EBA

DISSERTATION BRIEF SERIES 2017:08

PEACEMAKING UP CLOSE: EXPLAINING MEDIATOR STYLES OF INTERNATIONAL MEDIATORS

Mathilda Lindgren

Peacemaking Up Close: Explaining Mediator Styles of International Mediators

Mathilda Lindgren

Development Dissertation Brief 2017:08
Expertgruppen för Biståndsanalys (EBA)

Mathilda Lindgren is a Peace Researcher who defended her thesis ”Peacemaking Up Close: Explaining Mediator Styles of International Mediators” at the Department of Peace and Conflict Research at Uppsala University in October 2016. Mathilda can be contacted at lindgren.mathilda@gmail.com and mathlida.lindgren@humandignity.se.

Find and download the full thesis at http://uu.diva-portal.org/smash/record.jsf?pid=diva2%3A954426&dswid=3461#sthash.ZjBKphDz.dpbs

Read more about Mathilda’s current work on conflict resolution, peacemaking and leadership at the international, Sollefteå-based, center Human Dignity: A Center For Leadership, www.humandignity.se

The research was financed with grants from the Anna Maria Lundin Travel Grant (Småland’s Nation), Lars Hiertas Minnesfond (The Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences), the Nordic Africa Institute Travel Scholarship and the Forskarstiftelsen Theodor Adelswärds Minne (Handelsbanken). Associate Professor Desirée Nilsson (principal) and Doctor Anders Themnér (supporting) provided invaluable guidance as supervisors.

The Expert Group for Aid Studies - EBA - is a Government committee analysing and evaluating Swedish international development aid. This report can be downloaded free of charge at www.eba.se

Printed by Elanders Sverige AB
Stockholm 2017

Cover design by Julia Demchenko

Producing a dissertation is quite a comprehensive and challenging project, as is reading one. Having done both and being passionate about helping us progress and improve on our global peacemaking endeavours in relation to conflicts in general and armed conflicts in particular, it is with great joy that I take on EBA's invitation to share with you the main rationales, contributions, findings and implications of my dissertation"Peacemaking Up Close: Explaining Mediator Styles of International Mediators" (October 7, 2016). If you are curious about how we can understand and produce more effective and long-lasting third-party peacemaking around the world, this report is for you.

My doctoral research, as a first of its kind, deals with a specific aspect of the micro dynamics of international mediation, namely developing possible explanations for variations in mediator style among individual mediators working for international, peacemaking inter-governmental organizations (IGOs) and non-governmental organizations (NGOs). The research centers around the research question: *What explains mediator styles of individuals mediating for peacemaking organizations in armed conflicts?* It approaches mediation as a process of assisting two or more organized, armed parties in addressing their behavior and resolving their grievances (see Beardsley 2011: 18; Beber 2012). It defines mediator style as an expression of *how* individuals mediate in terms of themes in both goals and behaviors, varying along two particularly central dimensions: directiveness and orientation. Directiveness captures how much leverage the mediator both strives to use and actually uses towards the conflict parties, varying from non-directive to directive. Orientation concerns what type of outcome the mediator wants to emphasize and actually emphasizes in her/his engagement between the conflict parties, varying from being relationship-oriented to settlement-oriented. Based on these two core definitions, the dissertation develops a theoretical framework for understanding the effects of certain aspects of conflict context and mediator characteristics on mediator style directiveness and orientation, respectively. It does so by combining insights from previous research on mediation in the international as well as the inter-personal, communal or business-related spheres with evidence from new survey and interview material with a broad variety of international IGO and NGO mediators.

In particular, my dissertation presents a refined theoretical understanding of mediator style that shows that high rather than low conflict intensity makes mediators overall more directive (context and directiveness), and high rather than low mediator profile gives rise to more settlement-oriented mediation (characteristic and orientation).

Rationales and Contributions

When I initiated my doctoral research on mediator style, no systematic studies existed that gathered, tested and refined possible explanations for variations in mediator styles of international mediators in armed conflicts. Providing such a study thus filled an existing research gap. While this is an important element for motivating any new research project, it is not enough. We also want to pursue and invest in finding answers to questions that matter and make a difference to the advancement and benefit of both our academic understandings and practical developments. Three main rationales beyond the existing research gap motivate mapping and explaining mediator styles of individual mediators. These rationales pave way for the dissertation's three unique contributions at the level of the individual mediator. Together, the contributions help realign research with practice of international mediation.

A first rationale relates to how previous research on international mediation has shown that what state and organizational mediators do and how they mediate has an influence on whether, and if so how, conflicts are resolved (Bercovitch 2011: 47). In other words, research on international mediation from a realist bargaining, a social-psychological or a sociological perspective all point to how variations in mediator style, strategies and tactics matter for how mediated negotiations develop and turn out. In particular, more coercive mediation has been found to produce faster agreements and violence abatement, though at times and according to some, at the cost of the quality and durability of peace (Beardsley et al. 2006; Greig and Diehl 2006; Sisk 2009; Böhmelt 2010a; Beardsley 2011; Gartner 2012; Svensson 2014; Ruhe 2015). Conversely, more facilitative and non-coercive mediation initiatives appear to lead to more durable peace agreements, greater satisfaction among conflict parties and more comprehensive solutions (Bercovitch 1986; Lim and Carnevale 1990; Wilkenfeld et al. 2003; Curran et al. 2004; Bercovitch 2011). Similarly, broader and more comprehensive mediation approaches contribute to transformative

processes in armed conflict (Burton and Sandole 1986; Azar 1990; Nathan 1999). It is thus important to learn more about the ”how” of mediation and in particular its origins, as different ways of mediating contribute to different mediation outcomes.

A second rationale comes of how most existing studies on the styles, strategies and tactics of international mediation concern dynamics at the level of mediating states and organizations rather than the mediating individuals working for and with these third-party peacemakers.[1] While studying peacemaking states and organizations is important and informative in itself, it misses out on at least three aspects. First, it does not help us directly speak to some of the individual-centered mediation theories on inter alia a mediator's perceived credibility or ability to empathize with the parties (Nathan 1999; Beardsley et al. 2006; Wall and Dunne 2012). Second, it does not acknowledge and build on the accumulated research on both effects and causes of mediator styles of individual mediators in so called domestic mediation—mediation of inter-personal, community or business disputes. This related strand of research has both produced similar results on the effects of individuals' mediator styles to those identified in relation to international mediation at the level of the organization.[2] It has also identified mediator characteristics as a prominent area of explanation for variations in mediator style.[3] Third, it does not match with the practical world of mediation where employment processes, professionalization efforts and actual day-to-day implementation of mediation circle around individuals leading, implementing or supporting mediation initiatives (Martin 2006; Herrberg and Varela 2015).

A third, and final, rationale for explaining mediator styles is that this information may help us more effectively evaluate the impact of different styles on mediated outcomes. Unless variations in mediator style is completely random, we might be making biased inferences on the effects of mediator styles if we do not account for potential endogenous

[1] There are a few case study exceptions (see Curran et al. 2004; Svensson and Wallensteen 2010; Beardsley 2011).
[2] See, for example, Kolb (1983), Tracy and Spradlin (1994), Kruk (1998), Wall et al. (2001: 535), Kressel et al. (2002), Herrman et al. (2003), Noce (2009), Wall and Chan-Serafin (2009), Kressel et al. (2012), Wall and Dunne (2012).
[3] This research suggest that mediator characteristics such as educational and professional background, may sometimes matter more for explaining variations in mediator style than contextual factors related to, for example, time pressure and hostility among the conflict parties (Marlow 1987; Roberts 2005; Baitar et al. 2013).

relationships (Morgan and Winship 2007). In other words, if there are certain systematic patterns in when and where we see certain mediator styles, we can use this information to design more accurate studies on the impact of mediator styles in the future. Thus, by explaining mediator style now, we may help future research navigate between when certain mediator styles are implemented as a result of a particular mediation context; the mediator's characteristics, for which she/he may be employed in the first place; or a mix of both context and characteristics.

With a basis in the above-identified rationales, this dissertation makes three important contributions. First, it theorizes explanations for mediator style in international mediation in the form of both clarified concepts and specified expectations. It does this by combining research insights on both international and domestic mediation. More precisely, the dissertation develops a theoretical framework that explains mediator styles in terms of both direct and contingent effects of context—which has been identified in the literature on international mediation as important—and characteristics, which, in turn, has been proposed to be central by scholars of domestic mediation.

Second, the dissertation studies mediator styles of *individual* international mediators working for some of the most prominent peacemaking IGO and NGO third parties of today. In this way, it presents new and unique individual-level material on the experiences and perceptions of a variety of mediating individuals, from special representatives to political officers. In particular, both surveys and interviews engage public and non-public mediating individuals working with some of the most prominent IGO and NGO third-party actors, such as IGOs like the United Nations (UN), European Union (EU), African Union (AU) and the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD), as well as NGOs like Crisis Management Initiative (CMI), Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue (HDC) and MediatEUr. These new empirics serve to bridge the existing divide between the theory and practice of international mediation.

Third, and finally, the study further refines our understanding of mediator styles by leveraging a mixed methods research design. In particular, by combining findings from a survey experiment and 46 semi-structured in-depth interviews, the dissertation offers a more comprehensive understand- ing of mediator style in terms of both general patterns

and causal processes. Together, these three contributions help advance our understanding of international mediators' mediator styles.

Conclusions and Findings

In order to realign the study and practice of international mediation and advance our understanding of mediator style in armed conflicts my dissertation progresses through three stages before it identifies four main conclusions presented below. In a first stage, it introduces a tentative theoretical framework on conflict context and mediator characteristics to provide a basis for a possible explanation for mediator style. The framework, building on previous research on both international as well as domestic mediation, refines the conceptualization of mediator style to the two dimensions of directiveness and orientation and suggests in total eight hypotheses on possible explanatory roles of 1) conflict intensity (context), 2) mediator profile (characteristic) and 3) mediator personality features of Extraversion and Agreeableness (characteristics). A second stage of the dissertation presents newly collected empirical material on mediator style at the level of the individual international mediator combining results of unique survey experiments[4] with 46 in-depth semi-structured interviews[5]. The final survey experiment randomizes low- and high-intensity conflict scenarios (vignettes) and asks closed multiple choice or single choice questions about mediator style, mediator profile, personality and a few other background questions. The survey results are analyzed using relatively simple and straightforward methods such as descriptive graphical analyses, non-parametric randomization inference methods and parametric matching procedures. The semi-structured interviews are designed to conduct a closer and more open-ended

[4] Survey experiments are systematic and structured inquiry forms with a randomized component usually representing an independent variable of interest for a theorized relationship (Dunning 2010). The randomized component is what makes survey experiments unique among survey types. It offers the opportunity to eliminate concerns for the existence of alternative explanations driving the results, so-called confounding (Fisher 1937). In other words, by using a randomized scenario in a survey, we may significantly increase our confidence in that the treatment (the independent variable of the scenario) is independent of expected outcomes (the dependent variable mediator style) (Morgan and Winship 2007: 74f, 82).

[5] Semi-structured interviews are oral inquiry-based interactions between re- searcher (interviewer) and researched (interviewee), partially guided by a pre- set structure and a set of questions (Kvale 2009). The content of the interview manuscript reflects the theoretical framework of the researcher while allowing for some flexibility to ask follow-up probes and let the interviewee bring for- ward new points and perspectives (Kvale 2009; Lamont and Swidler 2014). Interviews are particularly suitable for getting closer to the experiences and perceptions of the persons of interest (Lucas 2014).

exploration of both theorized as well as new, complementary patterns and causal processes, analyzed and presented in themes relevant to context, characteristics and mediator style.[6] Finally, a third part of the dissertation, refines and updates our understanding of mediator styles in terms of conceptualizations, general patterns and causal processes based on the combined results of the survey and interview material. The main findings of these processes are presented in this section.

A first conclusions relates to the usefulness of approaching and explaining mediation along the mediator styles of directiveness and orientation. To support this, the dissertation first shows that important variations in mediator style can be both fruitfully mapped and explained at the level of the individual using the general conceptualizations and measurements (operationalizations) of directiveness and orientation. That individual mediators can vary in how non-directive versus directive or settlement- versus relationship-oriented they are challenges previous assumptions about the two dimensions always covarying. It also reveals a plurality of mediator style hitherto not captured in research on international mediation—a possible result of its focus on the organizational, peacemaker level and assumptions of mediators commonly prioritizing settlement production before relationship building. In order to further advance future research on international mediation, the study also proposes that it may be particularly fruitful to define and measure directiveness along variations in information-sharing, incentive structures and mediator evaluations, potentially also looking into whether a directive mediator style is implemented equally toward all or only some of the parties. Similarly, expressions of orientation appear to be best captured along variations in trust between the parties, with the possible addition of exploring trust between the mediator herself/himself and the parties. In short, mapping international mediation using developed definitions and measurements in my dissertation may help further understand the micro dynamics of international third-party peacemaking.

Further support for the first conclusion, which is of direct relevance to the causal element of the research questions, are the two main findings of the synthesized survey and interview analysis: 1) high rather than low conflict intensity makes mediators overall

[6] If you are keen on learning more of the details on the research design, I recommend you turn to Chapter 3 of the full dissertation.

more directive, and 2) high rather than low mediator profile gives rise to more settlement-oriented mediators. It is thus these two relationships that come out as most important for our understanding of mediator style. The plausibility of these general patterns is further strengthened by findings on possible causal pathways channeling the effects of context and characteristics on mediator style. These pathways are intricately interwoven with the study's individual analysis level, as they speak of the mediators' humanitarian concerns in high- and low-intensity contexts and her/his views and understandings of conflict among low- and high-profile mediators. In particular, I find that a mediator's concern for the humanitarian costs of continued conflict, rather than her/his concern for her/his own reputational costs as a mediator, increase in high intensity, crisis-like contexts, which consciously or subconsciously spurs mediators to apply a more directive mediator style. Likewise, for orientation, I find that the way in which mediators view and interpret how armed conflicts come about and should be resolved, impact their orientation. More precisely, a possible reason for why more high profile mediators are settlement-oriented comes of their realist perspectives on conflict as being caused by scarce resources, systems of anarchy and rational actors. Conversely, a possible reason for why more low profile mediators are relationship-oriented comes of their sociological views on conflict, which highlights social dynamics, underlying needs and group relationships.

A second conclusions of the more exploratory analyses is that we should also take into account contingent effects on mediator style arising between context and characteristics. The findings of the dissertation indicate that context in the form of conflict intensity has contingent effects on mediator style in relation to the two mediator characteristics of profile and personality. More precisely, the dissertation proposes that elements of personality condition the effects of conflict intensity on directiveness, and mediator profile conditions the same on orientation. High rather than low conflict intensity makes mediators with high not low Extraversion more directive; and high rather than low Agreeableness makes mediators more likely directive toward all and not just some parties; high-profile mediators already inclined to be settlement-oriented even more settlement-oriented, and low-profile mediators even more relationship-oriented. These findings

provide important rationales for expanding on current contingency models for mediation[7] to also look at contingencies related to the causes of mediator styles and the individual characteristics of the mediators. In other words, future contingency models on mediator style should not only theorize "what behaviors mediators use in different contexts" (Bercovitch 1996: 4), but also who the international mediators are and how their characteristics relate to the context in which they operate.

A third conclusion gives further credence to the importance of first understanding the causes of mediator style, in order to better evaluate the impact of the same. Previous research on the occurrence and impact of international mediation has shown that mediation happens in the "tough" cases where fighting is intense and conflict dynamics are complex. As a result of this, mediation may at first sight appear to be ineffective in contributing to the conflict's resolution, when rather and instead this may be due to the particularly challenging conditions facing the mediator (see Beardsley and Greig 2009; Beardsley 2010; Hellman 2012). As my dissertation shows that international mediators are more likely to be directive in contexts of high-intensity fighting, these patterns should be accounted for in future evaluations of the effects of individual-level directiveness. One way of doing this is to make sure to compare mediator styles of mediators in similarly intense conflict contexts.

A fourth, and final, conclusion is that the updated and refined theoretical framework introduced in my dissertation provides a useful starting point for exploring the dynamics of mediator styles in armed conflicts. At the same time, it both can and should be further elaborated on in light of other existing theoretical traditions. Currently, the framework is of so called mid-range nature, as it has been tailored to fit the reality of international mediators, particularly those working for peacemaking IGOs and NGOs. However, international mediation has been and can be studied from several theoretical perspectives using, for example, bargaining or social-psychological theories on mediation and armed

[7] The original contingency model of mediation builds on the work of Sawyer and Guetzkow (1965) and has in research on international mediation mainly been used to evaluate mediation's effect on outcomes (Druckman 1973; Bercovitch 1996; Druckman 1997), such as the initiation of mediation (Bercovitch and Jackson 2001), violence escalation (Fisher and Keashly 1991; Bercovitch and Langley 1993), cease fires and peace agreements (Ott 1972; Young 1972; Bercovitch and Jackson 2001), and party satisfaction (Fisher and Keashly 1988).

conflict—perspectives whose logics can be incorporated into the current framework toward a theory with broader and more parsimonious implications.

Finally, my dissertation also identifies three additional findings of relevance to international mediation, but outside the direct scope of my study. First, it finds evidence for how not only conflict intensity but also alternative contextual factors related to the "mediation environment" put constrains on variations in mediator style. In particular, the position of the international mediator and where in a team hierarchy she/he operates seems to dictate to what extent the mediator can be directive. Furthermore, the overall mandate of the mediating organization and mediation process sets the bounds for expressions of relationship- or settlement-oriented mediator styles. Second, the interview material also shows that how ready conflict parties are to make compromises and resolve their issues—in other words the degree of "ripeness" for resolution (see originator Zartman 2001)—may influence in what way mediators are directive in high intensity contexts. If the parties are not genuinely interested in resolving the conflict and therefore "deceive" and "manipulate" the mediator, mediators' directiveness can take the form of more forceful, military coercion or even the mediator's withdrawal. Alternatively, if the parties have an underlying interest in resolving the conflict but also suffer intense fears of making the necessary commitments, mediators' directiveness can come to leverage likely shared humanitarian concerns from high-intensity violence. One of the interviewees summarizes this latter sentiment stating that "If the parties are listening, you can play loud and they will follow, but if they're not listening and you play loud, they'll try to move away from the noise" (UN Official N4). Third, and finally, mediator style seems to change over time and with experience. More experienced mediators seem to perceive themselves as having become better at "controlling" themselves overall and adapting to the needs of the situation in particular. Some interviewees also talk about starting off their careers with an overall settlement-focus, prioritizing the technical issues and problem-solving aspects of mediation. A few even connect this eagerness for producing agreements to feelings of prestige. This settlement-focus appears, however, to loosen with experience, concurrently with an increased appreciation of the importance of relationship-building and networking between themselves and the parties.

Implications

I identify four academic and four practical implications in my dissertation, which together help direct our attention toward future scholarly explorations and hands on mediation initiatives.

Four Academic Implications

1) Testing the identified general relationships on alternative empirical samples

Our understanding of the relationships between conflict intensity and directiveness and mediator profile and orientation merit further testing on alternative samples and development with regard to explanatory pathways. To pursue this, future studies on conflict intensity could be designed to differentiate between potential conscious and subconscious psychological processes triggered by high-intensity crises. A possible approach would be to zoom in on alternative mechanisms of violent crisis and contrast effects of humanitarian costs, other material or political costs, overall time pressure and other pathways such as expectations to succeed. Similarly, for mediator profile, future research should look more closely into how international mediators view conflicts and related aspects, such as their feelings of accountability toward their organization, the parties or others. In particular, variations in views among mediators over time could help illuminate how these relate to mediator profile more precisely. Furthermore, conflict views mapping exercises could be coupled with both self-reports and behavioral measures of mediator style to get a better grasp of the relationship between conflict views and orientation.

2) Elaborating on the links between proposed independent variables, causal mechanisms and dependent variables

Taking a closer look at the way in which conflict intensity, mediator profile and personality impacts directiveness and orientation will help further clarify the identified and proposed causal pathways. Future research could help illuminate the general relationship between context, characteristics and mediator style by placing greater emphasis on the differentiation between independent variables and their related causal mechanisms.

3) Contrasting the refined theoretical framework against potential alternative explanations identified in the study

The studied factors of conflict intensity, profile and personality need to be contrasted to those of alternative explanations, such as the available resources of the international mediators. The additional findings of the study also suggest that we should take into account mediators' positions and mandates when explaining orientation, as well as the conflict parties' readiness for resolution when understanding directiveness.

4) Combining presented explanations for mediator styles with future studies on the effects of the same

The theoretical framework on mediator style proposed in my dissertation indicates that directiveness is overall endogenous to the intensities of the conflicts mediators engage in, whereas orientation, conversely, is overall exogenous to the same. Therefore, when setting out to compare, for example, the conflict resolution impact of different directive mediators, future research should theoretically and design-wise take into account that we are more likely to see directive mediator styles in high-intensity conflicts rather than low-intensity conflicts in the first place. In other words, if context and characteristics indeed matter for the mediator styles of international mediators, then they also deserve to be taken into account when evaluating the effects of different mediator styles in armed conflict contexts. Furthermore, as such evaluations on the impact of mediator style preferably should focus on the individual, future research also now has a unique opportunity to learn more about how individual mediators, in themselves and as teams, influence the progression and resolution of armed conflicts (see Beardsley 2011).

Four Practical Implications

1) Attending to the impact of conflict intensity on directiveness

As intensities rise, so will likely the mediator's directiveness, either consciously or subconsciously. Therefore, it may be important to reflect on what this may imply for the specific objectives of a mediation process. Nurturing a consciousness around these potential dynamics in high-intensity contexts may help avoid situations where mediators "get stuck" in a directive style strategically not beneficial for the progression of talks. It

may also be used as a welcome and necessary leverage if the immediate mediation objective is to "stop the bleeding". Certain individuals may also be more inclined to be directive overall or in high-intensity situations. For example, the study points to how high-level, high-profile mediators as well as high-level mediators without previous mediation experience may be particularly disposed to be directive. Attending to these potential inclinations when appointing lead mediators such as Special Representatives, Special Envoys and the like, thus becomes particularly important in high intensity contexts.

2) Learning more about the characteristics of potential mediator recruits

If orientation is indeed overall reflective of the international mediators' views and personality features, then those employing and appointing mediators may be interested in learning more about these characteristics. This may facilitate matching mediators to their formal or informal mandates as well as to their mediating colleagues. Understanding mediators' ways of interpreting conflict and their mediator roles could even be more informative than their mediator profiles and their political statue, which today seems to be increasingly important to IGOs and higher-level mediation appointments. That we should look closer into the views and values of international mediators becomes particularly relevant in light of the increasing movement of mediators across IGOs and NGOs, as well as across different peace process tracks (for example Track 1, Track 1 1/2, Track 2). This kind of migration of mediators across mediation environments may come to blur the lines between different profiles and past experiences. A possible result of that could be a greater relevance for the effects of these experiences embedded within international mediators—something which has also already been proposed within research on domestic mediation (Goldberg 2009).

3) Encouraging a greater self-awareness on mediator styles, context and characteristics among international mediators

If indeed high-intensity contexts encourage more directive mediator styles and particular characteristics promote certain orientations, learning more about these variations and inclinations would contribute to further professionalize international mediation. Both

stress and crisis management training, value and attitude mapping and other introspective exercises for increased self-awareness could benefit the mediators themselves. Such trainings may also serve to complement already existing programs on various technical elements or thematic issues of mediation. Increased self-awareness on mediator style could also potentially help mediators concretize their particular strengths and develop a vocabulary for categorizing their ways of mediating. A greater discussion on and awareness of mediator styles could also serve to help evaluate international mediation, albeit indirectly. While this evaluation would not study the mediator's impact, it would at least help map and evaluate the different mediators' ways of mediating. Systematic evaluation of international mediators remains a contested and sensitive issue (see Lanz et al. 2008: 9–10). Therefore, international mediators' self-evaluations on mediator style could constitute a complementary, and potentially less sensitive, instrument for quality control.

4) Acknowledging and supporting a broader variety of mediators and mediation team members beyond the high status formal lead mediators

The dissertation makes a case for broadening our common focus on the public and well-known high-level IGO and NGO mediators to include also their lesser-known colleagues engaged in mediation though not necessarily titled mediators. This is particularly relevant for the IGOs in this study, which are commonly more hierarchical than NGOs. Even though position and team functions may set the boundaries for how mediators can mediate, the study shows that the activity and process of mediating is equally relevant to many more individuals than those typically studied by academia, reported in the news or promoted within peacemaking organizations. It therefore seems to be high time to also acknowledge and support these less publicly known mediating individuals in their endeavors and developments. Although some training programs exist that target lower-level IGO and NGO officials, these could fruitfully be complemented with a more encouraging organizational culture that further helps all kinds of mediating staff to be better equipped to both support others mediating and to mediate themselves.

In conclusion, my dissertation, summarized in this report, presents a general framework for explaining variations in mediator style among individual, international

mediators, which suggests that high rather than low conflict intensity makes mediators overall more directive, and high rather than low mediator profile gives rise to more settlement-oriented mediation. Looking ahead, I am particularly excited about what new understandings and benefits we may draw from exploring both causes and effects of different mediator styles, building on mine and others' work on mediator style. I believe we can make great progress by investing in exploring mediators' awareness of and responsibility for how they relate and react to different contextual settings as well as their own expectations on conflict resolution in general and conflict parties and mediation goals in particular. In other words, the future progression of our understanding and mastering of peacemaking through mediation will do well in zooming in on the many mediators.

References

Azar, Edward E. (1990). The Management of Protracted Social Conflict: Theory and Cases. Hampshire | Brookfield | Dartmouth: Gower Publishing Company.

Baitar, Rachid, Ann Buysse, Ruben Brondeel, Jan De Mol, and Peter Rober (2013). "Styles and Goals: Clarifying the Professional Identity of Divorce Mediation". *Conflict Resolution Quarterly* 31(1): 57–78.

Beardsley, Kyle (2011). *The Mediation Dilemma*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Beardsley, Kyle C. (2010). "Pain, Pressure and Political Cover: Explaining Mediation Incidence". *Journal of Peace Research* 47(4): 395–406.

Beardsley, Kyle and J. Michael Greig (2009). "Disaggregating the Incentives of Conflict Management: An Introduction". *International Interactions* 35(3): 243–248.

Beardsley, Kyle, David M. Quinn, Bidisha Biswas, and Jonathan Wilkenfeld (2006). "Mediation Style and Crisis Outcomes". *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 50(1): 58–86.

Beber, Bernd (2012). "International Mediation, Selection Effects, and the Question of Bias". *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 29(4): 397–424.

Bercovitch, Jacob (1986). "International Mediation: A Study of Incidence, Strategies and Conditions of Successful Outcomes". *Cooperation and Conflict* 21(1): 155–168.

– (1996). Resolving International Conflicts: The Theory and Practice of Mediation. Boulder, CO | London, UK: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

– (2011). *Theory and Practice of International Mediation: Selected Essays*. London, UK | New York, NJ: Routledge.

Bercovitch, Jacob and Richard Jackson (2001). "Negotiation or Mediation? An Exploration of Factors Affecting the Choice of Conflict Management in International Conflict". *Negotiation Journal* 17(1): 59–77.

Bercovitch, Jacob and Jeffrey Langley (1993). "The Nature of the Dispute and the Effectiveness of International Mediation". *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 37(4): 670–691.

Böhmelt, Tobias (2010a). "The Effectiveness of Tracks of Diplomacy Strategies in Third-Party Interventions". *Journal of Peace Research* 47(2): 167– 178.

Burton, John W. and Dennis J. D. Sandole (1986). "Generic Theory: The Basis of Conflict Resolution". *Negotiation Journal* 2(4): 333–344.

Curran, Daniel, James K. Sebenius, and Michael Watkins (2004). "Two Paths to Peace: Contrasting George Mitchell in Northern Ireland with Richard Holbrooke in Bosnia-Herzegovina". *Negotiation Journal* 20(4): 513–537.

Druckman, Daniel (1973). Human Factors in International Negotiations: Social-Psychological Aspects of International Conflict. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

– (1997). "Dimensions of International Negotiations: Structures, Processes and Outcomes". *Group Decision and Negotiation* 6(5): 394–420.

Dunning, Thad (2010). "Design-Based Inference: Beyond the Pitfalls of Regression Analysis?" In: *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. Ed. by David Collier and Henry Brady. 2nd ed. Landham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield: 273–311.

Fisher, Ronald A. (1937). *The Design of Experiments*. 2nd ed. London, ENG | Edinburgh, SCT: Oliver and Boyd.

Fisher, Ronald J. and Loraleigh Keashly (1988). "Third Party Intervention in Intergroup Conflict: Consultation is Not Mediation". *Negotiation Journal* 4(4): 381–393.

– (1991). "The Potential Complementarity of Mediation and Consultation within a Contingency Model of Third Party Intervention". *Journal of Peace Research* 28(1): 29–42.

Gartner, Scott Sigmund (2012). "Civil War Peacemaking". In: *Peace and Conflict 2012*. Ed. by J. Joseph Hewitt, Jonathan Wilkenfeld, Ted Robert Gurr, and Birger Heldt: 71–84.

Goldberg, Rachel M. (2009). "How Our Worldviews Shape our Practice". *Conflict Resolution Quarterly* 26(4): 405–431.

Greig, J. Michael and Paul F. Diehl (2006). "Softening Up: Making Conflicts More Amenable to Diplomacy". *International Interactions* 32(4): 355–384.

Hellman, Johan (2012). "The Occurrence of Mediation: A Critical Evaluation of the Current Debate". International Studies Review 14(4): 591–603.

Herrberg, Antje with John Packer and Miguel Varela (2015). "The Evolution of the United Nations Standby Team of Mediation Experts in Context: Key Trends, Issues and Recommendations". *Peace My Way Report*.

Herrman, Margaret S., Nancy L. Hollett, Dawn Goettler Eaker, and Jerry Gale (2003). "Mediator Reflections on Practice: Connecting Select Demographics and Preferred Orientations". *Conflict Resolution Quarterly* 20(4): 403– 427.

Kolb, Deborah M. (1983). "Strategy and the Tactics of Mediation". *Human Relations* 36(3): 247–268.

Kressel, Kenneth, Cheryl Ann Kennedy, Elise Lev, and Louise Taylor (2002). "Managing Conflict in an Urban Health Care Setting: What Do 'Experts' Know?" *Journal of Health Care Law & Policy* 5(2): 364–446.

Kressel, Kenneth, Tiffany Henderson, Warren Reich, and Claudia Cohen (2012). "Multidimensional Analysis of Conflict Mediator Style". *Conflict Resolution Quarterly* 30(2): 135–171.

Kruk, Edward (1998). "Deconstructing Family Mediation Practice via the Simulated Client Technique: The Case of Unresolved Marital Attachment". *Mediation Quarterly* 15(4): 321–332.

Kvale, Steinar (2009). Interviews: Learning the Craft of Qualitative Research Interviewing. 2nd ed. Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.

Lamont, Michèle and Ann Swidler (2014). "Methodological Pluralism and the Possibilities and Limits of Interviewing". *Qualitative Sociology* 37(2): 153–171.

Lanz, David, Martin Wälisch, Lars Kirchhoff, and Mattias Siegfried (2008). *Evaluating Peace Mediation*. The Initiative for Peacebuilding, Swisspeace, Centre for Peace Mediation and Crisis Management Initiative.

Lim, Rodney and Peter J. D. Carnevale (1990). "Contingencies in the Mediation of Disputes". *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 58(2): 259–272.

Marlow, Lenard (1987). "Styles of Conducting Mediation". *Mediation Quarterly* 18(3): 85–90.

Martin, Harriet (2006). Kings of Peace, Pawns of War: The Untold Story of Peace-Making. London, UK | New York, NJ: Continuum.

Morgan, Stephen L. and Christopher Winship (2007). Counterfactuals and Causal Inference: Methods and Principles for Social Research. New York, NJ: Cambridge University Press.

Nathan, Laurie (1999). "'When Push Comes to Shove': The Failure of Inter- national Mediation in African Civil Wars". *Track Two* 8(2): 1–23.

Noce, Dorothy J. Della (2009). "Evaluative Mediation: In Search of Practice Competencies". *Conflict Resolution Quarterly* 27(2): 193–214.

Ott, Marvin C. (1972). "Mediation as a Method of Conflict Resolution: Two Cases". *International Organization* 26(4): 595–618.

Roberts, Marian (2005). "Family Mediation: The Development of the Regulatory Framework in the United Kingdom". *Conflict Resolution Quarterly* 22(4): 509–526.

Ruhe, Constantin (2015). "Diplomacy Against Escalating Violence: Disaggregating the Relationship Between Mediation and Conflict Intensity". PhD thesis. Konstanz, GE.

Sawyer, Jack and Harold Guetzkow (1965). "Bargaining and Negotiation in International Negotiation". In: *International Behavior: A Social-Psychological Analysis*. Ed. by Herbert C. Kelman. New York, NJ: Holt, Rinehart & Winston: 465–520.

Sisk, Timothy D. (2009). International Mediation in Civil Wars: Bargaining with Bullets. London, UK | New York, NJ: Routledge.

Svensson, Isak. (2014). International Mediation Bias and Peacemaking: Taking Sides in Civil Wars. London, UK | New York, NJ: Routledge.

Svensson, Isak and Peter Wallensteen (2010). *The Go-Between: Jan Eliasson and the Styles of Mediation*. Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace.

Tracy, Karen and Anna Spradlin (1994). "'Talking Like a Mediator': Conversational Moves of Experienced Divorce Mediators". In: *New Directions in Mediation: Communication Research and Perspectives*. Ed. by Joseph P. Folger and Tricia S. Jones. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications: 110– 134.

UN Official (N4). Official, UN DPA, New York, 30 October 2014 (face-to-face interview).

Wall, James A. and Suzanne Chan-Serafin (2009). "Processes in Civil Case Mediations". *Conflict Resolution Quarterly* 26(3): 261–291.

Wall, James A. and Timothy C. Dunne (2012). "Mediation Research: A Cur- rent Review". *Negotiation Journal* 28(2): 217–244.

Wall, James A., John B. Stark, and Rhetta L. Standifer (2001). "Mediation: A Current Review and Theory Development". *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 45(3): 370–391.

Wilkenfeld, Jonathan, Kathleen Young, Victor Asal, and David Quinn (2003). "Mediating International Crises: Cross-National and Experimental Perspec- tives". *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 47(3): 279–301.

Young, Oran R. (1972). "Intermediaries: Additional Thoughts on Third Parties". *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 16(1): 51–65.

Zartman, I. William (2001). "The Timing of Peace Initiatives: Hurting Stalemates and Ripe Moments". The Global Review of Ethnopolitics 1(1): 8–18.

Previous DDB-reports

2017:07 *Educating for Peace – A Theological Task in Contemporary Times* – Sara Gehlin

2017:06 *Increasing Access to Abortion – Perspectives on Provider Availability from Different Setting* – Susanne Sjöström

2017:05 *The Quest for Maternal Survival in Rwanda – Paradoxes in Policy and Practice*, Jessica Påfs

2017:04 *Effects of violent conflict on women and children. Sexual behaviour, fertility, and infant mortality in Rwanda and the Democratic Republic of Congo,* Elina Elveborg Lindskog

2017:03 *Moving upstream: gender norms and emerging sexual experiences in early adolescence*, Anna Kågesten

2017:02 *Strategy for supporting low-income countries in building a midwifery profession,* Malin Bogren

2017:01 *Exporting agrarian expertise: Development Aid at the Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences and its Predecessors, 1950-2009,* Karl Bruno

2016:10 *Beskattning och institutionell kvalitet*, Rasmus Broms

2016:09 *How does China challenge the IMF's power in Africa?* Johanna Malm

2016:08 *Anti-corruption reform – evolution or big bang?* Anders Sundell

2016:07 *Våldsamma hot och priset för ärlighet: En omvärdering av tjänstemäns val att ta mutor*, Aksel Sundström

2016:06 *Women in African Natural Resource Booms,* Anja Tolonen

2016:05 *Beyond the Buzzwords Approach to Gender in Humanitarian Aid*, Elisabeth Olivius

2016:04 *Child Education, Child Labor and the Agricultural Economy*, Elin Vimefall

2016:03 *Path dependent possibilities of transformation: Agricultural change and economic development in north and south Vietnam*, Montserrat López Jerez

2016:02 *The when and why of helping: Individual and organizational decision making from a psychological perspective*, Arvid Erlandsson

2016:01 *Going with the flow or swimming against the current? Interplay of formal rules, informal norms and NGO advocacy strategies*, Yumiko Yasuda

2015:07 *Aiding the End of Conflict? Reintegrating Ex-Combatants in Colombia*, Michael Jonsson

2015:06 *Causes of Communal Conflicts – Government Bias, Elites, and Conditions for Cooperation*, Johan Brosché

2015:05 *Stronger than Justice: Armed Group Impunity for Sexual Violence*, Angela Muvumba Sellström

2015:04 *Public participation in constitution building; an effective strategy for enhancing democracy?* Abrak Saati

2015:03 *Transformative Social Policy in Development? Demystifying Conditional Cash Transfers in Latin America*, Johan Sandberg

2015:02 Aiding *Science. An analysis of Swedish research aid policy 1973 – 2008*, Veronica Brodén Gyberg

2015:01 *Institutional impediments and reluctant actors – the limited role of democracy aid in democratic development*, Agnes Cornell