that are separating and really it's the same as the dissolving of some sort of business relationship. We use all of the same mediation approaches that we would in business with the divorces.

INT 3. Did you have any specific training for your work in mediation?

013 L2 Yeah, it was part of my law training and we also do some at the firm.

INT What do you mean, some at the firm?

015 L2 We do training with more senior members of the practice, or consultants who come in... to learn techniques or skills that we then use in our work.

INT So some sort of in house training?

017 L2 Yes I guess you could call it that. It basically means that we have someone come in who is an expert in the area and they might spend a day with us and we pick up some of the ideas to use... skills that they have... and tried to then use them in our own work. It could mean also that they come and give a seminar to the group of lawyers and we then try to apply what we could.

INT And you also said it was part of your course when you were studying law?

019 L2 Yes I had some of it my degree.

INT Is that something that everyone did?
Uh huh we all had it in our last year as a way of sort of understanding the face of the law out there in the community and what sort of things we might be doing with it. I thought it was a good thing to do and I learned a lot about mediation. I liked it.

**INT** Did everyone enjoy it?

L2 Not everyone

**INT** What, some didn't like it or not everyone did it?

L2 No everybody did the course, but some thought that it was a bit soft, if you know what I mean.

**INT** They thought it wasn't useful?

L2 I think they thought that it was not legal enough. They thought that it was too soft or too practical.

**INT** So you're saying they thought it was not...

L2 ... I think that it is all of those things are really just that it really questions many of the conventions of the law and law tends to be a very conservative type of endeavour ... or ... many of the students just thought that it was too far away from everything else they had learned to be very useful for their experience.

**INT** That's interesting does at mean at they just rejected the ideas or did you think that they were open to hearing what was said in the course.

L2 I think that most of them just did it the cause they had to do it as part of the course ... there were some of us who were very interested in it and we really had a chance to go into it in a very deep way ... I remember that we had good opportunities to meet with a professor about it because he was very interested in these approaches. He had done a lot of curriculum redevelopment to make sure that these things were exposed to lawyers, or law student at least.

**INT** 4. Do you feel that this training adequately prepared you for practice?

L2 Ah huh, it's been good. I have always felt prepared for my work with clients so its been okay compared to how other people get trained.

**INT** 5. Do you see clients?

L2 Yes.

**INT** 6. How many clients do you see per day, or per week?

L2 It's usually two or three parties a day, but it's hard to be definite because they're all part of the same dispute. We generally work on one dispute at a time. Ah it would come down to about five or six a week that are different cases.

**INT** So you don't have more than one case running at the same time

L2 Not individually, we each do one thing at a time in the mediation area. Or ... actually not everyone in the practice does the ADR, its only about half of us ...

**INT** ... how many is that?

L2 ... four or five

**INT** Okay

L2 So, we ... er ... we see one ADR case at a time and follow it through to its logical end point before being given another one to work with ... that's just how we do it ...

**INT** ... but you are doing normal cases as well at the same time with other clients

L2 Yeah yeah we have to do other more traditional cases as well, we don't do ADR all the time

**INT** 7. Over what period of time (for how long) do you see your ADR clients for?

L2 Each meeting is for two hours, but how long overall depends.

**INT** What on?

L2 The complexity of the case, how many people are involved, we sort most things out over about a months period.

**INT** Do you mean that most of your cases usually run for a month?

L2 Yeah. There is variation of course, some only take one session, but on average a month is normal to get everything done and that would mean about four sessions.

**INT** 8. When you see clients, how much do you rely on what you learned from your training and how much are other factors like common sense relevant?

L2 A lot of it is commonsense, and er some is by the book ... (pause).
What do you rely on most?

I don't know, I'd have to say both, equally. Some situations you can solve using the book, or that is theories, others will be best handled with no theory, when you have to use your gut, go with what feels right.

Can you be more specific ... the book?

I mean using what they say in most of the er the ah books about how to approach it. I know that there also is a large degree of skill that we develop over time, but we also fall back on the actual theories that we are meant to use.

What sort of theories?

Well it is really the basic model of the steps that you have to follow when you are putting together a mediation case. That is just the general type of steps that you would normally use with any kind of mediation.

So what about the other aspect that you mentioned ... the common sense aspect?

There is a need to be skilled in what you do ... of course ... but there is er you develop skills that makes you more efficient in what you do ...

So the intuitive aspects are really good for making you more efficient in dealing with the cases?

Yeah they make it better for the clients be because it is a quicker process for them.

And that is a commonsense approach?

Well I suppose that the commonsense part is really what many people see when they look at mediation and I think that is why many of my colleagues back at university thought that this was a rather softer approach to resolving conflict.

Yes?

Because it sounds like it is all simple and using very basic language and because it sounds more like anyone could actually do it properly, then I think that many people would think that it is a technique that anyone could do and its just commonsense. But er that's not to say that there's not a very large commonsense part to doing ADR or mediation. It is commonsense but at the same time you use a model ... you have to be very skilled to use that commonsense approach. It looks easier than it is, believe me (laughs), it's more complex, we only make it look easy.

9. Do you think that standard theories of conflict resolution affect practice?

Only a little. I think most people just do what they want with conflict resolution, so er not really. And the er the field is not well into er any theoretical information. I mean I think you have to use some kind of tested theory in your work so that you know it is likely to work, but not many others would.

What do you mean? Could you expand on that?

Umm, most people in this area don't use the theories. They might know one or two processes, but they don't understand the theory.

How come?

They are just not trained that way, and they don't care about theory because of that and er it's not emphasised properly by er by most of the um training programs that er people working the area do. Mmm, and there is very little agreement about what is "standard" in these theories anyway...you know what I mean?

Yes that's fine. Does that mean that they should know more?

I don't know. I have found that they are useful for me, but it's because I am using much more specific processes for very specific problems. In community mediation that ... it may not be as necessary...

So they don't need to be trained in the same ...?

Not to the same way ... but not in a worse way either ... I mean that they must have some training and be at least aware of the various different techniques and ways of doing mediation. But I er do think that we should have people trained better so that they have some proper understanding of the area.

Does that mean that other people should be affected by theories more in their practice?

I think they should but that's because I need to in my work.

What evidence can you give me to explain how you use that in your own work?
Umm ... I ... let me think ... that it is just in the fact that I have to deal with very complex issues that usually have very large possible repercussions. It means that we are perhaps more accountable when we do the negotiations if we can be shown to not using a service or a procedure correctly, then it is likely that we will either lose a very important account or that we will ... would ... be more likely to get in troubles with how clients.

And does that apply same way to people in say community mediation?

No ... it's clearly not the same for them. Usually people using community mediators tend to be these that can't afford other ways of doing the conflict resolution they use the community mediator because it often is the only possible area that they can address the problem. Now that doesn't mean that the community mediator shouldn't be accountable, that's desirable, but it does mean they aren't as accountable as us.

I think I know what you mean. Are you saying that because the stakes are high, you have to be more likely to be correct?

Yes that's what I'm saying we have more pressures to not make mistakes.

And are you saying that being closer to the underlying theories means that you are less likely to make a mistake?

Yes it does I suppose. Or at least it means that we are less likely to be considered to have made a mistake (laughs) you know what I am saying?

10. Do you do any research in this area?

No

12. How would you describe the nature of the relationship between research and practice in conflict resolution?

Umm, tenuous (laughing). There isn't much of a relationship ... it's kind of hard to explain why it doesn't work, it's just one of those relationships that has never really gotten working.

What do you think it is all about, why doesn't it work in your opinion?

It's mainly a problem of communication. No-one on either side really understands what the other is doing and there isn't much interest in making it work because there hasn't been any need to make it work.

What do you mean?

Well neither appreciates the value of the other ...

... yeah ...

We need a win win outcome ... to use a conflict resolution term (laughs) but that depends on the groups actually wanting to get to a stage where there is the will to actually set up a better relationship.

Is there some way how researchers and practitioners can work together to help each other?

Probably, there is always a way, but I think it will be hard to get happening, there is er very little communication, and that's the most important thing but er it would be good if it could, it er would help out our image and things like that.

13. So what do you think about the way researchers and practitioners help assist each other in this field?

No they don't ... not at all, there could be a much more helpful ... if they could communicate and work together properly. Really, it's important to sort this out.

Why do you say that?

As standards and codes of practice are established more clearly it will be more important to research what works and what doesn't. We will become more reliant on each other I think.

What it will become more important to work together, er researchers and practitioners?
Yeah and that's harder because it's so diverse, and er so many applications means lots of professionals and groups are using ADR. So it's hard to keep up with it all, as it gets more well known and everyone wants to use it. But with er conflict resolution because there are people from er different fields involved multidisciplinary also means multidifficult er multidifficulty (laughs). I don't mean to be negative, it's just hard to keep standards and know what's happening everywhere its no wonder that researchers and practitioners don't work very well together yet. But er if the field is going to prosper then we will find that people will learn to work together, so er I think that we may not work that well together now but we will in er the future.

14. Yeah, is there much consensus about the theories and processes that underlie conflict resolution among people you work with?

Yeah ... we all agree on our basic processes, ar of course each case is different, but we have the same basic approach and that's the most important thing.

What about theory?

The approach is the theory, what we do is based on theory.

Which theory is it based on?

I'm not really sure (laughs) but it is a theory! (laughs).
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001 INT 1. How long have you been working in the conflict resolution field?
003 INT 2. What do you actually do?
004 T1 I do a bit of everything. Being in conflict resolution so long means that you see all the different ways it can be used ... and you learn how to do most of the things ... mmm mainly counselling sort of things, but most things in conflict resolution I can do.
005 INT What do you mean?
006 T1 Well, you can do all the different types of mediation...you know community mediation, victim offender, ADR, ... I've been asked to do some consultancies and business work ... ah give workshops and courses, yes?
007 INT Ah ha, that's good. um what do you do most of the time now?
008 T1 Nowadays its mainly training and some actual mediation work.
009 INT Who is that with?
010 T1 With the Quaker Peace Service, I train the new mediators and also do interventions with whoever the service refers, its community disputes, problems between neighbours most of the time.
011 INT Ah, what do you actually do most of the time in you conflict resolution work?
012 T1 Er simple mediation really ....
013 INT About?
014 T1 about things like arguments between neighbours, community decisions umm, mm ... things like that mainly, mainly community work and mediation.
015 INT And you do the mediation with the people?
016 T1 Yes
017 INT And that's something you like doing?
018 T1 Yeah, it's good work to be doing, it really makes a difference for the community. I like it, yeah its good.
019 INT Uh huh, umm is there anything else that you do there?
020 T1 Oh yeah we also do quite a lot of divorce mediation, and child placement ah custody arguments that come with the divorce problems. They are becoming more and more common, with the neighbourhood area that we are in now ... yes ... its getting worse with the number of disputes that we are seeing or they are finding us more ... either way we are busier than ever ... and divorce mediation is a big part of our caseloads ... but we are getting good ... good results too with all the cases we are seeing
021 INT Yes you were saying before that it was getting very busy here, what do you attribute that to?
022 T1 I think that because we are are getting better known and because we are getting better results for everyone than they would get if they tried to chase their claim around our damn courts systems ... and it costs so much that way, and we only make a nominal charge ... er if the people don't have the money then we are free. Its because there are less problems for people ...
023 INT ... do you think that it might have something to do with more people knowing about mediation too?
Yeah of course, but its also because its a more expedient solution to the problem and people like that

3. Okay ... did you have any specific training to do mediation?

Yes I'm a social worker.

Did that involve training in community mediation?

No, I got that from other courses, but social work taught me the skills needed to work in the community properly. It's a good grounding, that or psychology, some sort of counselling, but most of my training came through the nonviolence work with the Quakers and just by doing it.

Yes, of course, I was just interested in whether they actually taught mediation to you while you were doing the social work training?

Well social work does talk about some of the issues in mediation because it does a lot of the same processes but the real benefit is that it does talk about the right way to work in the community and how to respect the process that individuals are experiencing when they come to mediation.

So the important thing from your social work training was that it gave you a good approach to use for mediation?

Yes

Did you, what were the other courses you did for mediation training?

I did a number of smaller courses mainly looking at the mediation processes and how to use it in the community. That was with the Quakers again.

What sort of focus did that have for you?

We looked at all sorts of things that are used in mediation ...

Yes

The need to have an equal balance of power, the stuff about a win-win situation ... the need for umm ... need for having confidentiality, some of the ways to approach transforming solutions, and coming up with alternatives, getting an equal share of the property, or the issues at hand ... finding some sort of way to keep both of the party's happy and especially with the children fand finding from the people there what is the best way to actually serve the interests of the child.

4. Yes that really good. Do you feel that this kind of training prepared you for practice properly?

Definitely, without the social work grounding it would be very difficult, probably impossible, to do my kind of work.

What, the counselling side of things or the training that you are doing now?

Yeah well prepared me well for the counselling ... as a social worker was it was a definite plus. And the peace service is now er it became to be the major part of my learning how to do this work well ... umm ... now that I am a trainer I have to try to keep er up with all the developments and new ideas that are coming up around the place.

So do you think the mediation courses that you said you did prepared you properly for doing mediation?

They were good, yes, but I think your naturally good at it er and experience is the best teacher.

What do you mean, er can you explain what you mean about experience being the best teacher?

Well I think I could do all the courses in the world but they wouldn't help without practice and the learning of real cases with real people with real situations and problems.

Yes.

That's what prepared me best. That's where I got my best training for what I am doing when I am working with clients ... its almost like that you have to see lots of examples first before you really catch on to how the whole thing really works in the way that they say it will when you are doing the training and the way I say it will when I am now doing the training role ... I always tell them that what I say doesn't mean anything unless they can see the models and steps in practice when people are actually doing er going through a mediation or in any type of conflict resolution ... it has to be real for them otherwise you can't really learn the heart of it, you know it stays in their heads without them really getting it.

Can you say some more about that I mean what is it about just staying in the head?
It has to be a concept that they have more than just a mental approach to or understanding of. I mean that it has to be bigger than that. If it is just an intellectual understanding its not enough for the effective or the good application of the ideas in practice. When it comes to being effective in the field you have to have more than that. We could spend all of our time just talking to them about the way that different ideas work or the way to understand the psychology of the people having the dispute, but it's not until they actually sit down with some people or who are having an problem that they are able to er to actually get it. It's like they need to understand the application. It has to be more of a feeling than an intellectual concept ... its too important to just leave it as a concept that they understand but don't feel ... hmm ... yes?

Yep, what is it about the feeling, what sort of feeling do you want them to to have, is that what you called the heart aspect before?

Yeah the feeling, is really getting it out of their heads into their hearts or getting them to understand that its a feeling that they are trying to get across to the people ... more than its a concept or intellectual process. If they just keep it in their heads then that is as far as the clients will understand it as well. Umm ... it has to be a more individual process than just a mental model. I'm in, I mean that they have to get across to be people the feeling of it.

And what is the feeling of it all about?

It is really a feeling of safety and a feeling of cooperation and a feeling of goodwill between people involved rather than it being like a court sitting where they just make the strategy that works best to help themselves umm ... so in their thinking rather than actually embodying any emotional change with it ... we are talking about getting people to experience the mediation or conflict resolution process at an emotional level so that their whole feelings about the situation is changed. As well as up the umm ... initial problem gets fixed so that way we hope that they will not have problems, well as many problems, again in the future. It is then a thing that becomes more generalised rather than being stuck on the one process or the one problem so we are talking about a more general skill and a more emotional change for the client. And sometimes it means a real transformation for the person or sometimes for the couple. I have sometimes done divorce mediations for people who then decided not to get divorced after the conflict resolution ... so its more of a healing for them than a settlement, and it means at when we do make a settlement it should be more of a peaceful or a gentle process for people so they don't go away harmed or upset about the whole thing. People are fearful about going to mediation or any sort of settlement, so we try to make it a positive experience and we can't do that unless the people are met by mediators who are more compassionate and more empathic than the court system. Sometimes mediation is just like a legal process, we try to put the feelings back into it and we like to try to have a healing process running through our mediations. That's what we do anyway.

5. Thanks that's really clear thanks, er so you still see clients regularly?

Yes.

6. How many clients would you see per day, or per week?

I umm it's only about two new cases a week now, the rest of my time is in doing training or case management and there is at least half of our time spent doing that er those tasks when you are working in a community organisation, there is ... its administrative and it also involves speaking to people about the case that is coming up and letting them know their rights or setting up the next part in a case ... so I'd be seeing about ten different ones each week.

So you just see two cases per day?

No, no er I don't mean that. Well er one case always has at least two people so I see them individually to get them ready for the actual mediation between er with each other ... and then there is the other cases that I am setting up or interviewing other people that are involved in new cases ...

... oh okay ... when you say getting them ready for the case what do you do?
You have to give people a chance to work through their problem before it's safe or for them to feel safe to go through it with the other person, and it's also to handle any anger that they might have so that doesn't come out in the actual settlement and leave them in a bad situation. Er I use it to explore the problem with them and help them heal their pain and understand what they conflict means for them in their lives, and and at the same time find out what they are really wanting out of the settlement so I can try to get that for them when we go to mediation ... hearing both sides first before the actual mediation means I can usually pick a solution that's going to make everyone happy, um so they feel heard and so they get their needs met and they know how to sort it out next time so they're building skills at the same time.

Mmm so it's like therapy for each of the people in the case and then they meet and sort it out together, with your help?

Yeah that's it, most of us use techniques from counselling to help them with the personal part and then mediation to sort out the conflict.

7. Okay I think I get the picture, for how long would you see a case on average?

Each mediation goes for about a couple of hours.

And how many times do you see them?

Oh the majority is only three. Most of the time it only takes about three sessions. I used to see people for a minimum of two sessions, but now we usually go for three. Nowadays the main reason for seeing them more than that is because they have made an appointment for a different problem (laughs).

8. Okay just another one about the clients, when you see them, how much do you rely on what you learned from your training and how much are other factors like common sense involved?

About fifty fifty really. You know some is from my training and some is common sense.

Do you think that's a good combination?

I haven't really thought about it ... it's just how it works out.

What do you mean?

I er I use the ideas of er my training, that's true, but intuitive understandings are also important and you can't really learn that from anyone but yourself.

Yes, can you say more about that?

You can learn the right things but that's different from doing anything about it.

But you say you do both about half and half

Yeah I've been lucky enough to have a good chance to develop er that along with good mentors and teachers in how to do mediation, they taught me how to intuitively use my skills.

Was that part of the training course you did or on the job?

On the job. The social work training reinforces all that though, it also trained me to be intuitive in the way I work with clients. I think what happens is that you learn all the different approaches, they're really all the same as you probably know, its just different techniques, slightly different order in how you work through a settlement, but otherwise they are the same mmm ... yeah yeah as I was saying you can learn all the different ways but eventually you end up working out your own style in how you do it, you know your own style as to how you order things in the mediation, the questions you ask and all that and that er then becomes very much like commonsense to you if your the sort of person who's good at it.

Is that a normal part of the social work training?

It should be (laughs)

Umm, well is that mainly your training doing that or common sense?

I'm not sure, I know you'd like me to say one or the other (laughs) but its not that easy (laughs).

No you don't have to say either if you don't want to (laughs).

Okay okay, I know what you're getting at, there is a lot of common sense involved in conflict resolution. But you do get better at it as you practice (laughs). I know a lot of my colleagues will say that its all intuition and those sort of unconscious processes but that's pretty simplistic ... but they haven't been educated in a way that helps that view along.

What do you mean?
Umm ... there's some trainings out there that don't really focus on the processes as we might if we were giving the basis of conflict resolution to learn and they simply say it's all intuition. Does that make sense?

**9. Yes, alright er do you think that standard theories of conflict resolution affect conflict resolution practice?**

Well that all depends on if you have been taught that they should or not.

**So what do you think happens generally?**

Generally they don't because they don't relate to what we do in practice.

**Why?**

Most people doing conflict resolution are not trained in the theories. They might get the basics and they might do a good job with people, but they don't know anything about the theories that underlie conflict resolution.

**Is it necessary that they do, if they still make it work?**

Probably not, but my opinion is that everyone who uses conflict resolution should know why they do what they do. It's like being a psychologist without any training in the theories.

**Well some might say its not necessary (laughs).**

(laughs) I just think it's better to really know what you're doing, you are better off, especially if something goes wrong, you know what to do and more about why it happened. There's also the issue about standards and proper training ... I just think that mediators should know the background to what they are doing, but I know that not everyone would agree with me (laughs).

**10. That's good er do you do any research in this area?**

Yeah a little, I have written a book you know.

**11. Can you tell me what your research was about?**

Ah it was really only on techniques, on ways that practitioners could improve what they do with counselling techniques.

**What did you do?**

I have er just pulled together all my ideas over the last few years, about what works and what doesn't, um it was like a condensed version of a counselling model, you know, quite simple stuff ... I just watched what good mediators have done over the years and put together some ideas into a format for others to use. It wasn't properly researched or anything like that, it was really er a collection of my ideas about it ... no I wouldn't really call it research.

**12. Okay, how would you describe the nature of the relationship between research and practice in the conflict resolution field?**

Research like I have done seems to be well received a lot of my books sold (laughs).

**So it was a success with other people in conflict resolution?**

Yeah lots of people in practice bought it and it was pretty popular because it was simple to understand and they liked that it was written by a local person who wasn't trying to impress them with big words and theories that were based in mathematics or something like you know, er physics (laughs) books by researchers are too complex, they don't understand what they need in the field.

**So simple was they key to it all?**

Yeah, but it has to be practically orientated too ... for it to make any sense to the practitioners it has to have lots of examples and that.

**Do you know why people don't like the more complex sounding books?**

Well some of it was very structural with A effecting B and all of that, you know the like of Fisher & Ury ... whatever the name is ... Getting to Yes book. It's also somewhat manipulative in the ideas of many of my friends in practice, ... they think it's very theoretical, very flashy, you know, and they don't like the idea of tricking people into coming into the mediation the way the mediator wants them to er its like they have an underhanded reason for it coming out the er way they want to make them look better.

**Mmm, do you keep up with the other research that's done on conflict resolution?**

Well I never hear about anything that is found out ... is that what you mean?

**Yes, umm do you have an opinion about the relationship between research and practice?**
I suppose I'd have to say I don't think it is very good. If researchers and practitioners don't communicate, then it can't be very good can it?

That is a good point. Do you think there is any thing that could be done to improve that relationship?

I think that the whole issue of communication is very important.

Could you say something more about that?

I have not really thought about it a great deal, but I think that it is as simple as making sure that there is some kind of useful dialogue between those people who are involved in the practical side of conflict resolution and those to a practising their trade as researchers in their area, they are so different ways of doing things and we hardly ever come into contact with each other and we have different values for what we do. Maybe if we met occasionally and talked about the issues at hand and then some of the research could be disseminated among those of us who are practising and if we could have some useful input in to the nature of that research then it would be important to us.

Do you do you think that that might help?

I'm not sure ... I am a little sceptical I suppose (laughs).

Why do you think you would say you are sceptical?

I suppose it's a learned response to these sort of ideas.

Yeah, okay, ah what do you mean by a er learned response?

I mean that we have been involved with some of our organisations before which have tried to make these ideals more of a practical reality, but they tend not to come out with any real gain for us the practitioners. I think that it affects researchers more. At the end of all of the work it is them that gained from publishing our work or using our ideas to get publications. Other practitioners don't really get involved in thinking about the sort of things that the researchers are really interested in doing. That means that we don't really gain anything from it ...

... but there be some form of co-operative research?

That's a reasonable sort of idea, but there aren't many er enough practitioners to really want to do research. It would be the same of them to come to us and ask us if they could be involved in our practice for some sort of gain.

Yes I see what you mean. Are you say that it's a bit of a one-way street?

Yes I am ... I think that we don't gain as much as they do from any form of collaboration. And I think that most practitioners are feeling like that, do you know what I mean?

Yes you have made it very clear and I think that what you're saying is representative of other things that I have heard from people

Have other people said the same things?

... more or less ...

Okay then maybe I'm not so extreme in my views after all (laughs).

No I do not think you are being extreme, it helps if you are this frank about your thoughts.

I just think that it is true that practitioners don't have a great deal to gain from sharing the collaborative approach to research. It is not a thing which is valued in our profession. We just want to try to help people with their problems and sorting out their disputes.

Would any research help you with that?

I have not seen any that is particularly useful yet. I know that might sound a little closed but most of the research that we see is somewhat specific or artificial ... it does not understand the real issues at hand

But practitioners might be able to inform those issues?
I suppose so, yes, but as I said, there is no real gain for us to do that. I really don't think that we would want to be involved in that sort of thing because the time and energy that one would have to put into it would far outweigh any sort of gain we might receive. That is not just a selfish thing it is something that we have to really consider when we are looking at how much work we can get done in our organisation. It is more a point of the use and where we chose to put our focus because there are always so many people who actually need our help and to have some mediation done seems much more important to us than doing other things. And its not anything that will help us do our jobs better, if we want to improve ourselves we would go and do another course or something like that rather than do something involving research. It is a practical focus rather than an academic focus I suppose, hmm. Is that okay?

Mmm that's very helpful thankyou

That's okay

13. Umm, there are just a couple of more questions, but we might have already answered them, do you think that researchers and practitioners adequately assist each other in this field?

Based on your last question the answer is no.

But why do you think that?

Well I just think they don't. As I said, I don't hear anything about research and there's no research about mediation that is worth reading about ... well that's my opinion ... I've seen some in newsletters, but I don't pay much attention, it's a waste of time when there is so much else to do in our jobs. Researchers are just as busy I suppose but there has to be a reason for the research.

What do you mean?

I mean the reason for research should be better ideas for how to do mediation. I've never seen anything like that that's been any good.

It's not been in anything you've read?

No I haven't seen anything ... but I don't look for it either (laughs).

Okay, do you feel like you could get something out of it if you had all the time to read and that, would it be useful if you had the time?

Well probably still not still. It's not right but there's not enough cooperation. I think it all comes down to education umm ... neither researchers or practitioners are really well educated about what each other do. It's like they don't know each other exist. I know practitioners feel like research isn't important and I don't know but maybe researchers have the same attitude about practice. What's more clear is the fact that there's not really any communication and there isn't the goal of helping each other do their jobs better.

Why do you think that is?

As I said, no communication, or respect for the value of each other potential contributions like we don't like each other and we know how to get on together because we come from such such different places in what we do.

14. Okay, is there much consensus about the theories and processes that underlie conflict resolution among people you work with?

Yes, we all talk about what we do with clients in mediation and it's all basically the same. We agree, there is a good understanding between us all.

So you all do things the same way?

Well of course we all have our own style, but we all come from the same philosophical place, we have the same values, so our ways of doing conflict resolution is very similar.
1. How long have you been working in the conflict resolution field?

2. And could you just explain for me what is it that you actually do in the conflict resolution field?

I work in doing mediation most of the time.

What type of mediation? um who with?

Most of it is in divorce and family mediation

... so what is your role in the service?

Because I am the senior mediator in our groups I generally do the training of the younger staff, or the less experienced staff that, and also I and a doing the administrative parts of the service which mean that I do the general setting up of the mediation the ... ah ... in our service and also the many other promotional and advertising stuff which we have to do now days ...

... but does that mean that you have to do any of the actual practice of mediation?

Yes I do practice as well

Okay is that practice a lot or a little, how much do you do, how much of your time is spent in practice and how much do you do administration?

It would be 50% practice and 50% illustration or training, No ... it's probably more like thirty er a third training a third practice and a third mediation er administration.

3. Did you have any specific training for the practice part of your work?

What the teaching trainees or the actual mediation?

The mediation

Well they didn't teach me anything about mediation in my psych course, you'd know that (laughs) ... everything I learned about that I picked up from workshops and courses, and from other people that I work with.

And what were the courses like?.

They really were very practical with the skills and things, they really aimed at making sure that we had very practical skills, you know how it is when you need to make sure that their is some kind of skills that people go home with so they know what they are doing ... so they were the sort of courses though which you don't get at university they are more the, they are more the focus of applied areas

So they were useful for training you in mediation?

It was so long ago (laughs) I remember them as helpful, but it was a long time ago ...

... and now you do the training

Yes and things have changed a lot since when I started learning about mediation and conflict resolution ...

... Uh huh ...

... and many to, of the basic techniques and ideas do remain the same but at the same time we have changed a lot of the things that that has to be in a general individuals training.

For the better?
To be honest I think that it is better now because it is more practice based with a great emphasis on the more applied aspects of being a mediator?

What sort of innings have you changed?

We have done programs now that really get the people to teach themselves with how they do mediation. We basically guide them through the basic ideas but a lot of the parts they learn from themselves either in small groups or in to practical situations through work experience to.

Is that like some sort of problem based learning exercises?

Yeah that's what it is but we don't call it that, we don't have a name for it, it's just much more practical and participant driven, it's sort of a person centred learning approach.

Okay that makes sense, or has that changed the emphasis at all?

I think that the emphasis has changed now because the focus really is on practical techniques and practice rather than just the ideas behind mediation ...

... what do you mean by that?

It means that who ever is learning the mediation learns how to do it by roleplays and observing real situations rather than by hearing a few lectures from people who have been to ... who have been around for longer than them. That's what it's was like when I learned it.

Can you say anymore other that?

I didn't have any experience of mediation when I started. I had just finished my training in psychology and then after I had some counselling experience I ended up being asked to do mediation for a social service that I was working for at the time. All they did, and all that was around back then, was for them to send me to this course which didn't emphasise anything practical at all. It was all theory driven. Is that okay?

Yes thank you, do you think that it is a better situation with training now?

It has to be (laughs)

4. There's another, we might have covered this already but do you feel that your training adequately prepared you for practice?

Err the psychology training was okay, but it didn't teach me about the practice of mediation, or anything like that, not for counselling either.

What you don't feel that your psychology training helped you learn how to practice counselling either?

No no not really, it wasn't much help for anything ... but that was a while ago now

Yeah, okay, what about the mediation courses that you said you did when you started mediation?

As I was saying before that the courses and workshops were really what helped me. It was clear that was the only thing that could help me in this area. Practicing the skills under supervision also was good training, it's a way of approaching training that's important, it has to match your own personal skills and er give you the sort of experiences that you can learn from, experience and practice is central to your supervision.

Can you explain what you mean by that?

Supervision?

Yes.

Err supervision is where you have like a mentor or a supervisor watch you work err and counsels you about what you did right and what you need to improve. I think the supervision time was the best training that I had and prepared me best for practice.

And do you do the sort of supervision where you just put aside some time each week or two to go and have a talk about cases which have effected you and er have a chance to debrief?

Yes that was also part of my training. I don't do it formally anymore, but I still debrief with someone sometimes.

How often?

Ah about every two months

And do you offer supervision to your trainees?
Yeah that’s a normal part of our training system to for all of our trainees to have supervision both in person and for debriefing each week or two depending on whether they are training fulltime or part-time ... err... oh and I am one of the supervisors so I see about five people each week for the debriefings and I have trainees sitting in on some of my mediation cases.

5. Okay, now you said you see clients in about a third of your time?

6. How many clients do you see per day, or per week?

It depends on the bookings, it varies depending on when they choose to call, us its up to them. Up to four or five a day sometimes.

What about on average.

On average it's probably three a day.

And are they all for conflict resolution sessions or mediation sessions?

Yeah, either actually doing a mediation or having a meeting with people who are due to come to mediation

7. For how long would you see a client?

Sometimes once, sometimes twice, again it depends on the case.

Over the life of a case er from start to finish how often would you see a disputant in a case?

I see most people about three times each time for about two hours.

And that includes the actual mediation meeting?

Yeah, usually its two meetings before the mediation and then the mediation ...

... and afterwards?

its not normal to meet after the mediation unless the mediation agreements fall through

8. Okay ah when you see your clients, how much do you rely on what you learned from your training and how much are other factors like common sense relevant?

Again, I rely on the skills I learned during my two years of supervision a lot, they are definitely what I base my practice with clients on and they are really based on intuition. Do you know what I mean?

Yes I do, do you think its an issue of common sense?

Yes of course. It's like the skills I use are common sense now, but they were from my training. Does that make sense?

Can you say more?

Well it is common sense to me now. I have developed my own way of doing it where it comes naturally and is my common sense. It's it comes naturally for some more than others .... I don't think about it ... er but I rely on this sort of thing much more than I do on what they taught me about psychology.

9. So do you think that standard theories of conflict resolution affect practice?

Um from what I know about the psychological theories ... er ...

... about conflict resolution

... ah no they don’t then ... I er they have very little to do with most of the work that practitioners of mediation like me actually do.

So you think theories of conflict resolution don’t effect the practice of conflict resolution?

Yeah I would have to say that I don’t think they do. But I don’t even know what is the popular theory er model at the moment or that I never really kept up with the sort of theoretical side of conflict resolution, I never have really been into it er I spose I'm not really interested and I don’t bother keeping up with the theories because frankly it doesn’t effect what I do and it it can’t help me with my work.

Do you think that if you did know what the theories and other ideas were that they could ever help with the work that you do with your clients?

I don’t think so (laughs). I don't think it would, even if I read up on the latest theories I don't think they'd actually help what I do. Maybe I’m not smart enough to use them, I have never understood that side of it all really.

What, you er haven't understood the theories?
086 T2 No I wouldn't say I couldn't understand the theories its more that I haven't really tried (laughs)
087 INT Well, I think you would understand it if you wanted, (laughs) er but I'm not saying that you should have, I am just interested in the sort of reasons why people do or don't, you know? Is there some reason you haven't tried to keep up with them?
088 T2 I suppose I'm not interested in it ... and its not easy to do ...
089 INT ... because?
090 T2 ...because there's so much other work to be done and its not easy to have time to read the right journals or even get access to the right resources and books, does make sense?
091 INT Yes, yes are there any other reasons that you don't find theories and models useful?
092 T2 Well theories can't help me to understand what makes my clients tick, er why they do the things they do and how I can get an idea of what compromises they are prepared to come to. They need people contact and a lot of listening before anything else and I haven't seen a theory that can teach someone how to do that yet?
093 INT So where do you get them if not from models?
094 T2 You learn how to be a mediator on the job.
095 INT And that's the best way in your opinion?
096 T2 Yeah I am one of those people who think that mediation is more of an art, and to learn how er to do it it takes a long time, er a lot of practice and a good apprenticeship to learn it properly.
097 INT 10. Mmm okay er do you do any research in this area?
098 T2 No I don't do any research at all.
099 INT 12. Alright er just a few more questions to ask, how would you describe the nature of the relationship between research and practice in the conflict resolution field?
100 T2 It is a relationship that doesn't work as far as I know. I've already said that I don't listen to research ... that I'm not interested in it ... er it doesn't help me with what I do because its so different from what I do. I'm not going to get anything out of it anyway, I wouldn't have time to anyway.
101 INT Why er why would you say you're not interested in it?
102 T2 Its well, um its so far out of touch with what we do in practice that it means nothing to us. There's not one theorist that I know who is really interested in the science of mediation or eh conflict resolution as we are interested in it.
103 INT The science?
104 T2 Err yeah the ah science as we call it, um I mean how we make it work in all different situations and whats really making it work, the er science of the art if you know what I mean (laughs)
105 INT Yes, I think I get it, why is it so hard for practitioners and researchers to get on in conflict resolution?
106 T2 It's that the research is just irrelevant to what we do and to why we do the mediation in the way that we do it ... ah ... and er the people doing research they are usually only trying to prove a new theory and thats important to their world not to what we do ...
107 INT ... and they are never helpful?
108 T2 I don't know, I just don't like the way they go about things. We work in completely different ways with different aims and ideals.
109 INT And what is the difference about?
110 T2 Okay ah the research tends to be cerebral, so mental that they can't get in to with what practice is all about. We are much more emotionally based in practice, researchers don't seem to understand that. I don't need to know how negotiation techniques work, I just use whatever is appropriate at the time. I go with what feels right. Does that sound okay?
111 INT Yes, it's fine thanks, and do you think it can ever get better?
112 T2 Er I don't think it would, I know they want to make it more accountable and all that as more people get into it and I can under understand that but I think it will wreck it a bit too. The sort of er guidelines that you er have to follow makes it all very different from what we like to do naturally. But I'm not saying all research is irrelevant, but as I said most practitioners are not interested, we prefer to learn from each other and from our clients.
13. So do you think that researchers and practitioners adequately assist each other in this field?

No.

Do you think there is anything that can be done to help improve that?

Not really, to tell you the truth, I think it is all a bit of a lost cause. I don’t rally care what happens to it all. As a psychologist I have more background it understanding research activities but the others they can.

Who are the others?

Oh, I mean the other people in practice, like social workers and community workers, or people who have only trained as mediators, you know?

Sorry, you were saying that group has less understanding of research than psychologists.

Yes, yes psychologists at least have some training in research, but even most of us reject the whole idea of research, it’s no wonder the others do too.

Can you explain why you reject it?

I just feel that there is no substance to have a belief in the validity of any kind of research that I have have seen than in this area that looks at what techniques work and what don’t and the whole idea of having any sort of outcome result.

Do you mean now that there is a different philosophy?

Yes er its a um a philosophical difference in the way that researchers and practitioners approach the whole idea of conflict resolution and the new mediation movement.

What is the difference, can you say anything to help me understand what this philosophy difference is about?

It’s like being told the whole thing about mediation being an organic process that can’t be studied by using techniques which hope to break it down to its smallest parts and the reductionist approach of most research.

The differences are around philosophical issues?

I suppose that the er the basic point of difference is that we um is that they believe that they can know something objective about mediation and er predict what will happen, and what we think is that most of the processes of mediation and conflict resolution are more subjective ideas that are based very much on the situation and in the feeling of the situation.

Does that mean that you cannot know anything about the basis of mediation, that they should stop trying to find it out?

No ... I’m not sure I’m saying that, I’m more saying that it’s their approach that is wrong, to think er that they can actually come up with a way of knowing about reality which they can then control the behaviour of people through a rigorous process of mediation is unjustifiable and wrong in my opinion.

Unjustifiable because?

Because it’s a way of making the process sterile, all mathematical, rather than embracing the group therapeutic roots of how we do mediation which is about emotional change in the disputants rather than about a mental process of what can I gain ... you know the work about needs and interests, er we are looking at what the deep needs and those are things that we don’t bargain with. And most of the time it’s about being able to who feel like they have been heard and seen, this is much more a therapeutic idea than a theoretical idea.

That’s good thanks. Will these things ever change?

I don’t think there will be a change in that until research becomes more orientated to practice and embraces some of the values of practitioners.

What do you mean by values?

Well some of our ways of doing things ... you know ... we don’t have real situations where we do controlled trials and theoretical models, it’s a different way of thinking, a different way of approaching the whole area of mediation.

Yes?

Err, that’s what I mean by values, we believe in different things, a different approach, almost a completely different belief system in some cases. I know it’s pretty typical, the stereotyping, but in most cases it’s quite accurate. Does that make sense?
139 INT 14. Yes, okay, this is the last one, is there much agreement about the theories and processes that underlie conflict resolution among people you work with?

140 T2 Yes we all agree on a common process ... but we all understand that we each do different things.

141 INT What do you mean you all do different things?

142 T2 Every mediation is different, and no theory or process could explain all of what we do in practice ... but we all agree about the methods we that we use when we work with people.

143 INT ... is that something that you set out to do?

144 T2 ... do you mean the consistent method?

145 INT Yes, the method

146 T2 ... then yes, we try to make sure we are all doing the same sort of thing when it comes to how we work with clients

147 INT I'm interested in the way that your ideas about the processes and the err I suppose the philosophy of conflict resolution and if they are consistent with everyone that you work with?

148 T2 Yeah that is similar as well, we all come from the same base when it comes to our understanding of conflict resolution and the reasons that we do it ...

149 INT ... and what would you say the reasons are in your group?

150 T2 Ah we all come from some sort of therapeutic background and we all want to help people, so we all have that same goal for our work with conflict resolution and um I think that is why we got involved in the divorce and family mediation work it it gives us the chance to do more of the healing part of mediation.

151 INT And that is something that you all want to have as a part of the work that you do in mediation now days?

152 T2 Yes we have decided as a team that that will be our approach and er it is working very well too.

153 INT Does that effect the way that you think in the questions that I have asked the before? I mean do your answers to the questions that I asked you about who the difference between research and practice come into it because of your motivation for doing mediation?

154 T2 Well they do because those people who tend to do research tend not to do the kind of things that we like to do and that they are doing it for a different reason ...

155 INT ... what does that mean?

156 T2 It means that those people who want to do mediation like us, obviously have a different agenda than those people who want to do it for other reasons like legal reasons or for social reasons, they want it for different things, do you know what I mean?

157 INT I don't think I am quite with you

158 T2 Its much easier to have shared agendas for doing this kind of work. You have to be doing it for the same reasons so that you can support each other properly ... its very hard work ... I can’t imagine doing it in isolation ... we need to share the same values so that we can understand what each other is going through and what the client is going through ... we have the same agendas ... you know?

159 INT Yes I think so. Is there anything else you would want to say about that ?

160 T2 No not really
1. How long have you been working in the conflict resolution field?
Umm, 12 years or so, mmm yeah 12 years.

2. What is it that you actually do?
I work in divorce mediation, with the legal system, and ah and with custody decisions.

But I mean is it that you actually do in those areas, er is it for the practical side of things or for the administrative side?
Oh I only work in the practical part of things really ... with the actual mediations and the settlements with the custody issues.

Do you do that on your own, I mean is it just you who goes in and does the mediation with people or is it as part of a team working on a case?
As part of a team. I do it mainly with a lawyer but sometimes there are three of us working together.

How do you work together? What are your roles?
I do the actual process of mediation to come up with the agreements which means that I have to guide the people through whatever it is they have as concerns and issues in the dispute er usually it is the divorce process like I said before and then (names lawyer) who I usually work with actually then drafts up the agreements that the people end up signing

So he just sits there while you are going through the mediation?
No (laughs) its not like that, we share the mediation process but I am in charge of that side of things, he follows my lead, he mainly offers examples of what has worked in the past for people and gives opinions that are more relevant to the agreement
Okay sorry
No its okay I probably didn’t make it clear really

3. Alright, can you tell me about the training that you have had?
Yeah I did courses in mediation while I was working as an educational psychologist, which sort of set me up to do this kind of work er and then changed across to doing this kind of work on a more permanent basis.
Can you tell me about the courses?
Yeah okay, they were night courses offered by the Quakers ... I’m a Quaker you know.

Yes you said before
... ah the training course went for a year
How many nights per week?
Only one and there were weekend intensives as well every second month, and there were some other weekend courses that I did as well and some workshops as well.

Were they Quaker courses too?
Some were and some weren’t. I did one at (named a Polytechnic), another with (names professional organisation) and one with (names professional organisation), have you heard about those groups?

4. Yeah I have, thanks ... er about the training, do you feel that this prepared you for practice?
Yes, it was a good preparation for the work I'm doing now.

Well I learned a lot of things from working with kids in educational psyche, so I know how to deal with them, and the mediation skills I learned, especially from the peace and nonviolence training in the Quaker courses has really taught me how to use my gifts the best way like I have to really. Now I can look at people, you know the separating parents, with compassion and love.

And that sounds important to you

Yes, very, the personal touch is easier to give to the mediation when you have those skills. Whenever I see clients those qualities are what I aim to express, it makes a resolution much nicer and more productive.

Is that what everyone does in mediation?

I think it is fairly specific to the approach that we use I mean not everyone makes the compassionate side that prominent in their training.

And it makes the process better for you?

... more meaningful and kinder for them.

Do you want to say more about that?

... I think it makes the process more meaningful ... we are dealing with very sad and hurt people when it comes to divorce mediation ... and especially when children are involved ...

... yes, I suppose that makes it harder...

yeah the process is so important, you have to be kind with the process as much as you need to be understanding and compassionate with the people, I mean the mediation process has to be made as gentle as possible.

And your training taught you how to do that?

Yes it did you know that the basic premise of Quakers in this area is for non- violence and we try our best to live that out in the way that we work with clients. It means that you have to try to make the process as kind and non- violent as possible if you know what I mean

Can you explain how you have learned to do that?

It's amazing really that if you just concentrate on being compassionate and giving people the full attention they deserve it is quite likely that they will co-operate with the process in a non-threatening way.

Do you mean that they are normally threatened?

No ... sorry I didn't mean that I mean to say that, it is important to make it possible for them to be as present as possible to the process. When they are dealing with these sort of issues it is very easy for them to get upset and for them to become emotional about the problem and we have to learn how to deal with those things if you know what I mean and the training that we do with the Quakers allows us to have the skills to do that?.

How do you manage emotions?

What we normally do is give the person space to express how they feel and then give some thought to the way they feel in the context of the problem. Usually people are just so frustrated that they are not going to have the sort of relationship that they thought they were going to have and this, of course, also the problems with the children, if there are children involved it makes the whole issue much more emotional.

Do you bring the children in on the set-up?

No ... sometimes we do but generally not ... I remember in the training that they said it was okay to do sometimes if you could be sure that the parents were going to cooperate, but I have really been in those sort of situations where I thought it was the right thing to do.

And that was all information that you learned doing your training?

Yes it was

6. How many clients do you see per day?

Three or four a day, but they're all at like different stages

7. How long do you see them for?

I give one and a half hour sessions.
How many sessions for each case?

It depends on the case, some are over in a couple of sessions, most last three, a few for four, some I don't get a settlement with at all and it ends up going to court.

How often would that happen? On average?

About one in ten I suppose. Most of the people that I end up seeing have already decided that they want to settle in a positive way, so it's unlikely that they will not be able to sort things out with a little help.

8. Okay that's good, when you see clients, how much do you rely on what you learned from your training and how much are other factors like common sense relevant?

You have to understand that mediation is a very intuitive process.

... yes ...

... there are rules that I follow, basic steps or competencies, but a lot of it I would have to say it is mainly intuitive ... But er I have to say that the Quaker way teaches you to be intuitive in your mediation.

What do you mean?

Well...we basically tune in to where the client is coming from and then use the principles of nonviolence, in er thought or action, that's verbal too, to try to mediate effectively, and that requires you to think quickly and make suggestions that feel right ... therefore its intuitive. I know I said I follow a model, I do, but most of it is how I feel, that's usually what works best.

And how do you know what you should be doing?

Well as I said it is very much a process that you get to learn but it's about being in touch with your own reactions to the client's situation and being very aware of the clients situation at the same time.

So does that mean that you are alert to things that they are feeling?

Yes it's true that I am trying to do that er but also you er get very good at reading people.

Mmm, er can you tell me how you read people?

You read people umm with practice you get better, you get good at noticing their body language and their individual reactions you can tell how they are feeling and I suppose that you have to think how would I be feeling in their situation ... ar that's a very simple way of getting insight into how the client might react next

And that helps you to developing your intuition?

Er it's a very difficult concept to actually name ... and describe ... to you, I find it hard to describe at all but er I think it means that you have an empathy for the person's situation so closely that you can almost tell what they are going to ask or feel next. Hmm, now that might sound a little too much like magic for you ... but I er don't mean it like that er I mean that you have a feeling for what might happen next and that feeling is often correct so that eventually you learn by feedback what is going to happen in a or er many situations.

I understand what you're saying, can you tell me what you think being actual process of developing intuition is all about?

Its part of the training you do with the Quakers and I suppose its something that people like me are attracted to, so it's very much a individual thing, but it's something that anyone could learn it's just a hard thing to explain. But I think it is clear though that it's a valid way of doing things, umm ... and I know that that is not scientific and I er know that that is not something that people would put in a text book to explain how good mediation is, but at the cold face of doing mediation with people, it works and I feel comfortable with it.

I suppose you have to go with what works

Yes obviously (laughs) it is obvious to me that this is a valid way of doing the mediation process and as I said before it makes it a kinder way of being with the people who are trying to find a peaceful way to settle their differences, that is what is important how the people feel and how they cancel their problem in a non-violent way, especially when there are children involved it's much more important to keep this simple and gentle in those cases.

So it's intuition before science?

I wouldn't say one is better than the other, it is both at the same time ...

... yes ...

584
... the training to use intuition allows me to do mediation better, it is a skill that I have learned so have my own way, but I think it is also an aptitude that some people have more than others.

9. Okay that makes sense, another question, do you think that standard theories of conflict resolution affect practice?

I'm not sure I can understand what the theories are about.

The theories and ideas of how conflict resolution should work?

Er do you mean the ideas about what causes conflict and theories of negotiation and that sort of thing?

Yes that's exactly what I mean.

Then I suppose so that they er must have some effect in the bigger scheme of things er if they didn't exist we probably wouldn't be using mediation so widely now, but er ...

... yes ...

well er they um they do effect practice because of that, but I also have to say that we practitioners tend to operate fairly independently of these theories.

What do you mean by that?

Not much of what we do are actually based on any theories. It's more practical for what we are interested in, we have more on practical "how to" models and frameworks of mediation.

10. Do you do any research?

No ah there really wouldn't be enough time to do any even if I wanted to, but er as I um said I'm er not that interested in doing the research side of things, its too boring for me.

12. Okay, I'm interested in how would you describe the relationship between research and practice in conflict resolution?

That's a hard one to answer (laughs).

Why is it hard?

I detect a lot of tension. It probably needs to be mediated (laughs).

Ah (laughs)

No, not really (laughs). I don't really have an opinion about it. I never really think about it, you know.

You don't think about research in mediation?

No, I believe I don't. I haven't since I was a psych student (laughs).

Why not?

Well its basically because research isn't really important for me or um my work, they're a long way apart in the greater scheme of things.

Can you say how it isn't relevant er or how do you know that its not going to help?

It doesn't help because I don't use it and I still seem to manage with my cases and make um help make people happy with the resolution of their problems. I um think I'm good at what I do and I er never consider the research when there's a difficult case, I don't read journals or research books or anything like that. I well, I suppose that's not very good, but I don't think it would ever help in most anyway.

It wouldn't help because?

... because it isn't immediately relevant to what I am doing I have not kept up with the reading or the latest research that you would need to to be able to understand what the different ideas and theories are actually about.

And do you feel that it would be good if you were able to keep up with those readings?

It's not realistic, I don't have the time to, and I am not particularly interested in that sort of thing I am a practitioner, I just am not into that kind of thing ... I am not suited to the sort of job that research people would be into.

So how would you respond to people who said that you should be interested in the latest theory because it would help you to be able to, or to be in a good position to help those of your clients who might have a case that has been researched recently or something like that?

I would have to say that it is still not really going to make me want to do anything about it, I believe in different ways of doing things.
INT Because?

T3 It really just er does not interest me ... at all. I think it is very boring to tell you the truth. And I am yet to be convinced that knowing everything about the latest theory is actually going to help me to help the next person that walks into my rooms who wants to try and work out a peaceful resolution to their problem. They don’t understand what we need in the field and they only care about what they are trying to achieve for themselves.

INT 13. So do you think that researchers and practitioners adequately help each other in this field?

T3 Obviously I don’t. I don’t make an effort to learn or listen to the research, and they don’t really take an issue, um take notice, of the issues pertinent to practice.

INT Why do you think that is the way it is?

T3 It’s not a realistic relationship, it can’t work the way it is. There is no communication so there is no relationship. We don’t really care about each others area, that’s my opinion any way.

INT Is there anything else?

T3 No, I don’t really have an opinion about it.

INT 14. Okay then, is there much consensus about the theories and processes that underlie conflict resolution among people you work with?

T3 I work alone most of the time except when I pair up with a legal person for settlements..

INT What about consensus with the colleagues or associates who do what you do?

T3 I don’t know, we do have different ideas but there’s a certain amount that we agree on that makes it common. I only associate with people who have a similar perspective though and with them we would agree on what is or the right way to do the mediation and what wasn’t so I agree with them about what is the right way.

INT What perspective is that, can you say?

T3 I tend to mix with other practitioners who have had the same training background, like in the Quaker methods of mediation, or at least from some kind of empowerment perspective and values for what we’re doing.

INT And there is general agreement about things in those groups?

T3 Yes, obviously we have our differences, but overall we all agree on what is a good way to do mediation.
INTerview Transcript 8  
Legal interest group: Interviewee 3 (L3)

ID: 008  
SEX: Male  
AREA: Divorce settlement  
PROF: Lawyer

001 INT 1. How long have you been working in the conflict resolution field?  
002 L3 Five and a half years.  
003 INT 2. And what is it that you do in the field?  
004 L3 I'm, I'm a lawyer, that's what I trained as ...  
005 INT ... but what about in the conflict resolution and er mediation field, er you know specifically in this area rather than generally as a lawyer?  
006 L3 ... ah in my opinion all law is conflict resolution, ....  
007 INT ... okay, specif...  
008 L3 ... the specific area in that I work in is in divorces settlement.  
009 INT And you did er you do mediation with that?  
010 L3 yeah, yeah, that is where I use the mediation skills that you are calling conflict resolution  
011 INT Is that what you would be calling conflict resolution ... is it all practice that you do?  
012 L3 Yes, and as I said also all law is a way of resolving conflict.  
013 INT Yeah okay that's fine  
014 L3 It's okay, I know where you are coming from with your questions, it's okay. I use mediation mainly for work with divorce settlement.  
015 INT 3. Can you tell me about your training in mediation, did you do anything specific for that?  
016 L3 Only really my legal training, and some workshops at work. But at uni we did quite a bit about it it was part of our course so we learned some mediation.  
017 INT So that was in your university course?  
018 L3 In my practical classes I did after I had done my degree  
019 INT What's that?  
020 L3 er we have like a year of supervised work before we can work as as, in the law.  
021 INT And you did some courses during that year?  
022 L3 Yeah and I picked it up in my studies at Uni first  
023 INT So it was a course during uni?  
024 L3 I did it there first, we had a course on alternative dispute settlement in our last year at (names university) and then I picked it up in my supervised year  
025 INT Can you tell me about that?  
026 L3 I did it in my placements you know because they were always in community law and divorce law.  
027 INT Did everyone do them or was it a choice?  
028 L3 We could choose from a a range of different areas and we ended up having to do at least one community rotation,  
029 INT Would everyone have done a mediation rotation?  
030 L3 I s'pose that everyone had a chance to get exposed to that sort of thing but not all of the community rotations would have had mediation directly in them.  
031 INT Oh okay, but you wanted to do that kind of thing?
Why did you want to do it?

I chose mediation because it's quicker and smarter than litigation and I thought it would be a more practical thing to do rather than just do another office type of placement, this way I had more contact with people

And you enjoyed them enough to get involved in mediation?

Yeah

4. Do you feel that your training adequately prepared you for practice?

Yeah, as I said a lot of it was on the job training, and I think that's the best training for anything.

Are you happy with what you did, in your training, or do you feel it adequately prepared?

...Umm yes. Obviously you can always learn more, but my training was pretty good compared to most people.

What do you mean by that?

Well it was a practical introduction to mediation for a legal use ...

... you think that's better than ...

... yeah er better than some of the people who I have seen coming through ... who er have just done a short course or something like that when they are then sent in to do it, it gives the whole field a bad name when er people with no training do it badly.

But you are saying that its better to learn as you are practicing mediation?

Yes, I think that's a much better way to learn it

5. Okay next question, er, do you see clients?

Yes that's my job (laughs).

6. Okay, how many clients do you see per day, or per week?

I work on two or three cases each day.

You see people each day?

Yeah two or three on average.

That sounds very busy, are they different cases each time?

It's only ever a two hour meeting meeting with the same client each week, but I might see the same person over four or five consultations before the resolution is completed satisfactorily.

So overall its about 5 visits for each client?

Uh huh.

7. Can you just clarify for how long you see them?

On average about a month ...

... from start to end? ... and er what sort of things?...

for a divorce settlement or something like that er ... most cases are settled within the month, some finish earlier, but that's the average.

8. So I just want to ask you a bit about what happens when you are doing practice ... when you see clients, how much do you rely on what you learned from your training and how much are other common sense factors involved?

Of course there's common sense involved ...

... but ...

... but it's the type of common sense that takes the right sort of training to acquire.

What do you mean?

Yeah, the right training results in the skills which can seem to be commonsense after a while. It looks like commonsense, but really its just the skilful use of knowledge and the right model and you get quicker and that looks like intuition but its just that your quicker and that'a okay because we get more done.

Knowledge that they learned in their training or general knowledge?

Both, both things are right, but but not every person working with divorce settlement uses the same kind of commonsense ... and that's because of the different trainings they have come from.

They do things differently because of their training?
9. Do you think that standard theories of conflict resolution affect practice?

Of course they do.

For everyone working in conflict resolution?

Not everyone is aware of them, they don't necessarily understand them, but no-one could deny that they form the basis of what are practice in mediation.

So even if they don't know it, or use them, it's still based in some kind of theory?

Yeah

Is that something that other people in conflict resolution would agree with you on?

No, I know most people doing mediation don't agree with that, but I just don't think they're being realistic.

Why is that?

I figure er think it's important to look at the history of something if you want to know how to best use it. I mean mediation goes back to the Chinese Dynasties, oh, you probably know that (laughs), but you'd be surprised how many people I work with, have no idea about the background of it.

Mmm

And that means that there is a history behind the ideas and theories that don't that people don't know about.

Yes ... is it important for people to know about the theories?

I think it would help them to do what they do better, they all learn models in their training anyway and then go on to use them after in practice and then say there is no theory to it (laughs)

How many people do you know in the field who would think that?

A lot of the people in practice would.

Any idea of a percentage?

I'd say about half ... in the family mediation work that I cross over with sometimes it seems they are happy to go on what feel right rather than on a model of how to do it that has been tested and tried out with people.

So do you think that their method is valid?

It's not not valid as much as it's not realistic ...

... Yes ...

... I don't know how you can learn a model of how to do something and then say that your not doing it that way that you are it based on something else.

I suppose it would depend on what you are calling a theory?

Yeah

Has this got something to do with the art science debate that's in mediation?

Yeah a lot of people think its just an art

What do you think it is?

I think you have to say that it is both ... a mixture of both, there is also a science to mediation if you can do it properly

Do you think that people who think its only an art are then doing it properly?

I would say no

Okay thanks, er do you do any research in this area?

No.

12. How would you describe the nature of the relationship between research and practice in the field?

I think it's okay.

Is there a ...
... there are efforts being made by many people to rectify problems of the research and practice and the bad relationship that happened in the past. I think there is a movement building to establish real research into applied areas.

*INT* What would you say have been the challenges of the past?

*INT* Basically ones of communication and self-interest ...

*L3* ... uh huh ...

*L3* ... I think most people doing mediation have been very guarded about what they have been doing, they don't want to be studied in case they're not doing the right thing.

*INT* Mmm

*L3* Similarly I don't think researchers have been very practically oriented in the past ... because it threatened the theoretical nature of their work.

*INT* So there were problems on both sides?

*L3* There wasn't much will to cooperate on either side really no.

*INT* But you think it's getting better, I mean you said this was in the past, but you feel it okay now?

*L3* I'd say its changing er as each group is finding out the value of each others experience, how each side can help each other.

*INT* What do you mean?

*L3* Let me give you an example from my background ...

*INT* ... okay ...

*L3* ...well law and divorce mediation has become now one of the most biggest areas of application of of mediation, so our legal theory people are now starting to take notice.

*INT* Uh huh

*L3* They are even asking practitioners like me to do some of the research in some of the newer studies that are being conducted er we would er collect the information ...

*INT* ... or you said before that you don't do any though?

*L3* I don't yet, but they want us to do case studies, write up and report our methods and things like that.

*INT* Will you do it?

*L3* If I have time, it's in both of our interests to find out more about the mediation process. I mean the law society wants to make sure they have a slice of the mediation cake if you know what I mean, I mean everyone wants to make sure that their profession will er do well in the um market place. So if the lawyers as a group work together we can ah do the research to show how er what we er do works and how it can be made to help people, its a good er for all of us.

*INT* Yes, that's a good example, thanks.

*L3* Mmm well its what's happening at the moment.

*INT* 13. Er do you think that researchers and practitioners help each other enough in this field?

*L3* We're er starting to, like I said before ... but not much so far

*INT* ... yes, I'm sorry, that question was repetitive, you've already answered it really ... er is there anything else you want to say about that?

*L3* Only that there is great potential for more cooperation.

*INT* Mmm

*L3* I can only talk for what I know and that the legal profession, I think the other areas are less organised and the problems are perhaps more philosophical.

*INT* Uh huh, ah why do you say that?

*L3* Er law is at an advantage because it is applied by nature, you know, but not all of the people doing conflict resolution have that, lawyers have to always refer go back to records of other cases and learn from whatever has been the precedent.

*INT* Hmm

*L3* Yeah, its almost second nature for lawyers to refer back to the research.

*INT* And that makes it easier for the relationship between those lawyers who do a lot of research and those who only practice?
Well not a lot of lawyers do research but research into applied things is probably easier to introduce than in other fields which use mediation because we accept it easier because we're used to that kind of documenting that kind of approach.

And you say its easier than in other areas?

Yeah, I have friends who do similar work to me from other fields who just detest research, they never give it a chance, they are really closed to any suggestion that it could be useful to how they work with clients.

So?

It means they miss out on any kind of new knowledge and its important to use everything we can.

14. Yes, that sounds like a good position, last one er is there much consensus about the theories and processes that underlie conflict resolution among people you work with?

Yes, between lawyers anyway. All of the lawyers that I work with basically have the same approach to using mediation.

And people you have worked with who are not lawyers, like social workers or counsellors?

It's not the same with people from other backgrounds. I don't agree with their perspective in most cases.

And then?

Er ... then we agree to disagree, that's okay isn't it?
INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPT 9
Community interest group: Interviewee 3 (C3)

ID: 009
SEX: Female
AREA: Community Mediation
PROF: Community Mediator

001 INT 1. How long have you been working in the conflict resolution field?
002 C3 Oh approximately 10 or 12 years, ....
003 INT ... uh huh ...
004 C3 ... closer to 12 ...
005 INT 2. yep okay, in what area of conflict resolution do you work?
006 C3 I’m a community mediator, like I said to you before when you rang me,
007 INT Okay, can you tell me more about exactly what it is that you do in community mediation or what sort of clients and what sort of issues come up, that sort of thing ...
008 C3 ... that is ... er my work is with community problems,
009 INT ... and ...
010 C3 ... ah, general community issues ... like neighbour fights, fights and disagreements between neighbours, couples who are having problems and need some help, er land lord tenant arguments and there's also a lot of youth work.
011 INT What is it with youth work?
012 C3 I see a lot of young people for all sorts of problems mainly because to do with problems they have with their parents or because they have been in trouble for stealing or starting a fight with someone else in the community and that sort of stuff ... I think that this is proving the most interesting part of our work, you know by the the young ones, they understand the idea of mediation very easily and usually are happy to get on with things very quickly when it comes to sorting out problems they take to it with these compared to the older people that I often work with.
013 INT Why do you think that is?
014 C3 Err maybe it's part of their culture to sort out problems and of course if they don't and they get into or trouble in the future obviously the penalties are much much harder for them so I think they understand the need to actually work through the problem at a basic level ... so that at the end it won't happen again ... it's pretty hard work for them if they have a record and most of them that I work with understand that predicament.
015 INT They sound quite co-operative?
016 C3 Well they are I suppose, not all of them of course, but most of them are into the idea of peaceful settlement rather than actually having a big fight or a problem most of them are encouraged by their families to get to community mediation rather than for them to continue in the own way and maybe end up in that a er correction facility.
017 INT So am I right in saying that you do the mediation?
018 C3 Yeah that's right I do the mediation and I then to some follow up counselling with individuals er when it comes to the young people, with the others like a neighbourhood disputes or a couple who are having problems I don't do the follow-up that's often done, someone else in our organisation ... I end up mainly seeing the younger people in our area.
019 INT So are you like a youth worker?
020 C3 Well its not that title for the job so I wouldn't say that, but hmm there's really a lot of it that's youth work.
021 INT 3. Did you have any specific training for your working with mediation?
C3 Yeah I did a night course.

INT What was it like?

C3 Oh it was good, very interesting for me because I didn't know a lot about mediation at that time.

INT I mean how long was it, what did it involve and that sort of thing?

C3 Sorry er ... it went for a year ... one evening a week at the (names community college) in East London and of course I've done you know those little weekend workshops and night courses every now and then since then.

INT How many do you think you have done?

C3 At least two workshops per year so that would be at least twenty or maybe not that many but it wouldn't be much less ... and I go to conferences sometimes that also have workshops as part of them.

INT What sort of things did your training cover all of the ways that you said end up covering, I mean what was the main focus during your training courses?

C3 It was mainly in the community mediation techniques and ways of working with people and also the sort of the things that you could use in general communication with people err that otherwise things like communication skills and those sort of characteristic skills for talking with others, you know, we did the sort of things that you would use when you are going counselling, but we don't do counselling, and we basically use the same skills, body language and things like that, its the same philosophy of training anyway. And we usually ended up doing um a lot of the same things that the social work students were doing, that's at the night course at (names community college) that I told you about. I think that we basically had the same courses as they did with out all of the administrative procedures and legal things that they were doing and also our course only went for a year and I know there's was much longer.

INT How much actual practice and focus was there on the mediation skills in the courses that you did, was it, were they very skills based?

C3 Oh it was very much like that. Ah all of the things that we did were always in the focus of having practical applications. Most of of our time was spent on how to do mediation with other people, in all types of community situations.

INT Okay that's good ... umm ... I can't remember tell me did you have any specific training before you did mediation er community mediation? Umm ... did you have some degree or something like that, what did you do before you studied community mediation?

C3 Well I was working in a bank actually (laughs) so I didn't have a degree or anything like that I haven't been to uni but I did my A levels and then went to work in a bank at Finchley

INT So you came straight from working in banks to working in in community mediation?

C3 Yes

INT So what motivated you to do that?

C3 I got sick of banking ... I suppose it was quite a boring jobs and even though I had contact with some people it wasn't what I wanted, you know with the counter between you and the customer there is no real relationship, and I was a bit bored with it all

INT Uh huh
It was hard and when I had my first child ... I really couldn't work that much and when I came back to the bank, after about a year after she was born, I realised that I would be stuck in very menial jobs because I couldn't commit the time to taking on the higher duties if I wanted to actually move up through the ranks because I had other values or other things to think about at home. So I started to look around and ways and I could do something a little more meaningful with my time, and I quit the bank and while I was looking for a new job it was then that I got interested in doing some mediation in the local community and then the ... and then I started doing some volunteer work with the local agency, it was in the same building where I was using the child care, and then after I had done some of the volunteer work after a few months I thought this is really good stuff, I wanted to do more of it and I spoke to the people in charge and they said they thought there would be a big rise in the number of people that would be needed for this kind of work and they thought that I had been doing pretty well in my volunteer capacity and they suggested that if I was interested in doing some of the courses that they recommended, including the one year diploma, then they would be interested in me coming to work at their office at a permanent level, so I ... in the and I really ended up being in the right place at the right time but I really do love this work it is much better than the bank (laughs).

Why do you like it more? What makes it better?

It's the people contact really and I wasn't that comfortable working for the bank because in this country the main role of the banks is to take people's money and make money for themselves out of it while making it more and more expensive for people to afford so I was a little uncomfortable with the concept of being involved in a bank and I find the work with mediation much more satisfying and much more easy for me to accept. At the end of the day when I go home from work I feel like I have done something good on most days and I never felt the way when I was at the bank.

So that sort of personal satisfaction and your personal feelings or values were important in your decision to do community mediation?

Yes definitely very much so, it was a primary reason that I wanted to do this kind of work, you get a less you know (laughs) but in the in it is a better thing to do. I feel better doing this and its more flexible when you are also a mum (laughs).

4. Thanks, that's a good er a good account of it, it sounds like this sort of work now suits you more in more ways than one. Err about your training in general, do you feel it prepared you for practice?

Yes, as I said it was very good for me. I did my community worker, you know like the social work ... course at (names community college)

Yes the same as you said before?

Yeah

When was that?

In 1975, I remember cause that's when I finished at the bank. It when the peace movement was just getting established in this country, and mediation was just getting going so mediation wasn't really a big part that course yet, so I had to do this other night course.

A different course?

Yeah, yeah, it was only a few weeks though, but it was just about mediation.

So that was just on mediation, not the general communication skills and stuff like you said before?

Yeah just mediation, it was good. I learned all about mediation and did some practice, it was very helpful to focus just on that. The best part was the supervision we had and the practice with experienced mediators

That helped you the most?

Yes, I think that's the best kind of training, well it seemed the most relevant anyway because it was focussed on real problems, when I actually practiced it with real people so that's where I learned the most.

5. Okay, er ... do you see clients?

That's what its all about, you have to see clients to do mediation (laughs)

(laughs) Sorry, I'm asking everyone the same question. It might be a bit repetitive if you've already answered it.
Sure, sure.

I mainly work in the evenings, or on a weekend afternoon, and it works out to a client each session... um um, that's on average about five different parties each week. Sometimes more, it depends on the demand.

So you work when it's needed, you don't have to set hours?

Err it's always about the same number of hours each week and the agency just tells me who I'm going to have to see at what time, people make appointments with the agency and the agency sets up different mediators to handle different cases... we get matched up to the kind of cases that we have had lots of experience with, that's why I get all the youth ones.

What do you mean? How long is the session?

Yes that and how many times do you see clients about a certain case or a certain problem?

Well its usually ever only once for the one problem, we keep working with it until there is an agreement that everyone is happy with.

So you only see people the once?

Yeah, I know not everyone does it that way but that's the way that we have always do it. You know sometimes it might be a bit more hard so we have to book more appointments if we run out of time but its not like that for most people cause most of the cases are fairly straight forward they don't take a lot of time to work out and if what we do doesn't work then they end up coming back to complain and we do it again or they go on and involve the courts...

Mmm umm how long do the sessions last normally?

Sometimes the mediation process takes only an hour, other times it can be 3 hours...

... on average?

Er... its usually about one and a half or two hours.

8. Okay, when you see clients, how much do you rely on what you learned from your training and how is common sense relevant?

I don't know... to be honest... umm I couldn't be sure... er at a guess I'd do some of both... some is from my training, others things I have picked up from other mediators or made up myself.

Uh huh

You develop your own style after a while, everyone is different in how they do mediation. My approach is pretty liberal, I usually adjust what I'm doing to fit with what the clients want. I sort of know what they need if you know what I mean, its like an intuition and that's the most important factor in what I do with mediation.

What do you mean?

I use whatever way of doing mediation that fits the situation... the people who are there and the type of problem that it is...

... mmm... it depends what they want

Err how do they decide what they want?

Well I tell them what are the options and then I help them to negotiate a process that they're both happy with. In most times people are quite motivated to make it work so they usually are happy to be involved in the setting of guidelines.

And in that way they are really directing the process for themselves rather than you telling them what to do?

Yeah, we think they wouldn't ask us for help unless they were already reasonably serious about solving the dispute, and if they weren't interested in resolution I guess whatever I did wouldn't work anyway don't you think?

Well what you say certainly makes sense

Yeah, but I think most of the time I lead them into a process that I think is going to be most appropriate just as much as they choose it.

So do they really choose it?
They would feel like they do because I only really suggest the things that I think would work ... its all really the same though ... they still choose what they are doing and they choose to be there, nobody makes them come.

INT 9. Umm do you think that standard theories of conflict resolution affect practice?

Mmm, yes ... there would be some sort of theoretical base to what we do in practice and er there are basic techniques and theories that underlie everything we do in our work in community mediation, and that is where we er do in the training er get an idea of the sort of theories that are used in mediation and other conflict resolution ideas ... um does that make sense?

INT Can you say some more about it? I'm not er really sure what you mean um about there having to be a theoretical basis to what you do, how does that happen? Why does there have to be a theoretical base to it all?

Probably cause it sounds better if it has some sort of theory in it you know ... ahh ... yeah okay, let me see ... what is ... when mediation started as an idea for use in England there was a study that proved it was better for people than going into the court system and I remember that really impressed me that it had been tested against the er normal courts processes and that.

INT Can you remember what that article was called er who wrote it?

No no, it was ages ago when I did my course when I read that, it was one of the readings that they gave us.

INT Okay can you remember what it said, err did it convince you that there was a theory to mediation?

Yeah yeah I thought it was a really well thought out technique and it was good that it was shown to be better than um the courts and I thought that was a good thing for people because the courts in this country always take so long and they are very hard to get anything done through.

INT Okay can you remember why?

It was shown to be quicker and less costly and more, er better for the people involved, you know there are lots of other reasons for that too.

INT Yeah yeah of course, and the theory?

Yeah it was obviously much better yeah the theories were all there, we learned about them more in the course about why people had conflict and how to do a mediation, you know the steps and that.

INT Do you think having a theory to mediation and conflict resolution is very important, does it make it work better for you?

Ah I don’t know. I think if it wasn’t properly worked on and had theories made then otherwise it wouldn’t have become so popular with everyone.

INT What do you mean?

Er it wouldn’t have become so well known if it wasn’t so well understood ...

INT ... Mmm ...

Now its so broad, its a household word in most places ... and that’s ‘cause it was endorsed by the law and by the government and that sort of thing of course effected its popularity

INT Mmm yes I see what you mean, er would you say you use the standard theories?

No ... not really ... I mean you have to ask what ‘standard’ is. I only use simple models, I’m a pretty basic mediator (laughs).

INT What do you mean simple?

Er the most important thing for me is making the clients happy with their resolution, its not being all that technical. I think I don’t need to know the current theories ... you know ... I just use my basic ways to help people solve their problems ... yeah really to help the clients solve the problem ... I facilitate them to do it, I accept that I don’t have to have all of the answers.

INT And that’s why you don’t need to know the latest theories?

Yes, that’s exactly what I think (laughs).

INT 10. Do you do any research in this area?
No I don’t. Umm I’ve thought about doing something one day and um it would be good to be able to, but its too busy with the mediation cases and all the other work to set anything up that would be any good, our agency has talked about it before and we would like to do something because that would be giving us good information mmm good information to use when we did our work, but its really a time issue and we are only funded on the number of cases that we do its not getting anything to do with all of the extra things that we want to do.

Umm yeah the funding can limit what you want to do, er, what would you do if you had the time to actually do some kind of research or a study into the er ...

yeah, err, I think it would be good to do some sort of test about umm following up our clients to see what sort of issues come up for them after the mediation is all done and settled, and umm it would be good to know how their lives are changed by the mediations, you know if its a real positive change and er if we could measure that we could look at what sort of process we used or the type of problem or something ... and then see what works best for the people.

Uh huh, so measuring what things work and what doesn’t and also about the quality of the settlements?

Yeah but also how it affects peoples lives to have the changes when the problem thats usually been there for a long time is finally sorted out.

Oh okay so more about the quality of life for people than the quality of the mediation?

Uh huh yeah that would be good don’t you think?

Mmm

And to also know more about what people think about how we do mediation. I often wonder how it is that they think we are doing a good job or not, no, what they think of what we are going and how they feel about it along the way, that would tell us more about what we should do to improve our skills and our processes so that we can offer a better service overall ... and it would be good for us to do this because we are doing some training of volunteers and hmm we want to know how or what impact it has if we have volunteers in as part of the training er their training to sit in on the real mediations like if it has an effect. You know?

Hmmm yeah ...

... and also it would be interesting for us to be able to keep er a record of whether or not people liked sort of thing or not so that we could improve our processes overall I suppose it's hard to do all of this without some sort of support umm from the the funding sources, but I think they are worthwhile questions to find out about because it is very important for us to make sure that what we're doing can help people in the long-term. I hope that our settlements are the kind that the people are happy with and last a long time, but sometimes you wonder, because we really have no feedback mechanisms. The only way we know if something hasn't worked is that they come back to us or if we're asked to provide some sort of the evidence that they tried to sort it out at mediation before they went to the police or to the courts. That sort of negative feedback isn't er the best, it would be good to actually follow up people over time and see if the problem is still present in their lives that sort of thing.

Alright, so on the topic of research, how would you describe the relationship between research and practice in conflict resolution?

It's okay er good I suppose. Hmmm I don't know a lot about it but I know some people who do research and some other practitioners ... they all seem to get along ... that's a good sign for the future ... but er most of us in practice um don't really know a lot about it and blame them for a lot of the pressure thats on us now to be more rigid in our approaches. Err I think we just don't trust them because we think they are only looking after their own jobs and they do that by telling us what to do, but its like its unavoidable too.

Okay do you think that researchers and practitioners adequately help each other?

Probably not. More could be done I suppose ... more than now ...

... what do you mean? Umm what sort of things could be done and what or how would that happen?

It would have to have something to do with getting us to understand what sort of things research could help with wouldn't it, because we don't really have any idea of the research and what it tries to do or er find out about mediation.

But would that help you at all, do you think that you should have to keep up to date with research? Would it help you do your job better?
I don’t know ... I don’t really think so because I think I’m doing okay now and I don’t know anything about the research sort of thing it’s all foreign to me and I can’t see how that is affecting what I do at the moment. But I can understand that it would be good to be knowledgable about the up to date research and the the sort of models and methods for doing the sort of practice that we are we are doing at the moment. I can see why that would be a good idea to know about.

Do you think that researchers, er more applied researchers have a good idea about what it is that you do in your practice of mediation?

I don’t know, er probably not.

Do you want to add more?

I um don’t have any more to say really, it's not an issue for what I do in my work. Is that okay?

Yeah yeah of course, that’s fine.

Good (laughs)

14. Okay last question, is there much consensus about the processes that underlie conflict resolution with the people you work with?

Generally speaking, yes there would be with the other mediators I work with.

How do you know that?

Well er um our group discusses our ways of working and we're all experienced workers in the field. We meet each, as a group er about twice a month on a afternoon where we don’t have any sessions booked, I mean we make a clear time, so we can have a staff meeting and at that time we always discuss our recent cases and we talk about what we did and what happened in them and we hear about other people’s experiences and sort of actually learn a bit from each other about things they did that worked out well and that sort of thing. So its like we help each other to get better at what we do which is really coming form the community focus that we all share.

How many of you are there?

There’s six of us who are meeting regularly, there are some casual staff too and we occasionally have some volunteers who come as well as part of the their training just so they know what is going on. Nearly all of us have been through that same training.

And in that forum you get the sense that everyone is using the same sort of model or following the same kind of approach to it all?

Yeah, there’s not much variation away from stuff that I use or anyone else uses, but there can’t be really, we just follow a set of processes like a series of steps that have always seemed to work and then the flexibility is in what the clients do with that rather than in how we guide it you know, they control it from there and we just go with them to make sure they don’t skip anything and that both sides get heard and that sort of thing. That’s what seems to work the best in my experience, doing er letting them do it themselves and really being a facilitator of the process.
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001 INT 1. How long have you been working in the conflict resolution field?
002 AR1 On and off for about eight or ten years.
003 INT 2. And can you explain what you do in the conflict resolution field?
004 AR1 I do peace research and other research in general conflict resolution techniques, and I do the occasional lecture or contribute to a teaching course, but mainly I do peace research, but I'm called a lecturer.
005 INT What exactly does peace research mean, or can you tell me what you consider it to mean?
006 AR1 Well umm its ...
007 INT What it involves, ... how is it part of the conflict resolution movement?
008 AR1 Peace research er is the basis of all conflict resolution movements that we use see today in the nineteen nineties. It really did begin the whole movement ...
009 INT ... Mmm ...
010 AR1 ... so in mediation and other forms of conflict resolution it has been going now since the nineteen sixties and we have experienced progressive and building interest over the last decade. Originally peace research looked at things like the cold war or like the Israeli problem or or Iran and did a historical analysis of what was happening, and but now what we do is see what happens in communities and what makes something a peaceful community and what things are needed to manage conflict in communities
011 INT And what does that involve at a practical level?
012 AR1 It involves research into what makes conflict tick, how it works and why it happens ... and then how it is best worked out ... ah how effective resolution can be structured. Does that answer your question?
013 INT Yeah, but how does that have a implication on the community ... because I thought you were saying before that peace research now focuses very much on community is that er right? I'm not saying that it isn't right, I just wonder?
014 AR1 It is very applied work that we are doing and we are out there sitting in the mediation rooms with people and interviewing the disputants as to why they or what er they think works in the way that the mediator handles the problems that they bring to mediation, so from that perspective it is very applied and very community based qualitative research. Umm er it is not working from a abstract or ideal model of what all of or how the mediator makes decisions or how they balance a choice model or something like that, we really well we've focused more on the effects on the people or the community in general and then what mediators can do to do it better. We want to help them with what they do to find out what is working and what's not, not tell them how to do it but help them find out the best way. Do I er ... I think that it is um more applied than it sounds.
015 INT Yeah that makes sense thanks, what sort of research have you been doing lately?
016 AR1 It's around negotiator effects on mediation and how power is distributed by the mediation process and how that effects the community.
017 INT Sounds interesting has it found much?
Well yes and no. It's very difficult to study the mediation process easily there are too many variables and subjective aspects that can go wrong, and thats why we can't do really structured research ... we need a more qualitative understanding first, but we're finding some interesting things about the mediator behaviours that people er the disputants um respond well to um and also the things that they don't like.

Mmm sounds good

Ah my first degree was in both psychology and politics and umm then I did my masters in peace studies, which was er had research in it too ...

... where did you do that? ...

... Here (names the institute that she is currently working at) um so yeah I've had some training for the research that I do.

And er that had some er training in it to help you learn the necessary skills that you need for when you do research?

Yeah.

Did you ever learn about the mediation process or other conflict resolution techniques as part of your training. I mean did you learn about how they work and the philosophy behind those approaches and that sort of stuff?

Yeah I did learn all about those, that was quite a large part of the coursework part of our peace studies masters courses, there was er course work as well as the thesis component.

4. Uh huh, okay, do you feel that that training prepared you adequately for the work you are doing now in research?

Yeah, all the work I did in my training has um er been just like the work that I do now, so its been a good preparation.

You said that they did teach you research methods and practices in your training? Er were they good for what you are doing now?

Yeah, I got the research methods, er it was in both the psychology and the political sciences courses that I took

How were they? Useful?

They were boring of course, but um I have to say they are good preparation for er what I'm doing now.

So they were a good training?

Yeah, being a researcher you certainly need to be doing those things ... ah ... learning those skills to do research have been the most important part of my training at uni and now I'm doing it, and even teaching it to others.

You sound surprised.

Well yes, I hadn't really realised that I'm actually teaching all the stuff that I had learned as an undergraduate now. God it's just a bit surprising that it's all happened without me noticing. Hmm ...

But you feel okay teaching them?

Yeah its easy now days.

Okay that's good, do you see clients at all?

No, only the ones we use in experiments, I don't do any practical conflict resolution.

9. Do you think that standard theories of conflict resolution affect practice?

Yes I think they do affect it.

Can you expand on that?

Ah huh. It's difficult to explain it all and I know not everyone thinks that they do, especially the people er some of the people that you would be talking to who are practitioners, but the work we've done on researching what mediators do it is quite clear that they they follow a consistent model or system to what they do whenever they work with clients and er more should be done to help them with that.
But does that mean its a theory?

Maybe not a theory but there is a model that is consistent across most different approaches for conflict resolution that we can say most people who do it actually end up following because it gives them a consistent model and it works best to do it that way.

Could it be that that is just the most sensible way to do it?

Yeah but theories can also be sensible sometimes (laughs).

I guess what I am getting at is does that mean the theories or the models or whatever you want to call them or affect what people do in practice?

Well it does, but I suppose it's only by default (laughs). Ah they may not realise what they are doing but it still has a theoretical basis to it, no matter how people learn some form of conflict resolution they always have someone show them the basic series of steps to follow which you use and those have at least at some time been based on some sort of model.

Do you think the model came first and then the practitioners learned it and learned how to apply it to their work and now they don't realise it? Or did the model evolve to explain a process that seems to have worked?

I think its probably that a theory emerged to explain the process.

I'm what, mm why do you think that most practitioners reject the idea or the notion of theories?

Well I don't know if they reject it completely but it still seems to be clear that many of them, well maybe most of them are, are just not interested in any sort of theoretical understanding of what it is.

Do you have people saying that in the research that you are doing, when you are in contact with them when you are doing your research?

Err, yeah sorry, it's really a rejection of what researchers do and how they do it and it could be a rejection of theory too but when you are doing the research in the field you do get the feeling that most of them really don't think that what you are doing is going to impact on what they do in any way and um they don't really have much time for what you are doing.

Do you get a sense at all about why they might do that, for why they think like that?

Um I think practitioners feel that we don't understand what they do in the real world, and they think that we can't really help them if we don't see what they do everyday.

Is that fair of them?

Well yeah for a lot of research they're exactly right and I suppose they have learned to or to think like that. But that's why I'm now running the sort of applied research that we're doing now. It's around the idea of getting practitioners to help us direct our research models because it might be better that way. Err I mean having practitioners involved may help to get a better picture of what they do ... and they might take our advice more too if we can get some sort of cooperative approach going.

12. So how would you describe the overall relationship between research and practice in the conflict resolution field?

Well as I said it's in a difficult place because there has been a culture of separation in the field for many years.

Ah is that something that is just part of conflict resolution or is it something that other fields have the same difficulties?

Yeah you can see it in other areas where their are strong cultures of research and practice without much communication between the two areas then there is going to be the same sort of problems. But in conflict resolution I think its probably true that the practice has been more extensive than the research side of things and the research has to do the work to get into understanding practice before they are going to ever get into understanding us.

Mmm, so what do you think is presenting that problem at the moment, why is it such a persistent problem for conflict resolution?

There are some serious deficiencies in the understanding of both the communication between research and practice, and the practical aspects that define the areas of research and practice which make up conflict resolution, um so its mainly communication and understanding what it is that is going on but we think it will probably get better in the next few years as we do more work to overcome the communication problems.
And er where do you think why do you think there is that problem with communication, where do they come from?

It's probably a different sense of what is important in our work.

Mmm.

Er researchers, er we want to have our knowledge on models and er so that they have been carefully researched and considered to give answers that can be relied on. That's what we want to try to communicate to the practitioners, to get it clear.

And practitioners?

Well I can only guess from the work I've been doing, but they seem to value what makes the disputants feel better rather than any theory or reliable practice, not that that is wrong or any less than what the researchers want, but er it's a different perspective and that's er what they are trying to get.

What do you mean by that?

They just seem more concerned with the factors that make everyone feel comfortable and happy to start resolving than they ever do about exacting a process that is reliable.

But don't they think what they do works anyway?

Yeah yeah and I'm not saying it doesn't. In most cases it all works together very well and their meeting the psychological needs of the disputants for safety and expressing emotions is exactly what is needed, but it concerns me that there isn't much agreement among practitioners about what they are doing practically. They think if it all settles down and works out then that is okay, when really we think that they should be guided by some more rigorous processes but they don't seem to want to hear that as much as we might like them to.

13. So do you think then that researchers and practitioners help each other in their work?

No.

Uh huh?

It's um not er clear in my mind that they don't, or that we don't help each other as well as we might, but it feels like there is so much potential for good relations and better research.

Mmm.

Some attempts are now being made, like the work that I'm doing that I told you about before, which try to promote some sort of intensive cooperation between the groups. And its getting through to them and the thing is that there really isn't any difference on what we want its just what we think we want the different things and we really want the same thing but there is not enough interest in research by practitioners and the same goes for researchers.

Why has it been so hard to get it to work?

It has a long history as you probably know ...

... Yes ...

... and er in my opinion it's because research was so theoretical that the practitioners couldn't see any application of it.

How come that is the case?

I mean the complexer the er models of decision making and um er all that early work on negotiation processes er its not easy to make research credible to them after that.

Can you say more about that?

Well it's not er been easy to convince practitioners that research is important after they have developed a culture in them that it is a bit of a waste of time for them to be involved in and they have had good reason not to like it. They er don't value research because it is er a way that they have er a rule of thinking.

Yeah?

I mean it's not easy to convince a results orientated practitioner that the Acme truck experiments are important for them to make their practice better (laughs). It is really about what you believe is important and most practitioners have learned in a very applied setting where they didn't rely on any er research so now they don't think research is important.

What about researchers, do they think practice is important?
AR1  Yes most of us do ... I think it's fair to say that. We have to have people using whatever it is that we come up with otherwise what we do has no purpose to it. Er we have to have people in practice listening to us otherwise what we do is pointless. So it's important that we try to get practitioners on side. I believe that what we are doing is important, that it will help conflict resolution, so the way to get that in practice is via those doing practice.

INT  14. Hmm that's great er one more question that I'm asking people, is there much consensus about the theories and processes of conflict resolution with people you work with?

AR1  Academics usually disagree about theories (laughs) its how we can work out what's going on, it's good to argue about the details.

INT  I suppose you have to at some level.

AR1  Yeah but er you have to still agree enough to get on (laughs).

INT  Hmm.

AR1  At the same time, most of the people in my department take a very applied, practical approach to their research. We want to get some of it into practice eventually.

INT  So you all have the same sort of perspective?

AR1  Yeah close enough to make sense of each other's research and work together.
1. How long have you been working in the conflict resolution field?

I've umm been a psychologist and are an academic for about twenty five years but my work in conflict resolution has been going for about er five years .... mmm five years.

Okay um what sort of work er interests did you have before that?

Before that I was doing work in other social psychology issues like human relations and some communication research, er so it was a natural step to go into conflict resolution research when it started to get popular a few years back.

What was it that got you interested in it, er why did you change to conflict resolution?

I actually had a student wanting to do a thesis in the area and that sparked my interest. So I used some of the concepts that I had been researching in other areas to try here in my work with conflict resolution, and it worked pretty well.

What to you mean that it went well, how do you tell if it is going well? Do you er how do you measure how well an area of research is going? I just wonder how you do that from your perspective?

The er it was very easy for example to get things to get articles published ... and there was a lot of interest in the area, and it was a public interest issue that lots of people wanted to know about and um there was er ... so that it meant there was opportunities for funding and that sort of thing. Like any area you have to move with the interests of the area and stay up to date ... so this was a new area for ah for social psychology to look at, so I moved with the general interest in the area I suppose.

Hmm it was really a choice to move with the er social interests of the times?

Mmm

2. And now your still doing research, is that your main activity in the field? I mean are you doing anything else in conflict resolution or is it just the research?

Primarily I'm doing research into whether mediation methods work or not ...

... Ah ha ...

... at a (names university) and also I teach students and do the normal things that academics do in the supervising students and um other teaching and departmental responsibilities ... but er most of the time I spend doing research related activities like reading articles, doing research, papers ... er ... the sort of activities that are related to research work.

3. Can you tell me about the specific training you had for research?

It's like a sort of apprenticeship that you get as a psychology researcher, you learn as you do it from people who are already skilled in it.

An apprenticeship, yes?

Yes it's like that (laughs), it's the best way I can describe it (laughs). You learn research from older researchers, through supervision of your own work, that's how I learned it as a doctoral student many years ago, and before that when I did my first degree ... and now I er try to provide the same service to er my students.

What about the um issue ... the more formal um training or lectures and er tutorials that people receive about research methods and statistics ... and how to do research design? How much does that sort of preparation help in your opinion?
Obviously you have to do the more structured and formal learning with design and methodology and all the statistical tests that you need to understand what to apply by in what sort of situation in research, but it's also clear that if you are to actually direct and guide research it is very important you gain experience from others who are already doing that kind of research. So from that perspective the student is given an opportunity to apply what they have learnt under the direction of someone who may have already expert experience in the area. From that perspective I think it makes sense to gain these skills of practice or practical research in the same way as you would learn the more theoretical aspects of research. So er that's what I mean by it being an apprenticeship. You learn the specific skills in a context from someone who has already learned the trade. In er this case er new researchers can er learn from more experienced researchers, under their direction so to speak.

Yeah. I think it has evolved in a er spontaneous way, it makes sense to do it like this, and in England we have been doing it this way for hundreds of years, passing on the knowledge and ways of researching across generations of researchers.

I would say yes. In my department it is really the only option that they have though. We have some students who don't really like doing it that way, so not always, but most of the time it provides a good approach for us.

Absolutely, I can't think of any other way to learn. Of course you can learn statistics and methods of er of research from various texts and you have to do that if you want to keep up and do a good job of your research, but really, I mean I can't think of any other way that it could be learnt.

No, I'm an academic psychologist now, I used to see people when I first started out years ago.

No, no it wasn't, it didn't have anything to do with what I am doing now, it er that was more um clinical.

Okay, umm I want to ask you some more questions about research and practice in conflict resolution, is that okay with you?

Yeah fine

Yes I do, um in my er experience it is very clear to me that the theories of conflict resolution guide what practitioners do so that it er therefore has to be the basis of practice er to be effecting the practice of conflict resolution and at least giving them a structure to follow.

Yes okay, is that because there er ... first is there anything else that you'd like to add?

I don't know what else to ... umm ...

No that's fine ... what about er what would you say to those practitioners who don't think theories affect practice and think that they operate completely outside of any relationship between research and practice?

Yeah well that's fine I suppose, there are those who think that and of course they're entitled to their opinions, but I don't understand it ... their objections ... its not based in any recognisable logic, er it's the arts or science debate that so often comes up in psychology and conflict resolution is no exception.

What do you think about that?

Er the research has to underpin the practice in my way of thinking. I mean it was the um research into conflict resolution methods is what popularised the whole conflict resolution movement. The research into international mediation and negotiation is what made conflict resolution popular with practitioners.

Is that right, I didn't realise that it was that.
Yeah with the peace movement and the middle east problems in the sixties and seventies everyone got exposed to words like mediation and negotiation ... and um conflict resolution as we see it in society today is er probably the outcome of the swell in public interest.

I always thought that a big part of the beginning of the movement was very much to do do with the lack of places in the court system needs as well, but I guess that the public interest may have also been encouraged because of the the interest in international affairs. They are all related really.

Yeah that er is also part of it it seems that in the analysis that we have done that it is going to be um very much a part of dissatisfaction with the courts process and all of the other things to do with equity and access, but it's clear that none of the mediation centres would have been put into place and supported by governments and community services if they hadn't been checked out by people like us first. There were many studies about efficacy and about how er reliable they were. That had to come first to convince the funders that it was money well spent.

And did the on people end up getting impressed by the results of those studies?

No, not as well as one might hope, I think they were um um productive and there was enough evidence to support the embracing of these ideas, but what you have to remember is that if the researchers haven't sanctioned or okayed the processes then they would not have gone ahead so much, er so its only fair now that we want to try to influence what they do with good models and push for better training and that sort of thing.

Yeah well its clear that research needs to be a part of the process, but I am not sure that most practitioners would think that it is particularly necessary or and helpful to them.

Mmm, I know that there is quite a bit of dissatisfaction from some practitioners and they er don't exactly go along with the idea of the need for research.

Mmm I'm going to ask you a bit more about that in a minute, but or what would you say to practitioners who don't agree?

Again, their opinions are okay, to have ... even if they are ignorant (laughs) they just don't know about or they're not interested in the history of the field. The sort of practitioners who would say that are quite narrow in their understanding of conflict resolution, but I know that that's not as uncommon as I might like it to be. But there are many people in the field who do understand the need for research as well.

11. Okay that's good, could you briefly describe the nature of the research that you do?

At the moment I'm working on a review of the recent research about negotiation. It's not experimental but it's like a ... um ... do you know meta-analysis?

Yes uh huh I do.

Okay it's like collating the outcome studies, the collation of the studies of negotiation and mediation studies in recent years. I'm working towards an overview of what works in mediation and what doesn't ... under what circumstances you're likely to get a satisfactory outcome and um what under the right or under what method works best in certain circumstances.

Are you trying to get to like an effect size for mediation processes or something like that?

Er its not really effect size, at this stage its er more about trying to sort out what methods can be sensibly grouped together and basically if people are happy with the outcome. At this stage people aren't measuring how much it worked or didn't work by, just whether it worked or not, we want to know what method is best.

Hmm, so are you doing a meta analysis of different techniques?

Not exactly because it's hard to pick out the differences between different techniques, it's more looking for an overall effect size for mediation that works than for looking at the differences between applications.

What applications?

Oh in ADR, business applications, community mediation, divorce mediation and victim-offender reparation, a few other areas ...

... that sounds interesting.

Yes it's well needed at the moment with all the interest that's been around all these methods lately.

Ah ha yeah what um what do you ... why are you particularly wanting to do it at the moment?
We just think it is important to check out some of the claims and ideas that are going around at the moment ... we would like ... mmm ... to see if mediation actually does what many of the practitioners have been very up-front about saying what they think it does.

**INT** Hmm so you say their knowledge claims could be a little over stated?

**TR1** No ... I am not saying that, I think that what you need to make sure that whatever you say you can justify or prove with some sort of study to back it up. It’s no good carrying on about how good a method is if the evidence is purely anecdotal. You need to make sure that you are giving people what you tell them you are giving them. Er when er I think its particularly important now because there are so many people doing mediation and there is very few, er well fewer than one would like, fewer standards in place for training than there er probably needs to be.

**INT** 12. In general, how would you describe the relationship between research and practice in the conflict resolution field?

**TR1** For the most part I think it is very good. There’s a good um working relationship around the important issues for conflict resolution.

**INT** Do you think that’s a view shared by most people in the conflict resolution field?

**TR1** I expect so. Everyone I work with would think that, and most of the people in practice that I have had dealings with seem receptive to working together now that the problems have been fixed up.

**INT** What if they didn’t agree?

**TR1** Of course not everyone would, is that what you are getting at?

**INT** Well ... yes; some people I have spoken to have said the relationship is not that good.

**TR1** I suppose there are those that er think that, but um I’d still have to say that of all the people I’ve had dealings with, we all seem to get on well and I think it will only get better as we work together more and the field gets stronger.

**INT** What about those that you haven’t had dealings with, are there any practitioners who you think, who you haven’t had any dealings with, who might not agree with what you’ve been saying?

**TR1** There are those people er, like in, like I was saying about before who aren’t who probably aren’t trained that well to think about the need for understanding the background to mediation from a more theoretical or psychological perspective, and I think that there is a growing movement in that group.

**INT** How would you characterise that group, what sort of group is it?

**TR1** Well, in in England there are those that reject any idea of needing to have a theoretical base to what they are doing, and they really don’t want to even look at er the issues that need to be discussed. When it er comes to training standards they tend to um be quite gung-ho with their practice approach working outside any sort of theoretical paradigm, but because, but they still use a method that was originally based in a theoretical understanding even if they don’t like it.

**INT** Why don’t they like it then?

**TR1** They think its boing and they don’t think it can help them with what they do but they can’t agree or substantiate what they do. They tend to have a more intuitive based approach and, you know how I was saying that they that there are those to think that mediation is purely an art form, which we, er we think that these people really do reject the whole idea for researching or theory based and evidence based practice.

**INT** So are you trying to provide the evidence to decide a practice benchmark?

**TR1** I think that is a um major part of the role of any researchers what I am doing is not applied er as such, I am not really out there in the field doing studies of what mediators do, but everything I do is based on trying to get better insight into the theory of how mediation works and how who um practises it can be improved.

**INT** So its more theoretical than applied?

**TR1** Yes I would say that theoretical to the extent that it is about trying to pull together a theory of mediation which can account for the er many differences of approaches that we are observing today.

**INT** And what of those people who reject, those practitioners who reject the need for theory, why do you think they do that?
I think it's more about this general view of the world or about this thinking they don't need any scientific basis for what they do, that they can do it all by um feelings or intuition.

Yes, intuition is a word I have heard a lot about when I have spoken with some practitioners.

Yes, but it's very hard to know what they are talking about and it's almost impossible for us to try to include in some sort of understanding that we can suggest needs to be included in the way one would develop a theoretical understanding of the process.

So would there be no place for intuition in mediation theory?

I wouldn't exclude it totally, but I don't think that sort of phenomena could be easily measured or ah studied and therefore be easily introduced into a theory.

But they must have some sort of understanding that they have attained and are calling intuition?

Yes, I think I know what you mean, it is a well developed skill probably, I think, but you still can't measure it and that's er what we're meant to do.

13. Well do you think that researchers and practitioners adequately assist each other in this field?

Yes, some do and some don't, but as I said before we all seem to get on well. I have never had any problems getting practitioners involved in my research and I'm always happy to share what I find with them, so yes we assist each other well...ah huh...it's good the way we've worked together.

You'd say its a good relationship overall then?

It can always be improved...though I think we are all doing very well at this time. In the last five years it is true that it has improved a great deal. But I have only really been involved for that time and don't know first hand the history of it all from the inside of the field.

14. Okay er last one, is there much consensus about the theories and processes that underlie conflict resolution among people you work with?

Yes, we're all working towards the same goal of improving the quality of conflict resolution so we all follow the same theories in what we do with our research and teaching, there's some disagreement around the specific details of methodology and different social psychological theories that we base our work on, but there is the general consensus.

What do you mean?

You know...there are small disagreements but we're all working in the same general, er the same direction. Er it's normal to do that in academic circles, we debate the details but overall the just get on with working in the same direction.
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001 INT 1. How long have you been working in the conflict resolution field?
002 AR2 Nearly ten years
003 INT Have you always worked in conflict resolution with your job and the career path that you have followed?
004 AR2 It's always been this kind of focus, ... so yes.
005 INT 2. Okay, would you mind explaining the areas in the conflict resolution field that you work in?
006 AR2 I work in communication research and I am a lecturer in the social work department at the (names polytechnic university) so I do some teaching too.
007 INT Can you say how that's related to mediation?
008 AR2 Well yeah, mediation is my area of research, but I'm employed as a lecturer in communication studies actually.
009 INT So what is it that you do in mediation, can you tell me about the communication or perspective that you take and how it is related to mediation?
010 AR2 Okay, who the mediation, is er, as you would know, is really a series of communications between people, so we try to study that series of communications. That means that the research that we do is there is applied and very much in the field so that what we do is sit in on some of the mediations and then analyse the communication in the mediation and as well we video tape to look at body language and to look at who is in a position of authority or power and how the mediators actually balanced that er power.
011 INT What is the aim of doing that kind of research, I mean, what do you hope to find from this approach.
012 AR2 I expect that this will give us some deeper insight into the actual mediation process then we will be able to map um the flow of communication and see how that follows the processes that the mediator is trying to use.
013 INT On that sounds very interesting have you published any of that work yet?
014 AR2 No ... and it will be quite a long time until we do that I think.
015 INT 3. Can you tell me what your original training was?
016 AR2 Er my doctorate was in communication processes, and um the way people solve problems in relationships ...
017 INT ... yes ...
018 AR2 ... and my er original degree was in social work and that involves a lot of the counselling and community focussed processes.
019 INT What was the actual training that you got, when you were a er student in the social work course for er for doing research, do doing the sort of research that you are doing today?
020 AR2 When I did social work training it was some time ago and back then there really wasn't much of a focus on doing research, it was much more a practical endeavour. So while we did a little bit about social research methods, you know we learnt how to put together a survey and that sort of thing and we looked at some of the counselling research when we were learning our counselling, but really you had to learn most of this for your self. If you were interested in research than they er would give you a hand to design what it was you wanted to do.
INT Hmm um what do you mean? Can you give me an example of how they helped you?

AR2 Er it hmm was very much on a ... if you ask we will tell you ... type of system. But I remember when I did a summer research project in my third year about the counselling methods er and whether they could be attributed to a certain um intervention process, um I really didn't know much about how to do the research that I had heard about in my studies ... but there were people from the faculty who could act as resources to tell me what to do and how to do it.

INT So not everyone would have had that sort of training?

AR2 No ...

INT ... it to was something you had to ask for?

AR2 Yes if you need to know it for some reason then it would be er offered.

INT Okay, what sort of instruction did you receive when you needed to find something out?

AR2 It really was the type of process that where you would be, you would tell them what you were looking for and then the faculty member would help you to design what it was on, er the design process for doing the research ... what to ask, how to structure your questions and that, so when it came to doing the research you had a pretty good idea of how it would go.

INT Um they just told you how to do it?

AR2 Yeah basically, it was long like that.

INT Mmm.

AR2 They er would direct you to the reading for social research that was relevant er ... so you you could get an understanding of what was going on and why you were doing it the way that they suggested.

INT And did those um readings help you to understand what you were doing?

AR2 Er usually a little, but they really were a little foreign for me back then as I remember it (laughs) ... it wasn't easy to get what they were talking about.

INT And now?

AR2 Yes, now it is a little easier.

INT Hmm

AR2 But it um still is a hard thing to understand what some of them are talking about nowadays (laughs), communication research has become very philosophical (laughs).

INT So er was it a good training for you to do it that way?

AR2 Um Yes I suppose, it is never an easy thing to learn, and I don't know we do more surveys and interviews and they don't really need stats ...

INT Yeah ...

AR2 ... but it would have helped to have formal classes in social research like we do today, er, but back then it was not the focus of social work.

INT Okay what about analysis, did they teach anything about how to analyse research?

AR2 Well again it's was very much on a need to know basis back then. There was someone in the faculty who you could always go and ask, but I'm sure when I was doing my doctorate particularly, it really meant a lot of time in front of the books trying to get an understanding of the processes of analysis. It meant learning the whole thing again really. An er I remember that was certainly a challenge for me, not having had any real background in the area.

INT And now, is it easier for you to know how to do it, now that you have to to make the research happen?

AR2 Yes um you certainly learn to these skills er by having to do it yourself I think.

INT Yes that makes a good deal of sense.

AR2 I think you have to learn it by yourself. It would have helped if if people were available to teach us the methods, and er we do today in our department, but then it really was us learning it on a whenever we need to know something we would ask for help or look it up.

INT So overall, who would you say you had a good preparation for research?
Overall, er um probably it was not the best, but, for the time it was about all you could expect. It wasn't normal for a woman to actually go back and be researcher if they only had er a social worker background. Anyway when I did my doctorate, it might actually have helped me to not know anything. It meant that I was not getting stuck in a in any particular method of analysis or understanding ... I had to start from nothing of course (laughs) but it was okay.

Do you feel that this helped you develop the skills that you have today?

Yes of course, initially I read it, it was part of if the understanding I got but er now I have done that work I can be happy that I know what I'm doing most of the time (laughs) ... now I do research using those same skills ... it's um ... it's been a good training.

4. For what you're doing now?

Yes, I suppose so. Obviously you learn a lot along the way that prepares you for what you ultimately end up doing though.

Yeah.

You can't get that from training ... I'd have to say you er you learn that through doing the task that's in front of you.

9. Do you think in er general that um that standard theories of conflict resolution affect practice?

No I don't ... er not as much as they should ... or um as much as they er probably could.

Because?... ... you know there's a lot of a er a general rejection and um a lack of awareness of the theories of er conflict resolution and mediation in the field we need to improve the relationship and do more to make it work better. Most of the people I know in practice they just don't pay any attention to the relevant theories of conflict because they er think they won't mean anything for their work...

Why do you think that is?

There are a number of reasons ...

... yes ...

... er one is that people in practice have absolutely no faith in research, and um ah another is that practitioners don't really know anything that's meaningful about theory ... I mean most of them, I er know some who do but I'm just saying that in general they er don't really have much of a understanding of the theoretical side of things.

You mean they don't know theory or research exists or er they just reject it?

It's probably both of those things er, if they know about it they reject it ... though ... and then there is the rest that just don't know anything about research or about any sort of theory that would be the basis of conflict resolution, so um neither of those two groups have much to do with the theoretical side of conflict resolution, its not part of their philosophy.

It sounds like you think there isn't much much chance of practitioners understanding the research side of things?

No and I don't necessarily think that we can expect them to for a long time ... there's a level of ignorance about conflict resolution theory and models that is quite alarming to someone like me who is meant to be er studying the field and how well it all is meant to work and the er effectiveness of mediators. It seems that only a few people that I am talking to in the field ever think they are really understanding or um following any particular model.

Mmm, so where does that leave theory and practice?

So that um means that theories don't really effect practice in the minds of most practitioners.

And do you think that there are any implications of that? Does it matter at all?

Well that's a good question. The problem is that if they don't have an appreciation of the models or the research then er we can't expect them to use theory which means that whatever they do in the field remains a bit of a mystery to anyone who is trying to understand what they are doing.

But I suppose I am asking if that is a problem? I mean do we have to know what they are doing if it is working?

That's the point. Is it working? We don't know.
075 INT So the purpose of research, um research that like that that you're doing is really to try and find out if what they are doing is working with people?

076 AR2 Yes essentially that's what we are trying to find out. If there is to be the total acceptance of these ideas then it really shouldn't be based purely on the feel good factor which is so much a part of many mediation approaches. Not that there is a problem with that, mediators just tend to be more into how the person feels than what the theory is of what they are doing, but it becomes more of a trend than an acceptable means of settling people's disputes.

077 INT What you mean, can you say more about it as a trend?

078 AR2 Well, what I think happens with these sorts of things, and we have seen it a lot in therapies and counselling methods particularly, is that what happens is that people get carried away with a new way of doing mediation or, a newcomers way of doing some sort of thing and then eventually the public gets a bit sick of it, and a new institutions forms instead so um the old for gimmicks get er replaced. What is happening with mediation is that we are setting up centres and places for people to go to get help and that sort of thing, but you need to know if that is worth doing in the long run. What we want to find out is is it a good idea to keep our supporting those things we don't want it just to be a trend.

079 INT Yes I see what you mean ... er what is the danger of it being left alone to find out, I mean mediation in different forms has been round for centuries?

080 AR2 Yeah I know, but why not institutionalise it properly?

081 INT Yes that's fair enough I guess.

082 AR2 Hmm it's important that we make sure that what people are saying they're doing is actually what they are doing as well. Because you must be able to support the claims that you are making and at the moment there are a lot of people out there making all sorts of claims about their services and nobody really knows if they are true of not.

083 INT So that's why it's important to gain or to get an acceptance of theory or a more scientific approach into practice?

084 AR2 Yes yes that's what we really are getting at ... and um it's very important that practitioners have an understanding of the methods that that they are using so er so that they can make correct claims about what they are doing. Some of them understand this and are very happy to become more scientific in their work.

085 INT So why are some wanting to do that?

086 AR2 Well I think they understand the gains that would be associated with being more based in theory or based in a more critical approach to their conflict resolution techniques, er that they would be seen as more scientific in their approach and that they might be taken more seriously in the area if they show that they are um using some kind of er tested theory or some kind of methods that are made more valid because they er have been properly researched and tested and that together makes them more confident in what they are doing. Um so they can tell their clients that what they are doing is more based on a proven method and that that way their er practice is based on the evidence of a theory.

087 INT Is that the only way that theory affects practice, through practitioners?

088 AR2 That depends if we're talking theoretically or practically (laughs). It seems to me that mediation is mostly done by practitioners, and they are the public face of mediation ... they er choose to implement theory or not, and in the end its up to them so its up to us to try to influence them to be more based on the evidence for a theory driven model.

089 INT 11. Okay that's good. Um before we talked a bit about your research before so we probably don't need to go into that much more um could you just say a little about what you have found with your studies?

090 AR2 Okay I'm looking I'm doing research out in the community looking into how mediator behaviour and communication effects mediation effectiveness. We're really getting to know how the type of communication that mediators use ends up effecting the outcome of the mediation and the disputants satisfaction with the process and how that varies for different techniques and er different areas of er application..

091 INT Uh huh...
092 AR2 Yeah, we've found some really interesting things like when mediators deviate from a standard sequence of events or processes, the less likely participants in the mediation are to positively rate the processes. We've also tested for heuristics and concession making and umm, and bargaining styles. Yes, that research has been the best that we have done.

093 INT So it sounds as if that's pretty much focuses on practical applications of mediation.

094 AR2 Well yes, that's our aim. We're trying to help mediators do a better job.

095 INT 12. Okay, so how would you describe the nature of the relationship between research and practice?

096 AR2 Its that there really is a ah information flow problem that makes it not work properly, the er relationship really is stuck on that point.

097 INT Yes?

098 AR2 Well I'm er not sure that anything that we are doing here at the University ever actually makes it through to the mediators in the work place, it's kind of isolated. Yeah, there really isn't much exchange of ideas with er people doing conflict resolution in practice.

099 INT Why do you think that is?

100 AR2 Well I er think they think that um a lot of what we are doing is really just a waste of time and effort. They don't listen to our findings, um but I that's er the same in all applied er academic relationships, I know it isn't meant to be, but that's how it works out in many fields isn't it?

101 INT Mmm, do you have any insight as to why that happens?

102 AR2 Umm it's centred around not communicating properly.

103 INT Yes?

104 AR2 And about having useful forums for where that communication can occur, like conferences that are relevant to both researchers and practitioners, most often it's either a research oriented or a practice orientated meeting, so only one group attends.

105 INT So there are no opportunities for exchanging information?

106 AR2 Uh huh and I think that the other problem is that researchers are always in the position where they are always telling the mediators what to do in their eyes.

107 INT And that leads to what?

108 AR2 We're always coming up with new methods and new approaches and then we say that this is the way that they should be doing it.

109 INT What, and practitioners don't like that?

110 AR2 Yeah and um of course I can understand them not liking that. And even if that's not what we are doing then they still see that it is. It's very frustrating and the results are that no-one communicates. Researchers go on their research paths not bothering to try to make their findings relevant to practices and not worrying about making the findings available to practitioners. It's a vicious cycle because then mediators see researchers as more aloof and less relatable to the point where they have absolutely no respect for the findings.

111 INT Is there any truth in that? Do any researchers act like that?

112 AR2 Yes probably, but it's wrong, very wrong, but it's been like that for a long time now. Mediation is so practical that the research has to be practical too. In many ways most of it is not. The decision making models and bargaining equations are more like mathematics than mediation. I actually don't even think it's relevant, and I can understand that it's very annoying that that always happens because we really need to come at the problems together if we are going to make good solutions.

113 INT 13. Hmm okay er I know this might be a little repetitive, but do you think that researchers and practitioners adequately assist each other?

114 AR2 Usually no. There are some examples where mediators have been invited onto research groups and they have contributed equally well and they have worked, but in general these things are rare and we need more genuine efforts for this. And I think it's more about being polite than because there is a genuine valuing of each other's skills and experiences.

115 INT Why don't you think they do that sort of thing more often?
Mainly because we're always asking mediators to do things for us, and they get sick of it. And I can't blame them because its more for us than for them at this stage. Of course I'd much rather work with mediators to set the research questions and work out the best methodology for a study, but there aren't enough around who want to have anything to do with Universities, they're scared that that institutionalises mediation, which in many ways we are and that's something which many of them don't want.

So what are you left with in how you choose research directions?

We just build on the literature and use undergraduates to test our models. We know that's rubbish but what else can we do when mediators don't value what we do and want to be involved. It makes you wonder what's the point of it all sometimes, but you can still make some progress when you find people who will be happy to be involved with you like I have at the moment.

14. Is there much consensus about the theories and processes that underlie conflict resolution among people you work with?

Academics seldom agree. We all have different models that we work from.

Which models are most common?

Some use an information processing approach, others focus more on social interactionist approaches. I come at it from the er communication model.

But do you all accept each others models?

Yes thats the only way to get a full understanding.
INT 1. How long have you been working in the conflict resolution field?
002 AR3 Forty years, are least forty years.
003 INT That certainly is a long time.
004 AR3 Yes yes I've been in the game for quite a long time.
005 INT And its always been in conflict resolution? Er how long have you been researching mediation and that sort of thing?
006 AR3 Probably about half of that ... since the early nineteen seventies so twenty or so.
007 INT 2. Could you explain what is it that you do?
008 AR3 Well nowadays I'm a researcher and an author, a writer, but I've done lots of things in the field in general.
009 INT Yes I have heard.
010 AR3 Mmm it's been a er very varied series of roles and activities that I have been happy to be involved in.
011 INT Can you tell me what sorts of things have you done?
012 AR3 As I said when we met, and I'm sure (names another person involved in conflict resolution) told you, I started off in the army many many years ago and that was where I first got interested in peace research.
013 INT The army was interested in your peace research?
014 AR3 I know the army doesn't sound like the sort of place that's interested in peace, but I was and as I worked my way up to (states rank) there was quite a lot of interest with the cold war and East Germany and Russia ... all that in the Israeli area ... there was plenty to think about that required an analysis of the strategies and working towards peaceful settlements of the problems.
015 INT Can you say what did you have to do with those things?
016 AR3 I studied them (laughs) and I had quite a bit to do with the training of men for peace building missions in those regions ...
017 INT ... really, that was with the army?
018 AR3 ... when I was working with the United Nations.
019 INT What er how long did you work with the UN, was it with the peace keeping initiatives?
020 AR3 Um yes it was when I did the work at the peacekeeping head quarters in Geneva and having worked with with the training of troops who were going in to do peace keeping. Um we were trying to encourage peace building rather than peacekeeping which meant doing then training of men who to focus on learning new conflict resolution skills rather than just going in to keep the peace and to be seen as the powerful figures that demand peace with a gun, we wanted to give them a role of bringing peace to the region by helping them to be in a role where the could solve problems and help the local community that they were in.
021 INT Sorry how long was that?
022 AR3 That I worked with the UN?
023 INT Yes.
024 AR3 In peace building or in general (laughs) ...
025 INT ... er what about in peace keeping and then in general? (laughs)
Okay, okay, it really has been hard to hmm guess how much time I have worked with the UN but mmm I have done lots of short roles and consulting type jobs with them ... and because the peacebuilding skills are things which we taught on a number of programs and we trained up other UN workers to do it as well.

Did you ever actually go into a combat role, a active duty role with the peace keeping forces?

Only ever as an adviser. By that time I was getting a bit old (laughs) for that type of thing.

Oh hmm.

What was interesting was seeing all of the different applications of conflict resolution across different parts of the UN and that certainly gave me something to think about when I was writing and analysing some of the things that were happening in the UN strategies or keeping peace and for seeing how they would be involved in mediation and negotiation in dangerous um conflict situations.

So what did you do from a more research orientated perspective, I mean er you have said the sort of education and training role that you have had, but really your emphasis has been on research in their recent years.

Yes I er did some negotiation and state work in the area.

State work?

Er sorry um represented the interests of the state in er groups that were interested in working out the peaceful settlement of the situations that we were working in.

Hmm, what did you do in the research part of that?

I also recorded a lot of what the real negotiators were doing and studying that helped me to go into more research orientated work.

How did that work?

I sat in on some of them hmm, and then also um, did some of the research work into understanding the problems that we were dealing with. The research of that is the most important so you can understand the need or the interests of that problem to for the people who had that problem so their interests and the civil interests of the region could be balanced and tried to be met if they could.

Would you say it was like a research officers role?

Yes. More like for a legal case than for anything else.

Yeah that makes sense.

One time I er participated in the negotiations, but that really wasn't my role. I was more of a helper in that area er um a gopher (laughs).

And that influenced your research interest later on I guess?

Yes that served me very well ... that experience um made me very passionate about finding out some of the more practical ways to put this sort of belief into work that would help people at a more general level rather than just in the area of politics hmm I mean find more practical applications for it and ar I er did some interviews with people in practice to find out what they er want.

And now? Are you still doing that sort of stuff?

Now I'm finished at the (states institution) I'm working on my own, writing, some consulting, doing what I can to still contribute.

3. Can I ask er what training you have had for your research work?

None really (laughs) not formally. I picked it all up as I went along. I got a degree through the army but that was not in conflict resolution, it was psychology actually, and that's all the formal education I had.

So how would you say you have come to do so much?

Being in the right place I suppose, at the right, or wrong time (laughs) it depends how you look at it (laughs) ...

... yes I s'pose ...

... most of what I learn I have learned from doing things and to do research you just need to think clearly and use, er keep up to date with everything else that's going on, and I had good people to work with, they taught me a lot of what I had to do and how to do it.
INT What sort of things did your colleagues teach you?

AR3 It was really about how to put together a research proposal, and um um how to plan a programme of inquiry ... hmm and to learn how to get hold of the sort of permission you need to do this kind of research that was always a way to do it are it was always a challenge.

INT So what sort of research would you characterise it as?

AR3 I think you would call it qualitative research today because we I only ever really looked I think you would call it qualitative research today because we I only ever really looked at doing surveys ah analyses of what had happened, we didn't plan any techniques or anything like that.

INT So would you call yourself a applied researcher or a theoretical researcher?

AR3 Applied, I still don't think I know what the right theories are (laughs).

INT How did you find a focus for your research?

AR3 Really it wasn't too hard because what I spent a lot of time doing was writing up the sort of method I saw out there in and from our training programs and other groups that I was involved with so there was always no shortage of things to study to or to understand.

INT There was always a lot to do?

AR3 It meant that there was plenty of information to look at.

INT And that was supported by the army?

AR3 I never had any trouble getting support either when I was working in the army, or since I never had any trouble getting support either when I was working in the army, or since then when I have been at the (names Institution).

INT So overall you had a real on the job training I suppose?

AR3 Yes that's right I learned about mediation by doing it and that helped me write about it.

INT 4. Do you feel that this training adequately prepared you for what you are doing now?

AR3 Yes, I believe it did. I never dreamed when I was your age that I'd have done (names project) and written (names a book) and the time I spend in the (names organisation) was the best training I could have had for that.

INT 9. Um do you think that theories of conflict resolution affect practice?

AR3 Yes and no, it's not that clear.

INT Yes?

AR3 The question is not the right question (laughs).

INT Okay, what should be the right question? (laughs)

AR3 That's not clear either (laughs) ... No, I mean that you should ask if I think that the theories of conflict resolution should effect what is done in practice.

INT Yes, Okay, do you think they should?

AR3 Yes, yes of course, otherwise I wouldn't have spent the last forty years trying to understand them better.

INT Okay yeah but do they affect it at the moment?

AR3 It depends who I is using them I suppose. I mean that some people do use a theoretical approach in their work in and other people don't use any real theory in what they do and they still seem to get the right sort of results with people. Er it is more that they need to pay more attention to the people they are working with and er then it is up to them if they use a model to do that or not, its more to do with how much they listen to what the people need and er some people find it easier to do that following a set model and others don't need it or prefer um not to use a tool they have their own way er but either way is doing the same thing it er in the end comes down to just different ways of listening to the people with the dispute.

INT Yes.

AR3 There is so much we have learned and so much still to understand about why people have this weird need to fight and why they are not very good at working out their differences. It is such a waste if what we learn doesn't get shared around with everyone else who is trying to address these problems, and it's not ...

INT ... not getting shared around?

AR3 No not at all. And people who do practice are interested more in the interpersonal dynamics of the situation rather than the actual basis of the mediation process.
INT  So um do the standard theories affect practice in general?
AR3  I would say not enough ...
INT  ... how do you feel about that?
AR3  Not good (laughs)
INT  Can you say why it doesn’t make you feel good?
AR3  It ... that bothers me. I am annoyed at how little is actually done to make sure that research and people involved in putting the ideas into practice don’t get on with the job together.
INT  Hmm that’s interesting ... I’d like to ask you some more about that in a minute is that okay?
AR3  Yes.
INT  11. For now could you tell me some more about the research that you do and have done. What has the emphasis of your work been?
AR3  Most of my work has been into how high ranking officers and politicians act and think when it comes to conflicts and while they try to solve them and them how happy they are about it afterwards.
INT  Mmm ... what did you look into?
AR3  I’ve interviewed people about their choices they normally make, how co-operative or competitive they are and what processes are part of their thinking and we need to know how they feel about it, or how they experience conflict.
INT  Um er other things you have looked at?
AR3  The other major area has been in what do you have to do to teach people effective conflict resolution and peace building skills and then if those skills actually make a difference to what people do in every day practice and then how that effects the people they’re working with in the community.
INT  That’s very practical.
AR3  Yes ... I don’t see the point unless it is (laughs).
INT  No no, its evident from everything that you’re saying that you like it to be practically orientated.
AR3  That’s good (laughs).
INT  Is there any room for theory though?
AR3  Of course theories are important, but you need to be able to understand what it is that they are trying to say ... you have to tell people who makes them up and what the theories are trying to say or what they are on about ... otherwise it’s all a waste of time.
INT  What makes you so clear about that? I mean I don’t disagree, but I’m interested because I know a lot of other researchers wouldn’t necessarily place that much emphasis on it as you would.
AR3  Yeah, I’m strong on that (laughs) ...
INT  It’s not a negative, I’m just interested in why you’re so definite about it?
AR3  Er well we know that if it’s not practical and simple then that means that people who are doing the work won’t listen to what researchers say. Usually we’re too theory driven and challenging as that might be to us who know, it is irrelevant to anyone else who is listening ... so it has to be much more practical, and aimed at getting a simple message across. That’s what I try to do anyway ... why do we try to develop theories and er models and if they can’t help the people who they are designed to help, if they don’t help them they are useless.
INT  12. Mmm okay what do you think of the relationship between research and practice in conflict resolution?
AR3  I think it’s disgraceful (laughs) ...
INT  ... that’s a strong comment ... (laughs).
AR3  I can say that now ‘cause I’m um nearly retired (laughs) ... I may not have before.
INT  Yeah, can you say more about it?
AR3  Yes. It’s true, it’s true, I should explain. The relationship is so very vital that I think it’s disgraceful that nothing’s been done by more people to try to make it better and it would get better if people worked at it.
INT  What should be done in your experience, what would you do to improve it?
I have always tried to make my ideas practical and I write them in simple books for people who do practice, but most people who do the research forget about the applied side of things. They're off doing one thing and people in practice are off doing another and no-one ever bothered to be communicating about the issues.

So there needs to be greater communication?

Yes. What we need is um more research like you're doing to bring the two sides together. That would be about the best thing that could happen for the whole group of us. More communication is the key. I've said it for years to anyone who'll listen (laughs). But it's hard to get through to them, we're a bit daft I think (laughs)

Why don't people listen?

I think it's the researchers fault. We should know better and um make more of an effort to make the ideas more clear and more simple.

But are they relevant?

Of course, yes yes they're relevant they just have to be told in a way so the practitioners can understand.

But are we talking about just those in peace building and international conflict resolution?

No, no it's the same everywhere ... exactly what we do internationally is exactly what should happen between a black and white neighbour or with a divorce. You know it's all very simple there just has to be better communication and it has to be made simpler and er relatable for the practitioners because they can't understand it in our terms. Then we'd be more likely to er get better results otherwise it's a waste of time even doing the research.

And um why do you think people involved in research don't recognise what you are saying and make it or make it simpler?

I don't think most researchers who are around today have had enough er experience of different types of conflict resolution and that to er realise that what we are er talking about is not isolated to what they are er looking at or researching. The um, the advantage of being old is that you can see those sort of patterns across many areas, many experiences, its the same ... I want people to understand that.

13. Hmm yes, do you think that researchers and practitioners adequately assist each other in this field?

No not enough, that's what I'm saying it has to be more, more clear, more directed towards a mutual helping of each other to get at the problems and find out answers everyone can use. We make it more complex than that and it becomes very tangled up with theories and models that's a waste of everyone's time and makes practitioners like researchers even less. We'd all help each other much more if we'd just stop and look at where we're going and where we've been. It's been the same question for twenty or thirty years, since the peace movements started research has been too slow to listen to what practitioners need to hear, it's their fault really but they're a pigheaded lot (laughs). We have to pull together, to make a stand to listen to each other to do the research that best addresses the problems of everyday mediators, you know the simple stuff, otherwise its just research for research sake its got to be useful too.

You sound very much like there's a sense of urgency to it.

Yes that's right, there is a sense of urgency. You can't be complacent with peace. Yeah we've had some victories with the Berlin Wall and Russia breaking down but that's always going to bring more problems up ... and you can never be sure what's going to happen in the Middle East next, there could be a new war tomorrow ... you know, we have to work for peace while we can and I just want to do it as quickly as we can.

You don't think we've done enough to capitalise on all the new interest in mediation and peace. We have to do more to make it more public ... it will all help to make peace more practical eventually ... it's no good being up in the air with peace, all the feel good people don't know the first thing about it, I've seen war and killing and it is all so unnecessary when we can just do some simple things to understand each other better. To make it a better existence for everyone, I'm going on aren't I?

No no it's been good to hear you say that and do you think that many other people in research think like that?
Yes lots more than it seems. I know it's easy in research to play the publication game, but most of us have a vision to actually make a difference, to do something good for the world you know. It's more than you think, the system hides it but you have to believe in what you're doing.

And most researchers, do they do that?

You know I don't know one researcher who is in this field who isn't interested in this or this perspective for or peace and such, but they forget about making it applied after a while which means that eventually it turns out that there's a big gap in the thinking of researchers and practitioners where originally it was all the same.

What, you or think they lose sight of that?

Yes, but I'm not blaming them really, there is so much pressure to make it more and more academic and that doesn't or help when you are trying to get ideas across to all levels of the society.

14. Is there much consensus about the theories and processes that underlie conflict resolution among people you work with?

Now I work by myself there's no trouble with that - but I remember it was normal to have differences in opinions and that's healthy, it makes you think more about the whole thing and get your ideas straighter. I miss those sought of discussions where you nut out the little differences in opinion about how a model works or how it should be made better.
1. How long have you been working in the conflict resolution field?

How long have I been working in the field?

Do you mean how long have I been working with (names the current place of employment)?

Not only that, since you started in the area.

Oh about twelve years, since I finished my Masters degree.

2. Can you explain what is it that you do in conflict resolution?

Now I'm ah doing research for (names organisation) and testing the working up of all our conflict resolution and mediation courses and whether they work ... the ones that we do, er around er London.

And you've been doing that for how long?

This contract er this job is been going for a couple of years.

Before that, um what did you do before that?

Er before I did this I was doing the same sort of work that I'm doing now ... evaluating the effectiveness of different techniques that are put into training programs and that.

So what is your position actually called?

Research Officer

And your main role is doing research on the training methods er if they're working, if they're like if they're effective or not.

Yes that's what I do most of the time but er with this position I'm also expected to take part in the training of mediators so that I can instigate our studies into the and effectiveness of the training. I'm not that experienced as a training person but it er goes with the job that I have to do some because its part of the research to train them in the methods of recording the effectiveness of the mediation that they do.

The research that you are doing is part of an overall training package then?

Yeah, its part of a bigger program.

And that's with the (names organisation) like you said before, its the same project as we were talking about before?

Yeah, the research is all part of the training programs of the (names organisation).

Okay, I just wanted to be sure that I got it straight, so I understood what you meant about it. If its clear, if I'm understanding about what you're saying about it. Um how long has that program been going on for?

About two years.

So you've been involved with it from the beginning?

Uh huh ... I set up the research protocols and the formats for the data collection in all of the training so we can have an idea of how much effect we are having with our training. I set up the whole er research program for this project.

Mmm ... sounds like a pretty big endeavour, I mean its on such a large scale the way that you are doing it, it must be a big er responsibility to make sure it all follows the right er format.
Do you do any practical mediation?

No, no I don't. I do the training and evaluation of our programs and research new material and methods for the programs.

You've said about the methods but er what does the evaluation of the training involve?

I work with the other trainers doing the training but my role is also to evaluate the training during the course. That's just the standard type of course evaluation that you'd put in any course but the er focus is on the evaluation of how the er mediators then go about putting that into practice and then that involves the research that we are doing ... and then afterwards to go out with the people who do the training and measure how well they apply what we've taught.

Hmm um do you do any research out in the field at all or is it all in the er training setting when the er training courses are on? Do you um ever see the people who do mediation in their work places?

Yeah I also go out into the work place with the people who do the mediation and look at what they're doing in practice.

What are you looking for there?

We are trying to see if they are doing in practice what we are teaching them in the training ... to er check up on the er method that they're using to see if its as er they say it is, um to see if they are a doing what they think they are.

What er how do you do that? What methods do you use for that?

I developed a behaviourally based scale where I rate them on what they are doing while they are doing the mediation.

You sit in on the mediations while they are doing them with clients?

Yeah.

Okay yeah er has it come out okay so far?

I've only been gathering data for about six months, which would be er that I've only actually made about six visits to centres that have been through our training so that would mean I've probably only got about that number of completed scales so far, but there's a time delay on it because they have to er finish the training before that stage of the research.

Mmm.

My er initial analyses are quite positive so far but I can't draw any real conclusions yet.

Hm, would you er call yourself more of a applied researcher or a theoretical researcher?

I'd say I'm more theoretical than applied nowadays.

Mmm but what you are doing sounds very applied in many ways, its very much based in applied research ideas.

Yeah but its only an applied project, you have to understand that the focus of my work is building up a picture of the models that are taught, and whether they work in practice. I'm trying to see if the theory works in practice. To me that's much more of a theoretical question because we are checking whether the theory works and we are then in a position to remodel the theory on the basis of our results.

Yeah that makes sense that way.

Mmm I know it looks applied and you could call it that but I prefer to see it as a theoretical question a er theoretical research that I am working on from a theoretical perspective because I'm in a position of testing the model.

3. Okay er what was your original training?

My original degree was in politics and then I did post graduate training in Peace and conflict resolution. I've just finished my Masters degree in that.

Was that by research or course work?
Both, we had to do both course work and a research thesis.

It was an evaluation study of the (names project).

That sounds very similar to what you're doing now.

(laughs) Yes I have certainly found a suitable career path to use that work ... it's worked in well with what I have done in the past.

What sort of training did the original degree and ah your work since then give you in research methods that that would qualify you for the sort of thing you're doing er now?

Umm ... there was always a lot of data analysis that ... and to and the er basic putting together of different ideas in the work that I did undergradulately but after that in the Masters I had to give more of a emphasis on um the more formal research.

Uh huh, what do you mean by that, what was the formal research that you had to er learn in your Masters?

Oh we er did a training a course in the proper research methods for analysis of data and that sort of thing and I picked some up from the other people I was working with and my er supervisor.

4. Do you feel that your training adequately prepared you to be doing the sort of work that you're doing now?

Yes of course.

Why do you say that?

The ... um ... the masters course helped me because I learned a lot of the research skills by doing stuff like writing up reports and statistics which I hadn't been exposed to in my first degree ... and they're what I'm using now most of the time now.

And that's what you learned in your Masters, yeah, what about what you learned while you were have been doing the er different positions that you have had in research roles since then?

Yes that taught me a lot too but it was the simple skills that I had earlier that allowed me to do all of that as well.

Okay, that's fine, I just want to ask you about research and practice issues ... do you think that conflict resolution theories affect conflict resolution practice?

We're trying to get our trainees to be aware of it and that they also can use theories rather than just doing what they hope will work er most of them haven't had enough training from before.

At the moment they are just doing what they think will work?

Yeah most of them ... but even if they listen to what we're talking about that doesn't mean they do it in practice because they don't know how to.

Er and that's what you ...

... and that's what our research is trying to promote with observing what mediators do in real dispute situations. In the past we know that they didn't do anything that drew on the theories like we talk about, and er now we are trying to teach them that.

Why do you think that is?

Originally it's because our mediator weren't trained in the more theoretical aspects of mediation.

What did they do then?

Our research suggests that they had a good idea of the models that we suggested and just used them ... and anything else they could think of to work out a dispute, we're just trying to give them get them to follow a structure.

And did it work?

Oh yes, it worked very well, they are usually very good just by being empathic and listening to the people having the problem and coming up with good problem solving tactics.

Maybe that's all they need to do?

That's definitely what many of them think and it's hard to convince them of anything else ... but with the changing types of conflict that they're seeing and the standards that are expected it's important that they are trained as well as possible.

Okay okay, but do you think that theories of conflict resolution affect practice now?
No I suppose still not as much as we would like, but it does effect it though er but the er research that's being done now is showing the people who make decisions about where the money should go that it works and is a good use of money so I think it will get more acceptance in time.

12. How would you describe the nature of the relationship between research and practice in conflict resolution?

How could I describe it?

Uh huh?

Most people who do mediation don't like research err they er they think its boring and it doesn't effect what they actually do in practice and thats pretty normal for most practical areas like counselling, but that's not always how it is.

Well what's it like in (names organisation).

It's good in what we do but do you mean in general?

Yes okay, what's it like in the field?

I think it's well known that um problems exist in communication and that, but I really think at the bottom of it all it's about a difference in opinion about the future of mediation and its that stuff that will have to be sorted out before we can get on and work out what we need to do make the area better. We are certainly trying to make it better.

Mmm.

It's really about the future of standards and training, about who will be allowed to mediate and what sort of training that will be required by various governing organisations. Obviously ah lots of the mediators are concerned by that because they most of them have very few qualifications or none at all ... and they're worried about their futures in the area and therefore there has been a lot of resistance to the changes that are coming in. And they think that its being er pushed along by the researchers and by what we do.

So you think that they're worried about their jobs?

Yes but it's not just their jobs they're also worried about the field and the service that they can provide to their clients. They think that with more regulations the creative edge of mediation will be blunted which they think will result in a worse mediation service.

How?

By more rules and regulations is the usual argument, they don't really agree on a model anyway so ...

... do you think it's a realistic possibility?

Yes it is possible that the extra focus on standards could be end up in making mediation less er spontaneous or er therapeutic, but its also unavoidable ... we have to bring in standards and training, if we don't the problems could be worse.

13. Do you think that researchers and practitioners adequately assist each other in this field?

No, there isn't enough done to capitalise on the potential learning that could be gained from a better relationship between researchers and practitioners and that's a real shame because each could learn a lot from each other.

He you learnt much from the training and the research that you have done with practitioners?

Yeah, I know the time I have spent with practitioners has been invaluable in helping me to work out what to do in my research and I'm sure the same could be said for my colleagues we all learn a lot from what people in practice tell us. Mediators have a lot to offer us in the research perspective.

And do researchers have much to offer back?

I hope so (laughs) yes sometimes mediators tell us that we help them with our input, but there's less receptiveness overall from practitioners. They're not as interested in us as we are in them (laughs).

Why do you think that is?
Well they see us as the bad guys. It's researchers and people like us who are calling for reform to training and methods so they don't really have much interest in what we're saying overall. I know that most don't care at all about the findings we come up with and they should be interested ... it could make them much better at doing what they are doing, but in general they do not value theory or research in the way that we want them to.

Why don't they value research in your opinion?

I don't know. I think it is because of different motivations or reasons for their involvement in mediation. Researchers like me want to understand how it works, how to do it to get results that last, in my experience of mediators they have the same goal of making it work, but they want it to be therapeutic as well. Most researchers are not concerned by therapy and the things like that.

Is there much consensus about the theories and processes that underlie conflict resolution among people you work with?

Yes or we have a consensus model that we use in our training and research.
1. How long have you been working in the conflict resolution field?

I've been an academic for about five years now and in that time I've been working mainly with conflict resolution and in social psychology.

2. What is it that you actually do?

I am a lecturer here at (names institution) and as I said I teach conflict resolution to students from a social psych perspective.

3. Okay er could you explain what training have you had for your research work in conflict resolution?

Okay I did an undergraduate degree in psychology at (names institution) then did my Masters and doctorate ah at (names institution)...

How er was the undergraduate degree? Did you do any study of conflict resolution in that?

Not really, it was a fairly traditional kind of bachelors degree. We did the same sort of things that everyone would do in an undergraduate psychology degree.

Did you do anything on conflict resolution?

Only what is normally covered in the way that social psychology addresses conflict resolution... er more about conflict and social processes than er anything about how it er how it can be resolved.

And after that, after your er bachelors, during your masters?

During my masters I did a research thesis about conflict and conflict resolution techniques.

Was that all be research, your masters?

Yeah, by research.

Er was there any training for research methods and that sort of thing or was it all just research?

There wasn't any coursework at all.

How did you learn everything you needed to actually do the research?

Well we learned research methods in our undergraduate degrees, it wasn't like we didn't learn anything about it then.

Hmn okay, I didn't mean that you didn't learn anything in the er statistics in you psychology degree, I just wonder if they were relevant to your masters an and your PhD? Were they enough or did you need more?

Okay, er the masters was okay because the research I did didn't have any statistics in it. It was more a collection of all the er ideas and the er research... I wasn't statistical, I didn't do any formal research, it was more a matter of a er review.

Yeah I know what you mean, and your doctorate, did you need statistics for that?
TR3 Yes, that was er very statistical, very reliant on er getting the methodology right.

INT So how did you get the skills to do all of that? From your undergraduate training still?

TR3 A little bit from back then, but most of it I just picked up from other people as I went along.

INT You learned it as you went along. What does that mean?

TR3 It means that you find out how other people did it and then do what they did (laughs). You ask people, your supervisor ... anyone who can help you (laughs) ... thats how you get the skills you need I think.

INT Uh huh...

TR3 So I er ... well that has been my training.

INT Uh huh, what was your PhD in?

TR3 I looked at strategic choice models in mediation basically and how that effects mediator behaviour and the ways they mediate in different conditions you know co-operative, not co-operative, highly aggressive ... you know ... er ... the standard conditions and all that sort.

INT 4. Great ... um do you feel that this training has prepared you adequately for what you are doing now?

TR3 Yes, yes I do.

INT What about the er would you say the formal side in your undergraduate helped you?

TR3 Well only conceptually, the rest I learned and picked up as I was doing it in my doctorate ... I er I think that is the only way that it can make much sense. But er you have to er have the understanding of it that you get in undergraduate psychology training even if its boring.

INT Why do you say that?

TR3 Its, it has to do with that sort of training giving you skills in the way that you look at things ... which are the sort of skills that you need to do any real examination of new information and to do the um teaching and that sort of thing.

INT What are they, the skills?

TR3 It gives you a mind set or a way of approaching things to draw on and think about ... you know a way of looking at it that you can only get with a psychology background which is very different from how others in the area look at it.

INT What would you say that mind set is like?

TR3 It's more objective ... but at the same time it's more accepting of the inconsistencies that one might find in a situation ...

INT ... er hang on I'm not sure I know what you mean ...

TR3 ... I mean it adds a perspective that is a more historical way of looking at what you're doing ... where you can understand the roots of a problem from knowing about the theories that have contributed to what we now know about conflict.

INT And what would you say is the purpose of that, the advantage of that?

TR3 It gives a much broader perspective to what we're doing when you understand that sort of thing so that when you're doing research you can see what your doing in a context ...

INT ... yes mmm ...

TR3 ... yeah it's much more sensible to see the bigger picture and that's what a psychology approach does.

INT And do you think your training prepared you for your work now?

TR3 Yeah uh huh...

INT How?

TR3 Well it gives you that perspective of some sort of insight into what you're doing

INT Yes, and did it umm teach you how to teach and do research?

TR3 Only really by watching what others did.

INT Like modelling?

TR3 Yeah it's actually a bit like an apprenticeship ... you watch what the more senior members of staff do and learn the trade first by doing tutorials then small lectures, then bigger ones until you can co-ordinate a whole course.

INT And research?
It's the same. I worked on projects with more senior people and learned the hows of it all and now I co-ordinate my own projects on my own and use research staff to do what I used to do.

9. Mmm, that's good um moving on a bit now. Do you think that standard theories of conflict resolution affect practice?

Yes I think they do because nowadays most of the people who are doing mediation have some training in the theories and methods of conflict resolution so they have a structure to follow er most have been taught what the um theories are about and its that focus in recent years that's made mediation much more popular.

Yeah.

... well that's what it's like in England ... I don't know about Australia and the States. I think there it's more chaotic in the States but I know here and in most of Europe everyone is trained in the theories if they are practicing ...

Is that right? I didn't er think that everyone had that level of training?

Well they er are meant to now. There were standards put into place earlier this year that says that people have to have had a training course.

Okay but does that um mean that they are going to necessarily get an understanding of the theoretical ideas that mediation and er conflict resolution are based on?

No I er see your point.

Mmm ...

But that's the only way it the only way that we can expect mediation to proceed ... people in the field want to have the best training possible and they want to be kept up to date with what research is coming up with.

How do you know thats what they want?

We ask them in our research and they always say they'd like a better understanding of the theories and processes behind mediation practices, so er maybe they don't have a really good understanding yet and they need the training. They sound really eager to learn more about the scientific side of it you know how it is er works and the sort of ideas that it is all based on and er the history of mediation.

When do you ask them, are there processes set up for that kind of thing, that sort of communication between researchers and practitioners?

Ah yeah there sort of is but it depends on the people around the time ... I er we find out through meetings and the groups we go to ... the practitioners there are all interested in knowing about our research.

Yeah but do you think that they might be the minority of practitioners?

Yeah they could be. I don't know ... um they're very genuine though and they say their colleagues would like to know more too ... it's hard to say, we get the feeling from our research contact that they're eager to find out more about how to do mediation better, I mean how to be more effective you know what I mean?

11. Yes okay can you tell me a little bit more about your research, I mean the research you're doing at the moment, not the doctoral work like we were talking about before?

Well it's a follow on of my work in my doctorate in er mediator behaviour ...

... no yes that's okay, er say again what's that about ...

... ah what conditions are most conducive to mediation success ... er what works and what doesn't and if it does how much it works better than other methods of dispute resolution ... and er also what um what tactics mediators usually use to bring about a successful outcomes in their mediations.

Does that require a lot of contact with practitioners?

Yeah, a lot.

Do you only use qualified practitioners in your research?

No no, we don't work with them all the time ... we also use people with no experience ...

Undergraduates?

Yeah we get them to go through the same conditions as the qualified mediators to see if there's much difference between the groups.
Is there?

Not really but that's quite simplistic and we don't believe that we're measuring what that suggests ... so much is based on the problem at hand and the behaviour of disputants that it's hard to rely on the sort of data we're collecting ... it's an indication though.

An indication of what, that anyone can do mediation?

No an indication more of that the model that people are using is sensible an can be used in different situations. It's not just about the mediators at that level, its more about the um theory or model of mediation, but it helps to know if they are doing what they say they are.

Um would you call yourself an applied or a theoretical researcher?

Probably I'm more a theoretical person and thats why I get into the theoretical parts of cr conflict resolution research.

12. Mmm, overall, how would you describe the relationship between research and practice?

It's good ... they're er very co-operative with our research ... you know happy to be involved and interested ... um I think it's one of the few fields where this sort of relationship is good.

And what do you think practitioners think from their perspective on research?

Yeah okay ... I think they get a bit sick of it all and get ... they used to be very pessimistic about research efforts ... especially the ar more theoretical work that we did but as we got more apllied they are happier with it even if they don't agree on what's right.

What did they way was wrong with theoretical work?

They just couldn't see the relevance of it all, they wanted to get something from it immediately and um then to get something they could take home and apply to or their work ... you know?

Yes sure ... yes was it relevant?

Well we thought so (laughs). Yes it was important but most practitioners don't worry too much about the theory, they want to spend their er time learning about the er techniques and ways of working that are er ...

... that are more practical?

Yeah more practical and more able to be understood by them.

Mmm.

Er the theoretical research was a bit hard to understand from their perspective, that's not saying they're stupid or anything like that, it's just not the area they are interested in ... but it's vital for the research in the area.

Because?

Because its important for us to be able to explore whether what we think actually happens in the mediation process is what happens in the field.

But I'm asking what is it that makes that important, what's the importance of knowing if the theoretical model takes place in the practice of mediation, why is that important?

So that makes it a more valid process?

Yes thats what we're after ... and it has significant implications for the standards and training needs of the er people who are now um regulating the profession.

So what about the volunteers and the people who just learn to do er mediation at a weekend workshop?

I don't think we will see much more of that in years to come. I think that as it becomes a profession all of that will disappear and I think the field will become much better for that and it'll really improve everything.

Do you think everyone is happy with that?

No, they're not happy with it, but there's enough people who are to make it work.

So why do people want it that way?

Its probably because they understand that there is a lot to be gained professionally by having conflict resolution and mediation tightened up.
Do you mean having it made more professional?

Yeah because when it is then the profession will be more respected and people will pay more for it and the government will have to support it more generously so it only makes sense for practitioners to get involved with what we’re doing.

13. Well do you think overall that researchers and practitioners help each other enough in this field?

Yes as much as in any other field of inquiry, yes.

But is that enough, is it enough for the sort of professionalising that you were talking about?

Most of the time it is ... er but with it growing so quickly it’s important for research to keep up with the practice. There are a lot of people still getting crash courses on ways of doing mediation that is not tested or proven to work ... the real issue is keeping the field credible with properly researched techniques and ideas that can be relied on and we know that work consistently and thats why its so important that we keep working closely with practice to um validate what they’re doing.

But surely there are parts of mediation that aren’t reliant on research and cant be validated?

Sure, yes but the techniques and models need to be researched.

Are there some people who are doing it well with out any real reliance on any kind of model?

Yes, you know there there are plenty of people out there who are like gurus in how mediation should be done and most of that’s based on the sort of charismatic personality approach to it all that only works for a few special individuals ... but er most people can’t pull it off just by making people feel uh good.

What most people couldn’t do it just on their personalities?

Yeah, because they need a practical model to fall back on and that’s only fair for the people buying the service you know, and er most practitioners accept that now.

Yes

There are those parts of conflict resolution like er communication skills which we can’t really research well and maybe they are more instinctive and er personality based, I think that’s true, but through them the other techniques can be used better ... it’s not exclusively one thing or the other and we’re concerned that a lot of them think it can be just one thing or the other.

What personality or theory?

Yeah they sometimes think that the models will some how reduce the effect of the personality factors its just a different view about what we think is important for the field and what they think is important for it do you know what I mean?

That practitioners think models will somehow break down the communication process?

Uh huh yeah ... they feel that will make it too technical for people who are trying to sort out the problem and that it will change what they think is the feel of the mediation process.

Where do you think that’s coming from?

From the popularised experts the er gurus, you know the people who have written the books that are based purely on ideas not facts that have been tested

Are they no help at all to the field?

No I wouldn’t say that the ideas that can’t be tested aren’t wrong and they obviously help but it has to be a bit more rigorous than that with the way everything is growing and the sort of public use that is being proposed ... it’s important to do both parts of the research its more that they just dont like what we are finding or don’t believe it.

It sounds like there is some difference in opinion?

Yeah, it’s a real problem that needs attention.

14. Is there much consensus about the theories and processes that underlie conflict resolution among people you work with?

Yeah we share the same approach and believe in the need to sort out the theoretical base to mediation.

It sounds like that is the most important point for you, that there can be a theoretical basis for mediation

I suppose it is.
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