International Journal of Conflict Managementt
Vol. 15, No. 2, pp. 167–191

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PEACEKEEPERS AND NGO WORKERS: THE ROLE OF TRAINING AND CONFLICT MANAGEMENT STYLES IN INTERNATIONAL PEACEKEEPING

Lakshmi Ramarajan
University of Pennsylvania
Katerina Bezrukova
Rutgers University
Karen A. Jehn
Leiden University, The Netherlands
Martin Euwema
Utrecht University, The Netherlands
Nicolien Kop
Utrecht University, The Netherlands

To examine the effect of negotiation training and conflict management styles on the relations between third-party actors involved in international peacekeeping situations, we analyze data from a sample of Dutch military peacekeepers on missions between 1995 and 1999 (N = 850). We predict and find, contrary to the traditional "contact hypothesis" (Allport, 1954), that peacekeepers' contact with Non-Governmental Organization (NGO) workers was positively associated with conflict between them, and this increased if the peacekeeper possessed an avoiding conflict management style. When sufficiently trained in negotiations, peacekeepers who had intensive contact with NGO personnel and possessed a dominating conflict management style were less likely to become personally involved in conflicts with NGO workers. Implications for conflict management and training are discussed.

Keywords: Peace Studies, International Conflict, Communication and Conflict

International intervention in intra-state war has been a common feature of the international system in recent decades and continues to the present day (Caplan, 2002; Rupensinghe, 1995). During the last twenty-five years the United Nations alone has engaged in more than fifty peacekeeping and peace-enforcing operations, deploying close to one million soldiers from various countries to missions world-

wide. Currently, there are over 40,000 military personnel and civilian police serving in UN peacekeeping missions (United Nations Peacekeeping Operations, 2003a). In addition, other international institutions such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the Economic Union of West African States (ECOWAS), as well as individual states (for example, the UK and South Africa), have also sent military peacekeepers into situations of conflict. A typical aspect of international intervention in complex humanitarian emergencies (such as those in East Timor, Kosovo, and Bosnia) is the rapid mobilization of international Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) to scenes of conflict (Anderson, 1999; Evans-Kent & Bleiker, 2003). For example, at the height of the Bosnia crisis in 1993, the number of NGOs nearly doubled from 65 to 126, and of those, 91 were international (Weiss, 1999).

While research on international intervention has mainly focused on the impact of peacekeeping missions and NGOs on managing the local conflict (Baros, 2001; Evans-Kent & Bleiker, 2003), there has been a consistent concern both academically and practically with conflict *between* peacekeepers and NGO personnel that seems to inhibit the effectiveness of both. The purpose of this study is to examine the nature of the interaction between peacekeepers (members of a military force intervening to maintain a ceasefire in a conflict situation) and NGO workers (employees of international and/or national non-governmental organizations working in a conflict situation) and the management of conflict between them.

Conflict between peacekeepers and NGO workers has been attributed to three major causes in the literature on international peacekeeping. First, problems between peacekeepers and NGO personnel are attributed to differences in organizational goals, missions, and mandates (Aall, 2000; Report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations, 2000). The two actors are organized for different purposes: peacekeeping missions are designed to stop violence while NGOs are designed to build relationships (Last, 2000). Therefore, military peacekeeping objectives may dictate withholding assistance to persuade local parties to cooperate, while for many NGOs in humanitarian situations, their *raison d'être* is to give to those most in need; this also drives NGOs ability to gain donations and grants. Thus, NGOs may provide succor and assistance to local warring parties, and in doing so restrict the peacekeepers' leverage (Flint, 2001). Second, it has been suggested that organizational culture differences between military and civilian organizations, such as the need for hierarchy and order in the military, and the need for consensus building among NGOs, may contribute to conflict between the two parties (Aall, 2000; Duffey, 2000; Slim, 1996).

Finally, there is direct competition over resources, legitimacy, and claims to glory. The classical conception of peacekeeping often invokes the image of a military force intervening between two conflicting parties who have agreed to a ceasefire (Leeds, 2001). Today however, peacekeeping missions also undertake a variety of public tasks, such as civil administration, policing, monitoring, and human rights enforcement (Leeds, 2001). Likewise, NGOs are expanding from their traditional domains of purely relief-oriented missions to more state-building and society-building endeavors (Calliess & Merkel, 1995; Natsios, 1997; Rieff, 2002). As traditional organizational boundaries have become blurred, peacekeepers and NGO

workers have seen their responsibilities and goals increasingly impinge on each other, thus furthering the competition between the parties.

The international peacekeeping literature has also prescribed ways in which the conflicts between peacekeeping missions and NGOs can be managed. One obvious answer involves greater coordination, but this has proven difficult given the organizational and political interests involved (Aall, 2000; Aall, Miltenberg, & Weiss, 2000; Last, 1999, 2000). While coordination remains elusive, another proposed solution lies in careful conflict management by individual peacekeepers and NGO workers. Successful peacekeeping may depend on the character and experience of individuals on the ground as well as the ability of the international community (meaning governments and NGOs) to support those who can operate in a complex, often violent, environment (Aall, 2000; Aall et al., 2000).

In this study we address three questions about the individual peacekeeper's ability to manage conflict with NGO workers. First, can peacekeepers and NGO workers cooperate on an individual level? Second, to what extent does a peacekeeper's conflict management style play a role in the peacekeeper's management of conflict with NGO workers? Finally, to what extent does training in negotiation skills support a peacekeeper's ability to manage conflict with NGO workers? Given that peacekeeping tasks include inter-organizational communication and negotiations (Tripodi, 2001), mediation (Leeds, 2001), and facilitation (Wall & Druckman, 2002) we look at training in negotiations as a form of organization-sponsored support for peacekeepers' conflict management tasks. In the next section we draw upon organizational and social-psychological literature concerning intergroup conflict, conflict management styles, and training in negotiation to help answer these questions.

Intergroup Contact and Conflict

As peacekeepers and NGO personnel share the same humanitarian space they constantly come into contact with one another (Slim, 2001). Traditional "contact hypothesis" theory (Allport, 1954) suggests that contact between members of different groups may lead to positive sentiment and reduce intergroup hostility and conflict. The increased contact, and assumed cohesion, is proposed to increase cooperation (Brewer & Miller, 1984) and information exchange between members of various (often competing) groups (Ancona & Caldwell, 1992; Pettigrew, 1998). However, we suggest the opposite (that contact will increase conflict) based on a more recent view of the theory that delineates specifications regarding the contact—that is, the contact must be specifically structured to reduce hostility and increase positive attitudes across group lines (Brewer & Miller, 1984; Brewer, Weber, & Carini, 1995; Dovidio, Gaertner, & Kawakami, 2003; Hewstone & Brown, 1986). Such a structure would include a similarity of status across groups and similar goals set for the two groups (Brown & Lopez, 2001; Dovidio et al., 2003; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2000). However, in peacekeeping situations there is a distinct lack of coordination structures, different views of the status of each group (i.e., each sees himself/herself as higher status in some regards), and differences in goals between the two types of organizations (military and non-governmental)

(Duffey, 2000; Flint, 2001; Last, 2000). Therefore, we propose, in general, that intergroup contact will increase rather than decrease conflict in this situation.

More specifically, in situations of conflict intervention where peacekeepers and NGO workers have almost daily contact (Slim, 2001), the contact creates opportunities for social comparison and social categorization (Bartel, 2001; Brewer, 1996; Callister & Wall, 2001; LaBianca, Brass, & Gray, 1998). Since social comparison typically occurs on the basis of *salient* and *relevant* social categories (Hogg & Terry, 2000), we argue that peacekeepers' and NGO workers' organizational identities form the basis for social categorization in the post-war inter-organizational context. Peacekeepers' and NGO workers' organizational identities are made *salient* by the visibility of each individual's affiliation. For example, peacekeepers wear uniforms and identifying clothing such as the ubiquitous "blue helmets." In many arenas of war, their possession of weapons also makes them distinctive. For NGO workers, white vans or SUV's with their organizational acronyms provide public symbols of organizational affiliation. In such situations of public roles and affiliations, Dutton, Dukerich, and Harquail (1994) argue that employees' organizational identities are strengthened. Peacekeepers' and NGO workers' organizational identities are also highly *relevant* to them as individuals. Both military and non-governmental organizations have strong organizational cultures (Duffey, 2000; Slim, 1996) which increase the degree of internalization of organizational norms, values, and beliefs about the distinctiveness of one's work (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; O'Reilly & Chatman, 1996) and hence stress the relevance of an organizationally situated identity (Ashforth & Mael, 1989). Thus, as peacekeepers come into contact with NGO workers, the salience and relevance of their organizational identities may increase the likelihood of engaging in social categorization and comparison.

Once social categorization and comparison occur on the basis of organizational affiliation and distinct identities, it affects intergroup behavior such that it increases in-group cooperativeness and cohesiveness as well as out-group competition and derogation (Abrams & Hogg, 1990; Brewer, 1979; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). As a result, we expect there to be competition, hostility, and tension between peacekeepers and NGO workers, which can escalate into overt conflict (Hogg, Turner, & Davidson, 1990; Schminke, Cropanzano, & Rupp, 2002). Therefore, we propose that:

Hypothesis 1: The greater the degree of contact a peacekeeper experiences with NGO workers, the more likely it is that a peacekeeper will experience conflict with NGO workers.

Conflict Management Styles and Intergroup Contact and Conflict

Although researchers have shown that intergroup contact often precipitates social categorization (Fiske & Taylor, 1991; Williams, 2001), there are also a number of individual-level factors that can ameliorate or exacerbate the effects of contact and social categorization processes on conflict. Specifically in the realm of peacekeeping, researchers have discussed self-awareness and cultural sensitivity (Leeds, 2001), and communication and negotiation skills (Last & Eyre, 1995; Tripodi, 2001) as some of the individual factors required for successful interpersonal

interactions while at work. In this study, we extend past research on peacekeeping and examine how peacekeepers' conflict management styles can influence the relationship between peacekeeper/NGO worker contact and conflict experiences.

We examine an individual's conflict management style based on the dual-concern model (Blake & Mouton, 1964; Rahim & Bonoma, 1979) that describes a conflict participant's typical approach to conflict management. The five conflict management styles are forcing/dominating, accommodating, integrating, avoiding, and compromising (Dallinger & Hample, 1995; De Dreu, Evers, Beersma, Kluwer, & Nauta, 2001; Rahim, 1983, 2001). Integrating, accommodating, and compromising styles all derive from a high concern for others or a pro-social orientation (Blake & Mouton, 1964; De Dreu, Weingart, & Kwon, 2000; Pruitt & Rubin, 1986; Rahim & Bonoma, 1979). A pro-social orientation in conflict management style can reduce conflict related to intergroup contact in two ways. First, a pro-social orientation towards others results in a greater exchange of information that builds greater trust and confidence (Lewicki & Stevenson, 1997; Murnighan, Malhotra, & Weber, 2004; Weingart, Bennet, & Brett, 1993). Beersma and De Dreu (1999) specifically show that higher levels of trust exist between pro-socially-oriented groups than individualistically-oriented groups. Increased trust causes individuals to be more certain regarding their positive expectations about another's behavior (Lewicki, McAllister, & Bies, 1998). This trust-based certainty decreases reliance on social categorization processes which are often used as uncertainty reduction tools (Hogg & Terry, 2000), thus decreasing the likelihood of negative biasing and conflict experiences.

Second, pro-social or cooperative orientations also induce positive emotions in others (Barsade, Ward, Turner, & Sonnenfeld, 2000). Positive emotions can result in greater cognitive openness (Isen & Baron, 1991), which also reduces cognitive biasing factors that occur during interpersonal contact such as stereotyping (Hogg & Terry, 2000). Thus, we predict that pro-social conflict management behavior during peacekeeper/NGO contact will result in less conflict between peacekeepers and NGO workers. That is, a pro-social conflict management style decreases the likelihood of contact leading to conflict. Specifically:

Hypothesis 2a: The peacekeeper's conflict management style moderates the relationship between peacekeeper/NGO contact and conflict such that when peacekeepers have a pro-social conflict management style (integrating, accommodating or compromising), the positive relationship between contact with NGO workers and conflict will decrease.

Conflict management styles can also have negative effects in conflict situations. Dominating and avoiding conflict management styles stem from self-concern, or an egoistic orientation (Blake & Mouton, 1964; De Dreu et al., 2000; Rahim & Bonoma, 1979). Individual, egoistic, or self-orientations result in greater fixed-pie perceptions and other cognitive biases (Harinck, De Dreu, & Van Vianen, 2000) that may lead to exchange of less information and lower levels of trust (Beersma & De Dreu, 1999; Weingart et al., 1993). Lower levels of trust intensify the social categorization processes that often lead to conflict. According to Lewicki

et al. (1998), low trust can result in paranoia and perception of threat. This perception of threat can cause less cognitive flexibility and stimulate extreme and negative responses (Staw, Sanderlands, & Dutton, 1981), resulting in greater social categorization and stereotyping. The intensified social categorization processes exacerbate problems between peacekeepers and NGO workers in contact with one another. Additionally, converse to pro-social behavior, egoistically-oriented behaviors are associated with negative affect (Watson, Clark, McIntyre, & Hamaker, 1992) which is more easily transmitted (Bartel & Saavedra, 2000; Kelly & Barsade, 2001) and escalated (Schminke et al., 2002) than positive affect. Therefore, we would expect that egoistically-oriented peacekeepers would experience more interpersonal conflict with NGO workers as contact increases. Thus, we propose:

Hypothesis 2b: The peacekeeper's conflict management style moderates the relationship between peacekeeper/NGO contact and conflict such that when peacekeepers have an egoistic conflict management style (dominating or avoiding), the positive relationship between contact with NGO workers and conflict will further increase.

The Influence of Negotiations Training

Peacekeeping missions and military institutions regularly offer training in skills that can support peacekeepers' tasks (United Nations Peacekeeping Operations, 2003b), including training in conflict management (Last, 2000). We believe that through training, peacekeepers can acquire skills that can influence their ability to manage conflict and therefore, impact the peacekeeper/NGO worker contact and conflict experiences. Therefore, we investigate the role of organization-sponsored negotiations training in combination with peacekeepers' individual conflict management styles. Specifically, we consider the impact of training in negotiation on egoistically-oriented peacekeepers' conflict management style and the resulting impact of styles *and* training on peacekeepers' abilities to manage conflict when in contact with NGO workers.

We define training in negotiation as a set of educational activities that aims to improve individuals' skills in communicating with others, provide knowledge of negotiation tactics, and assist in individuals' acquisition and maintenance of negotiation skills (Fetherston, 1994; Stevens, Bavetta, & Gist, 1993; Wall & Druckman, 2002). Training in negotiation may assist egoistically-oriented peacekeepers to minimize overt conflict by changing their behavioral repertoire in several ways. First, training in negotiation can expand the peacekeepers' self-orientations to include cooperative orientations through simple instructions, directions, or knowledge-provision. For example, Beersma and De Dreu (1999) and Weingart, Bennett, and Brett (1993) show that cooperation can be induced through simple instructions. Carnevale and Probst (1998) show that directions can induce cooperative mental frames, which affect the individual's choice of negotiation strategy. Because training is designed to expand the tactical or skill-based knowledge (De Dreu et al., 2000; Ford & Quinones, 1992; Stevens et al., 1993), peacekeepers may acquire either of these prescriptive educational techniques during training in negotiation.

Second, training in negotiations can provide individuals with an improved sense of control over their interactions (Babcock & Laschever, 2003; Stevens et al., 1993), resulting in greater self-efficacy beliefs or confidence in one's ability to perform certain tasks (Stevens et al., 1993). Improved self-efficacy increases an individual's belief in their ability to acquire and use new skills (Stevens et al., 1993). In our domain, this could imply that peacekeepers that respond to negotiations training could have improved self-efficacy, and therefore greater confidence in their ability to utilize new negotiation skills rather than depending on their usual style. Therefore, an egoistically-oriented peacekeeper with negotiations training might have a higher propensity to employ cooperative strategies, as well, to manage conflict rather than relying only on their egoistic style. The change in egoistically-oriented peacekeepers' conflict management styles would result in a lower impact of social categorization mechanisms such as stereotyping (Hogg & Terry, 2000) and hence decrease the impact of peacekeeper/NGO worker contact on conflict.

Finally, the improved sense of control resulting from negotiations training could also reduce egoistic peacekeepers' reliance on negative responses that arise in the face of uncertainty (Staw et al., 1981). This would also result in a lower impact of negative cognitive mechanisms such as stereotyping (Hogg & Terry, 2000), which inflame the effects of intergroup contact on conflict. In sum, we propose that peacekeepers with an egoistic conflict management style, if they participate sufficiently in negotiations training, will be less likely to experience conflict with NGO workers with whom they are in contact. Specifically, we hypothesize:

Hypothesis 3: A three-way interaction between peacekeepers' contact with NGO workers, conflict management styles, and negotiations training is expected, such that peacekeepers with an egoistic conflict management style (dominating or avoiding) and who have intensive contact with NGO workers are less likely to experience conflict with NGO workers when they are sufficiently trained in negotiation compared to when they are not.

Method

Sample

Our data come from a sample of Dutch military peacekeepers on missions between 1995 and 1999 (N = 850). The Dutch army participates in many peacekeeping missions, and peacekeeping is a core part of their mission statement. Also, training and personnel issues related to these missions have high priority. Therefore, the Dutch Ministry of Defense assigned the Clingendael Institute for International Relations to investigate the peacekeepers' interaction problems during missions and their satisfaction with training. The questionnaire used for this evaluation was developed in close cooperation with military staff and sent to the home address of 1703 Dutch military peacekeepers, with a free return envelope. Anonymity was guaranteed and assured by having a separate institute (university researchers) process and analyze the data at an aggregate level. Permission for

publication was obtained from the Clingendael Institute and the relevant Dutch authorities.

The sample included all Dutch military peacekeepers sent out on missions in the period of 1995–1999. The response rate was 52% resulting in a final sample of 850 peacekeepers. The response rate of 52% is considered quite adequate in survey research where the return rate of mail-in questionnaires is often 20–25% (Roth & BeVier, 1998). The officers' age ranged from 23 to 58 years with a mean age of 41 years and 97.3% were male. Military rank ranged from Sergeant to General, but the majority of respondents were Captains (25%) and Majors (20%) . Years of military service ranged from two years to 39 years with a mean of 20 years. Fifty-five percent of officers served in land-forces, 3% served in naval-forces, 4% were in air-forces, and the remaining 38% served in military police.

Measures

Contact with NGOs. Contact between peacekeepers and NGO workers was measured by asking respondents "What parties did you have contact with? Please indicate the frequency of these contacts and the importance of these contacts for your job." One of the choices of parties listed under this question was "Contact with NGOs (for example The Red Cross)." Frequency of Contact was measured on a five-point Likert scale (1 = hardly ever to 5 = daily). Importance of contact between peacekeepers and NGOs was also measured on a five-point Likert scale (1 = irrelevant to 5 = very important). We averaged the peacekeepers' responses about the frequency and importance of their contact with NGOs to create a measure of contact.

Conflict with NGO Workers. Conflict with NGO workers was measured quantitatively and operationalized on the survey with a set of items regarding "Problems you were confronted with." A list of parties was provided which included NGOs and respondents were asked to respond based on three aspects of the conflict: frequency, seriousness, and personal involvement. Three survey items on a five-point Likert scale were available: "How frequently did you face problems between the different parties?" (1 = hardly ever to 5 = daily), "How serious were these problems?" (1 = not at all serious to 5 = very serious), and "Have you been personally involved in these problems?" (1 = not at all to 5 = heavily involved).

Conflict Management Styles. Conflict management styles were measured using the revised and updated version of the Dutch Test for Conflict Handling (DUTCH) (De Dreu et al., 2001). There were twenty items responding to the question, "How did you *in general* manage personal frictions and differences of opinion or interest with others during your latest mission" on a five-point Likert scale (1 = never to 5 = always). Examples of conflict management styles included statements such as "I examined issues until I found a solution that really satisfied me and the other party;" "I pushed my own point of view;" "I searched for gains." We performed a confirmatory factor analysis and obtained a five-factor solution based on a scree test and eigenvalues above 1.0 similar to other research using this scale (De Dreu et al., 2001). The first component included four items that reflected the integrating conflict management style (e.g., I examined issues until I found a solution that satisfied me and the other party), Cronbach's α = .75. The second component

included four items that reflected the dominating conflict-management style (e.g., I did everything to win), Cronbach's α = .74. The third component included four items that reflected the avoiding conflict-management style (e.g., I avoided difference in opinion), Cronbach's α = .73. The accommodating style (e.g., I gave in to the other's wishes) was reflected in the fourth component by four items from the survey, Cronbach's α = .65. The fifth component included four items that reflected the compromising conflict-management style (e.g., I insisted we both give in a little), Cronbach's α = .76.

Conflict Management Training in Negotiations. Respondents participated in training either at the Clingendael Institute, the Center for Peace Operations/School for Peace Missions at the Royal Netherlands Army Base (CVV/SVV), or at other locations. During this training respondents learned to reflect on their own preferred style of conflict management, observe the effects of their behavior in different conflict situations, and select the most adequate style in different situations. Training in negotiations also included skills such as making contact and establishing a working relationship, analyzing the problems and situation, exploring needs and interests, and discussing possible integrative solutions, including specific tactics, such as working with an interpreter in mediations and dealing with power games. While there was variation in the level and perception of training, this was not correlated with the institute where the training was held. In addition, there was no direct measure of the exact amount (e.g., days, hours) of training received. Therefore, we measured the extent of conflict management training using a composite of two questionnaire items: The first item asked "Looking back at the training for your latest mission, how important do you find knowledge and skills in the following subjects (negotiation)?" Responses were on a ten-point Likert scale (1 = irrelevant to 10 = very important). The second item asked "Was this training sufficient?" Responses were on a ten-point Likert scale (1 = no, not enough to 10 = yes, excellent). The composite was formed by multiplying the peacekeeper's responses on these two items to arrive at our measure of training. A multiplier was considered the most appropriate measure since the two survey items are not measuring the same aspects of training but instead represent two dimensions of peacekeepers' perceptions of training that could interactively affect the impact of training on peacekeepers' conflict management styles.[1]

Controls. We included years of military service as a control variable because it reflects competence and expertise that may affect peacekeepers' perception of their conflicts with NGO workers.

Results

Correlations

Table 1 provides the means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations between variables. The correlation between contact and conflict with NGOs was significant and positive. We further examine the relationships among contact, conflict, conflict management styles, and training using hierarchical regression analyses presented below.

[1]An aggregated measure of training using these items yielded the same results.

Hypotheses Testing. We conducted hierarchical regression analyses[2] to test the main effects of contact on conflict with NGO personnel (Hypothesis 1) and the moderating effects of conflict management style on that relationship (Hypothesis 2a & Hypothesis 2b). Step 1 of the hierarchical regressions included a control variable (years of military service) and four of the five conflict management styles to show the effect of each conflict management style above and beyond the others. Step 2 included the main effect of the contact variable and the relevant conflict management style. Step 3 included interactions (e.g., contact x avoiding and contact x dominating when testing Hypothesis 2b).

Hypothesis 1, predicting that the greater the degree of contact peacekeepers have with NGO personnel, the greater the experience of conflict, was supported. As shown in Table 2a, 2b and 2c, the relationships between contact and conflict frequency, conflict seriousness, and personal involvement in the conflict are significant and positive ($\beta = .31$, $p < .001$, $\beta = .35$, $p < .001$, and $\beta = .48$, $p < .001$, respecttively).

Hypothesis 2a, which predicted that peacekeepers with high levels of contact will experience less conflict when they have pro-social conflict management styles (integrating, compromising, or accommodating), was not supported. Hypothesis 2b, which predicted that peacekeepers with high levels of contact would experience more conflict when they possess egoistic conflict management styles (avoiding or dominating), was supported for the avoiding style. As shown in Table 2a, an avoiding conflict management style moderated the effect of contact on frequency of problems with NGO personnel ($\beta = .30$, $p < .05$). That is, peacekeepers with high levels of contact with NGO personnel are likely to experience more conflict with NGO workers when they possess an avoiding conflict management style.

Further, we conducted a hierarchical regression analysis to test a more complex relationship between peacekeeper/NGO worker contact, egoistic conflict management styles, training in negotiation, and conflict outcomes (Hypothesis 3). Step 1 of the hierarchical regressions included control variables: years of military service and four of the five conflict management styles. Step 2 included the main effect of the contact variable, the fifth conflict management style, and the training variable. Step 3 included all the two-way interactions (e.g., contact x training; contact x conflict management style and training x conflict management style).

[2]We gave full consideration to whether our observations are independent and specifically, whether any hierarchical levels are present in our data. For example, we assessed if peacekeepers worked in groups/troops at the time of data collection and thus, if some hierarchical ordering existed in our data. Because peacekeepers were assigned to the missions and placed in their respective troops after the training, we ruled out such possibility for the hierarchical structure of our data. We realize that the "training site" (as a context or environment) may constitute a higher-order level (Hofmann, 1997) in our data that may create a potential for the responses to be somewhat correlated and failure to account for variation (Nezlek, 2001) due to the fact that participants maybe nested within these training options. However, given the fact that HLM is very sensitive to the power issues (the minimum number of options should be 30 (Hofmann, Griffin, & Gavin, 2000) and inevitable constraints of our dataset (only 4 training site options), we preferred to employ more traditional hierarchical regression analyses.

Table 1
Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations Among Variables

Correlations	*Mean*	*SD*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Years of military service	20.30	9.01										
2. Contact	2.33	1.21	.13**									
3. Training: Negotiation	44.78	27.99	.13**	.21**								
4. Integrating	3.77	.62	.07	.04	.01							
5. Compromising	3.34	.66	.07*	.09*	.07	.48**						
6. Dominating	2.66	.73	-.11**	.05	.02	.01	.04					
7. Avoiding	2.45	.82	.15**	.07	-.02	-.06	.24**	.11**				
8. Accommodating	2.82	.47	-.01	.02	-.03	.10**	.20**	.07	.29**			
9. Frequency of problems	1.52	.88	.08*	.31**	.07	.05	.06	.09*	-.01	.02		
10. Seriousness of problems	1.68	.93	.09*	.35**	.11*	.03	.02	.08*	-.05	.00	.73**	
11. Personal involvement in problems	1.94	1.22	.09*	.48**	.16**	.04	.01	.14**	-.04	-.04	.58**	.69**

Note: $N = 850$
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. (two-tailed)

Table 2a
Hierarchical Regressions Predicting Contact on Conflict (Frequency) Moderated by Conflict Management Styles

	Frequency				
Step 1: Controls					
Years of military service	.10	.10**	.09*	.09*	.1**
Integrating (A)		.04	.02	.04	.03
Compromising (B)	.05		.04	.02	.04
Dominating (C)	.11**	.11**		.11**	.11**
Avoiding (D)	−.06	−.04	−.04		−.04
Accommodating (E)	.02	.02	.02	.01	
R^2	.02	.02	.01	.02	.02
Adjusted R^2	.02	.02	.00	.01	.02
F	3.29**	3.23**	1.61	3.07**	3.29**
Step 2: Main Effects					
Contact (F)	.31***	.31***	.31***	.31***	.31***
Integrating	.01				
Compromising		.02			
Dominating			.08*		
Avoiding				−.06	
Accommodating					.03
ΔR^2	.09	.09	.10	.09	.09
ΔF	36.99***	37.15***	41.57***	37.59***	36.98***
R^2	.11	.11	.11	.11	.11
Adjusted R^2	.11	.11	.11	.11	.11
F	13.15***	13.15***	13.15***	13.15***	13.15***
Step 3: Interactions					
F x A	−.12				
F x B		.19			
F x C			.19		
F x D				.30*	
F x E					.01
ΔR^2	.00	.00	.00	.01	.00
ΔF	.26	.85	1.45	5.17*	.00
R^2	.12	.34	.12	.12	.11
Adjusted R^2	.11	.12	.11	.11	.10
F	11.53***	11.61***	11.70***	12.22***	11.49***

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

Table 2b
Hierarchical Regressions Predicting Contact on Conflict (Seriousness) Moderated by Conflict Management Styles

	Seriousness				
Step 1: Controls					
Years of military service	.12**	.12**	.11**	.11**	.12**
Integrating (A)		.02	.01	.04	.02
Compromising (B)	.02		.01	−.02	.01
Dominating (C)	.10*	.10+		.09*	.10*
Avoiding (D)	−.10*	−.09*	−.08+		−.09*
Accommodating (E)	.02	.02	.02	−.01	
R^2	.03	.03	.02	.02	.03
Adjusted R^2	.02	.02	.01	.01	.02
F	3.31**	3.32**	2.01+	2.42*	3.30**
Step 2: Main Effects					
Contact (F)	.35***	.35***	.35***	.35***	.35***
Integrating	.00				
Compromising		−.00			
Dominating			.07+		
Avoiding				−.10*	
Accommodating					.03
ΔR^2	.12	.12	.13	.12	.12
ΔF	43.26***	43.24***	46.67***	45.73***	43.3***
R^2	.14	.14	.14	.14	.14
Adjusted R^2	.13	.13	.13	.13	.13
F	15.04***	15.04***	15.04***	15.04***	15.04***
Step 3: Interactions					
F x A	−.15				
F x B		−.26			
F x C			−.02		
F x D				.07	
F x E					−.01
ΔR^2	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
ΔF	.36	1.52	.02	.26	.00
R^2	.14	.15	.14	.14	.14
Adjusted R^2	.13	.13	.13	.13	.13
F	13.19***	13.36***	13.14***	13.18***	13.14***

+$p < .10$. *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

Table 2c
Hierarchical Regressions Predicting Contact on Conflict (Personal Involvement) Moderated by Conflict Management Styles

	Personal Involvement				
Step 1: Controls					
Years of military service	.12**	.12**	.10*	.11	.12**
Integrating (A)		.03	.04	.06	.04
Compromising (B)	.00		−.02	−.04	−.02
Dominating (C)	.16***	.16***		.15***	.16***
Avoiding (D)	−.06	−.05	−.03		−.06
Accommodating (E)	−.04	−.04	−.04	−.05	
R^2	.04	.04	.01	.04	.04
Adjusted R^2	.03	.03	.01	.03	.03
F	4.79***	4.94***	1.69	4.73***	4.79
Step 2: Main Effects					
Contact (F)	.48***	.48***	.48***	.48***	.48***
Integrating	.03				
Compromising		−.03			
Dominating			.12***		
Avoiding				−.07+	
Accommodating					−.02
ΔR^2	.23	.23	.25	.23	.23
ΔF	97.41***	96.95***	107.36***	97.60***	97.41***
R^2	.26	.26	.26	.26	.26
Adjusted R^2	.25	.25	.25	.25	.25
F	32.29***	32.29***	32.29***	32.29***	32.29***
Step 3: Interactions					
F x A	.05				
F x B		−.06			
F x C			.26		
F x D				.07	
F x E					−.25
ΔR^2	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
ΔF	.06	.08	2.68	.25	1.27
R^2	.26	.26	.27	.26	.26
Adjusted R^2	.25	.25	.26	.25	.26
F	28.22***	28.22***	28.66***	28.25***	28.42***

$^{+}p < .10$. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Step 4 included a three-way interaction between contact, training, and the specific conflict management style. Hypothesis 3, predicting a three-way interaction between peacekeeper/NGO worker contact, conflict management styles, and train-

ing in negotiation was supported for the dominating conflict management style. When trained in negotiations, peacekeepers who possess a dominating style and have intensive contact with the NGO personnel are less likely to become personally involved in conflict interactions with NGO workers ($b = -1.09$, $p < .05$) and are less likely to perceive their problems as serious ($b = -.81$, $p < .10$)[3].

Discussion

Discussion of the results

Our findings show that contact between peacekeepers and NGO workers often results in conflict. While this is contrary to what one would expect given traditional contact hypothesis theory (Allport, 1954), it is as we expect based on more recent specifications and adjustments to contact theory (e.g., Brewer et al., 1995; Dovidio et al., 2003). For instance, the increased cooperation and information exchange expected between continually interacting members of various groups (Ancona & Caldwell, 1992; Deutsch, 1973) does not occur without the existence of a structure specifically designed to reduce hostility and increase positive attitudes (e.g., common stated goals, coordination structures, status-equalizing mechanisms; Brown & Lopez, 2001; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2000). Our results demonstrate that increased interpersonal contact is not successful in reducing conflict in this inter-organizational context, which exhibits a distinct lack of coordination structures, common goals, and status equalizers. In fact, in interviews conducted with peacekeepers, several of them specifically discussed the lack of coordination as promoting problems between peacekeepers and NGO personnel.

> "The NATO Stabilization Force (SFOR) is responsible for safety in an area. Therefore, they give a weekly or daily briefing. NGOs do not come to this briefing, nor do they inform SFOR they are traveling in the area. When problems do occur, or they are taken hostage, they expect SFOR to assist and help them."

> "NGOs often start up activities that are totally uncoordinated with others, and they do not finish projects. At the same time, peacekeepers see their role more as coordinating and offering a platform to meet the needs of the local population and in conjunction with NGO efforts. For example, one school needed to be completely repaired and was working with Civil Military Cooperation (CIMIC) units to do this. An NGO offered to repair and repaint the walls. However, this NGO does not repair roofs. Two months later, the roof was finished by another organization but the walls the NGO repaired were ruined again."

[3]We note that there might be a possibility of capitalizing on chance. Therefore, we employ Fisher's "protected *t*" test that was adapted for use in multiple regression analysis (Cohen & Cohen, 1983). Using sets of IVs entered in each step as the primary units of analysis, *only* those IVs were *t*-tested for significance whose sets have given rise to significant *F* change (see Tables 2a, 2b, and 3). We have performed this procedure on all our significant effects and found confirmation.

Table 3
Hierarchical Regressions Predicting Contact on Conflict Moderated by Egoistic Conflict Management Styles and Training in Negotiation

	Frequency		Seriousness		Personal Involvement	
Step 1: Controls						
Years of mlitary service	.09*	.10*	.11*	.10*	.09*	.11*
Integrating (A)	.02	.03	.00	.03	.05	.06
Compromising (B)	.04	.02	.01	–.02	–.00	–.02
Dominating (C)		.09*		.09*		.16***
Avoiding (D)	–.05		–.09^{+}		–.03	
Accommodating (E)	.05	.04	.07	.04	–.02	–.03
R^2	.02	.02	.02	.02	.01	.04
Adjusted R^2	.01	.01	.01	.01	.00	.03
F	1.85	2.62*	2.01^{+}	2.2^{+}	1.27	3.99***
Step 2: Main Effects						
Contact (F)	.32***	.32***	.33***	.32***	.47***	.47***
Training (G)	–.02	–.02	.03	.03	.07^{+}	.07^{+}
Dominating	.07^{+}		.07^{+}		.12**	
Avoiding		–.07		–.11*		–.06
ΔR^2	.10	.10	.12	.12	.26	.23
ΔF	23.46***	22.05***	24.79***	24.44***	62.80***	56.91***
R^2	.12	.12	.14	.14	.27	.27
Adjusted R^2	.11	.11	.13	.13	.26	.26
F	1.08***	1.08***	1.72***	1.72***	24.62***	24.62***
Step 3: 2–Way Interactions						
F x A	.1		–.02		.29^{+}	
F x D		.46**		.18		.13
F x G	–.05	–.03	.21^{+}	.24^{+}	.07	.08
G x C	.02		–.07		–.22	
G x D		–.29*		–.3*		–.21^{+}
ΔR^2	.00	.02	.01	.01	.01	.01
ΔF	.18	4.23**	1.07	2.81*	1.76	1.23
R^2	.12	.14	.14	.15	.28	.27
Adjusted R^2	.10	.12	.13	.13	.26	.26
F	7.35***	8.60***	8.09***	8.64***	18.46***	18.26***
Step 4: 3–Way Interactions						
F x G x C	–.33		–.81^{+}		–1.09*	
F x G x D		–.18		–.32		–.44
ΔR^2	.00	.00	.01	.00	.01	.00
ΔF	.64	.27	2.98^{+}	.75	6.36*	1.63
R^2	.12	.14	.15	.15	.28	.28
Adjusted R^2	.10	.12	.13	.13	.27	.26
F	6.79***	7.90***	7.69***	7.98***	17.62***	16.90***

$^{+}p < .10$. $*p < .05$. $**p < .01$. $***p < .001$.

We also believe that the increased conflict associated with high levels of peacekeeper/NGO worker contact highlights the importance (and potential nega-

tive impact) of organizational identities in the post-war context. In situations of conflict intervention, peacekeepers' and NGO workers' organizational identities are the most salient and relevant social categories. When peacekeepers share the same humanitarian space with NGO workers, constantly coming into contact with them (Slim, 2001), peacekeepers can constantly engage in social comparison and categorization (Bartel, 2001; Brewer, 1996; LaBianca et al., 1998). Once social categorization occurs, it leads to out-group derogation, competition and conflict (Abrams & Hogg, 1990; Brewer, 1979; Schminke et al., 2002; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Interviews with peacekeepers in our study reveal some of the tensions arising from organizational identification, out-group derogation, and competition that arise from contact with NGO personnel and result in conflict.

> "An NGO promoting breast-feeding went into a protected area, and wanted to inform mothers about the advantages of breast-feeding. The NGOs request guided transport from us to assist them in their promotion. However, the military refused to assist the NGOs because the military felt it was totally irrelevant and irritating to the local population. The NGOs then got upset with the military."
>
> "NGOs often irritate the military because they are rich and want to 'score' success and so they compete on the local market. For example, in Angola and Bosnia, the military trained local people to sweep and disable mines and offered a salary for doing so—just to show results to their own donors, NGOs would sometimes offer twice as much salary."

We also hypothesized that conflict management styles (pro-social versus egoistic) will moderate the relationship between contact and conflict. We found that peacekeepers that are in high contact with NGO personnel are more likely to experience conflictual interactions with NGO workers when they have an avoiding conflict management style. This may seem counterintuitive given that the goal of an avoiding style would be to avoid conflict, but this specific style increases the likelihood that contact leads to conflict. Past research has shown that avoidance has had both positive and negative effects. Jehn (1995) showed that conflict avoidance norms in groups increase group members' satisfaction. Hughes (2001), in a study of contact-increasing programs in Northern Ireland, reports that avoidance is a common strategy for maintaining inter-group personal friendships. However, in line with our reasoning based on avoidance as an egoistic conflict management style, peacekeepers that report high reliance on avoiding may be extremely self-oriented (Beersma & De Dreu, 1999; Harinck et al., 2000; Rahim & Bonoma, 1979; Weingart et al., 1993), exaggerating the negative effects of social categorization leading to increased levels of conflict (Abrams & Hogg, 1990; Schminke et al., 2002; Tajfel & Turner, 1986) upon contact with NGO workers. The results regarding dominating styles are more complex and discussed below.

In addition, we found no indication that pro-social conflict management styles moderate the relationship between contact and conflict. The implicit assumption in this study is that if peacekeepers have a more pro-social conflict orientation, less conflicts and problems will arise. Results suggest this is not the case. One explanation might be that pro-social behavior pays off only in long-term relations (Deutsch

& Coleman, 2000). Competitive behaviors are often effective (at least for the party employing that behavior) in the short run. Pro-social behavior can be seen as an investment in a relationship that pays off in future interactions. In that respect, it is also preventive behavior, building up trusting and cooperative relations. However, military peacekeepers in the international arena typically are deployed for 6 months, after which they are replaced. This short-term perspective does not help to create a trusting environment. This may be one explanation for the absence of the expected effects. We suggest future research on the short- and long-term effects of pro-social conflict management strategies.

Finally, recent studies on conflict behavior emphasize the combination of different behaviors as being effective (Euwema & Oosterman, 2002; Euwema, Van de Vliert, & Bakker, in press; Munduate, Ganaza, Peiro, & Euwema, 1999), particularly combinations of different assertive behaviors such as problem solving, forcing, and process controlling. In our study, pro-social behavior emphasizes both highly assertive behavior (problem solving), in combination with less assertive behaviors (compromising and accommodating). This combination may lack the components necessary to achieve one's goals cooperatively (Van de Vliert, Huismans, & Euwema, 1995).

Training in conflict management skills has been specifically promoted in the peacekeeping literature as potentially the most helpful intervention for peacekeepers to resolve conflict with both local parties and other third-parties (Last, 1999; Leeds, 2001). We see some support for this in our results regarding the interaction between a peacekeeper's dominating conflict management style and his/her experience of negotiations training. We found that peacekeepers who have a dominating conflict management style and intensive contact with the NGO personnel are less likely to experience intense conflict with NGO workers when they are sufficiently trained in negotiation. One explanation is that training in negotiation broadens the range of available strategies and/or decreases the reliance on any one strategy, reducing the likelihood that peacekeepers with dominating styles will solely depend on their egoistic orientation. Even if it is their natural tendency is to be dominating, the training may illustrate that in high contact situations dominating is not always the best, or even an effective, strategy.

Limitations of the Study and Implications for Future Research

This study is one of the first of its kind that empirically investigates the relationship between peacekeepers and NGO workers in an ethnopolitical conflict site, and shows that, despite both parties common intent to manage local conflict, the contact between them is actually associated with an increase in conflict between the third-party actors. This research also presents a unique data set that provides a vast amount of information on peacekeeping. One limitation of this study is that the data from local parties to the conflict and from NGO workers operating in the same territory were not available, thus we could not take into account the experiences of the entire range of actors affecting the interaction of peacekeepers and NGO workers. Additionally, we were not able to explore the impact of conflict between peacekeepers and NGO workers on their effectiveness in managing conflict between the local parties. This is critical for determining the ultimate success

of peacekeeping missions and NGO interventions on local peace and should be explored through additional data collection in future studies.

Another limitation of our study, a common characteristic of field studies, is that causal direction cannot be determined in a cross-sectional survey. Prior theory as well as research on peacekeeping that discusses multiple ways in which peacekeepers' and NGO workers' contact with one another leads to conflict supports our conclusion regarding contact and conflict (Aall, 2000; Duffey, 2000; Last, 1999, 2000; Weiss, 1995, 1999). However, it is quite possible that in our study peacekeepers' recall of their contact with NGO workers could be affected by their experiences of conflict. Another possibility is that a mutually amplifying cycle could be in place, in which greater contact could increase conflict between the two parties and conflict could lead to more contact (to further pursue the particular issue, for example) which could lead to further conflict and so on. Since, we are limited by our methodological design in determining causality or the net effect of contact on conflict, we encourage future researchers to test the causal direction of contact and conflict directly.

Recently, researchers examining the "contact hypothesis" have suggested that conceptualizing and measuring different types of contact (McLaren, 2003) and considering both quantity and quality of contact separately (Dovidio et al., 2003) are important. Future studies could tease apart the differential impact of the frequency and importance of contact on conflict.

In this study we treat conflict management styles as independent from each other. However, there might be interactions among the styles resulting in patterns or conglomerations of conflict behaviors (Euwema et al., in press; Munduate et al., 1999; Van de Vliert et al., 1995). As such, we should examine conflict management "profiles" rather than just the independent effects of single styles (Jehn & Chatman, 2000). In addition, while we were able to construct a reliable measure of training importance and adequacy, our data contained no direct measure of the specific amount of training individuals received, and this could be addressed in future studies. Another possibility for future research would be to examine the impact of other training subjects on conflict management styles. For example, at the largest companies today two types of training are very popular: awareness training and skill-building training (Cox & Blake, 1991). Awareness training focuses on promoting participants' self-awareness on organizational, cultural, and legal questions (e.g., organizational goals, mission and rules, ethical dilemmas, stereotyping, and cross-cultural insensitivity). Skill-building training educates employees on specific attitudinal and behavioral issues and how to respond to these issues in the workplace (e.g., individuals' skills in conflict and stress management and intercultural communication). Often, the two types are combined. Subsequent research should examine a wider array of training topics and techniques (e.g., skill-building, awareness training, cross-cultural sensitivity) to determine how they may affect interpersonal interactions in conflict environments. In addition, a comparative study of other peacekeeping missions is a possible avenue for future research to increase the generalizability of our findings.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to provide one of the first tests of factors that could promote essential cooperation between peacekeepers and NGO workers intervening in ethnopolitical conflict. In answering our three main questions regarding the nature of individual level interaction between peacekeepers and NGO workers (Can peacekeepers and NGO workers cooperate at the individual level? To what extent does personal conflict management style play a role in peacekeepers' ability to succeed at their jobs? To what extent does training in negotiation skills serve as a form of organization-sponsored intervention that supports peacekeepers' conflict management tasks?), we find that the outcome of interaction between peacekeepers and NGO workers is conflict rather than cooperation. Second, this study shows that conflict between peacekeepers and NGO workers, rather than being managed successfully at the individual level, can be mis-managed: conflict management styles that may prevail in conflict situations can have dysfunctional results (e.g., avoidance). However, the conflict management styles that have potential negative effects on interpersonal interaction (e.g., dominating) can also be improved through organizationally-sponsored training, as found in this study. For conflict management training in particular, this is an exciting development because we empirically show that negotiations training has an impact on the effect an individual's style has on the contact-conflict relationship. This is of critical importance, given the growing trend in international conflict management to send peacekeepers to do more than just enforce a ceasefire. Specifically, our results might help improve the design of future peacekeeping missions and the training of peacekeepers to work with NGO personnel in a successful manner. More importantly, our study offers hope that although the political motivation to coordinate between peacekeeping missions and NGOs may not be sufficient to create cooperation, organizational training can improve the outcome of interaction between peacekeepers' and NGO workers by influencing their ability to manage inter-organizational conflict, and hence contribute to the effectiveness of both third-parties in building peace after ethnopolitical conflict.

References

Aall, P. (2000). NGOs, conflict management and peacekeeping. *International Peacekeeping, 7* (1), 121–141.

Aall, P., Miltenberger, D., & Weiss, T. G. (2000). *Guide to IGOs, NGOs and the military in peace and relief operations*. Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace.

Abrams, D., & Hogg M. A. (1990). An introduction to the social identity approach. In D. Abrams & M.A. Hogg (Eds.), *Social and identity theory: Constructive and critical advances* (pp. 1–9). New York: Springer-Verlag

Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Ancona, D., & Caldwell, D. (1992). Bringing the boundary: External activity and performance in organizational teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 37*, 634–665.

Anderson, M. B. (1999). *Do no harm: How aid can support peace—or war*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of Management Review, 14*, 20–39.

Babcock, L., & Laschever, S. (2003) *Women don't ask: Negotiation and the gender divide*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Baros, M. (2001). The UN's response to the Yugoslav crisis: Turning the UN charter on its head. *International Peacekeeping, 8*, 44–63.

Barsade, S. G., Ward, A. J., Turner, J. D. F., & Sonnenfeld, J. A. (2000). To your heart's content: A model of affective diversity in top management teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 5*, 802–836.

Bartel, C. A. (2001). Social comparisons in boundary spanning works: Effects of community outreach in member's organizational identity and identification. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 46*, 379–414.

Bartel, C. A., & Saavedra, R. (2000). The collective construction of work group moods. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 45*, 197–231.

Beersma, B., & De Dreu, C. K. W. (1999). Negotiation processes and outcomes in pro-socially and egoistically motivated groups. *Journal of International Conflict Management, 10*, 385–402.

Blake, R., & Mouton, J. (1964). *The managerial grid*. Houston, TX: Gulf.

Brewer, M. B. (1979). In-group bias in the minimal intergroup situation: Cognitive-motivational analysis: *Psychological Bulletin, 86*, 307–324.

Brewer, M. B. (1996). When contact is not enough: Social identity and intergroup cooperation.. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 20* (3–4), 291–303.

Brewer, M. B., & Miller, N. (1984). Beyond the contact hypothesis: Theoretical perspectives on desegregation. In N. Miller & M. B. Brewer (Eds.), *Groups in contact: The psychology of desegregation* (pp. 281–302). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Brewer, M. B., Webber, J., & Carini, B. (1995). Person memory in intergroup contexts: Categorization versus individualization. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59*, 273–286.

Brown, L., & Lopez, G. (2001). Political contact: Analyzing the role of similarity in theories of prejudice. *Political Psychology, 22*, 279–292

Caplan, R. (2002). *A new trusteeship? The international administration of war-torn territories*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Carnevale, P. J., & Probst, T. M. (1998). Social values and social conflict in creative problem solving and categorization. *Journal of Personal and Social Psychology, 74*, 1300–1309.

Calliess, J., & Merkel, C. M. (Eds.). (1995). *Peaceful settlement of conflict: a task for civil society: "Third party intervention."* New York: St. Martin's Press.

Callister R. R., & Wall Jr., J. A. (2001). Conflict across organizational boundaries: Managed care organizations versus health care providers. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 754–763.

Cohen, J., & Cohen, P. (1983). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Cox, T. H., & Blake, S. (1991). Managing cultural diversity: Implications for organizational competitiveness. *Academy of Management Executive, 5*, 45–55.

Dallinger, J. M., & Hample, D. (1995). Personalizing and managing conflict. *International Journal of Conflict Management, 6*, 273–289.

De Dreu, C. K. W., Weingart, L. R., & Kwon, S. (2000). Influence of social motives and integrative negotiation: A meta-analytic review and a test of two theories. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 78*, 889–905.

De Dreu, C.K.W, Evers, A., Beersma, B., Kluwer, E., & Nauta, A. (2001). A theory-based measure of conflict management strategies in the workplace: *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 22*, 645–668.

Deutsch, M. (1973). *The resolution of conflict.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Deutsch, M.., & Coleman, P. T (Eds.) (2000). *The handbook of conflict resolution.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Dovidio, J., Gaertner, S. L., & Kawakami, K. (2003). Intergroup contact: The past, present, and the future. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 6* (1), 5–21.

Duffey, T. (2000). Cultural issues in contemporary peacekeeping. *International Peacekeeping*, *7* (1), 142–168.

Dutton, J. E, Dukerich, J. M., & Harquail, C. V. (1994). Organizational images and member identification. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 39*, 239–263.

Euwema, M. C., & Oosterman, C. (2002). *Effectiveness of conglomerated conflict behavior among Dutch peacekeepers.* Working paper, Utrecht University, The Netherlands

Euwema, M. C., Van de Vliert, E., & Bakker, A. (in press). Substantive and relational effectiveness of organizational conflict behavior. *International Journal of Conflict Management.*

Evans-Kent, B., & Bleiker, R. (2003). Peace beyond the state? NGOs in Bosnia and Herzegovina. In H. F. Carey & O. P. Richmond (Eds.), *Mitigating conflict: The role of NGOs* (pp. 103–119). Portland, OR: Frank Cass.

Fetherston, A. B. (1994). *Towards a theory of United Nations peacekeeping.* New York: St. Martin's Press.

Fiske, S. T., & Taylor, S. E. (1991). *Social cognition.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Flint, E. (2001). Civil affairs: Soldiers building bridges. In D. S. Gordon & F. H. Toase (Eds.), *Aspects of peacekeeping* (pp. 231–252). Portland, OR: Frank Cass.

Ford, J. K, & Quinones, M. A. (1992). Factors affecting the opportunity to perform trained tasks on the job. *Personnel Psychology*, *45*, 511–528.

Harinck, F., De Dreu, C. K. W., & Van Viannen, A. E. M. (2000). The impact of conflict issues on fixed-pie perceptions, problem solving, and integrative outcomes in negotiation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 81*, 329–358.

Hewstone M., & Brown, R. (1986). Contact is not enough: An intergroup perspective on the contact hypothesis. In M. Hewstone & R. Brown (Eds.), *Contact and conflict in intergroup encounters* (pp. 1–44). New York: Blackwell.

Hofmann, D. (1997). An overview of the logic and rationale of hierarchical linear models: Theoretical and methodological implications for organizational science. *Journal of Management, 24*, 623–641.

Hofmann, D., Griffin, M., & Gavin, M. (2000). The application of hierarchical linear modeling to management research. In K. Klein & S. Kozlowski (Eds.), *Multilevel theory, research, and methods in organizations: Foundations, extensions, and new directions* (pp. 467–511). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hogg, M. A., & Terry, D. J. (2000). Social identity and self-categorization processes in organizational contexts. *Academy of Management Review, 25*, 121–140.

Hogg, M. A., Turner, J. C., & Davidson, B. (1990). Polarized norms and social frames of reference: A test of the self-categorization theory of group polarization. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 11*, 77–100.

Hughes, J. (2001). Constitutional reform in Northern Ireland: Implications for community relations policy and practice. *International Journal of Conflict Management, 12*, 154–173.

Isen, A. M., & Baron, R. A. (1991). Positive affect as a factor in organizational behavior. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organization behavior* (pp. 1–53). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Jehn, K. (1995). A multimethod examination of the benefits and detriments of intragroup conflict. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 40*, 256–282.

Jehn, K., & Chatman, J. (2000). New conceptualizations of team conflict: Proportional and relational conflict. *International Journal of Conflict Management, 24*, 292–316.

Kelly, J. R., & Barsade, S. G. (2001). Mood and emotions in small groups and work teams. *Organizational Behavior, 86* (1), 99–130.

LaBianca, G., Brass, D. J., & Gray, B. (1998). Social networks and perceptions of intergroup conflict: The role of negative relationships and third parties. *Academy of Management Journal, 41*, 55–67.

Last, C. D. (1999). *From peacekeeping to peacebuilding: Theory, cases, experiments and solutions.* Royal military college working paper, Kingston, Ontario.

Last, C. D. (2000). Organizing for effective peacebuilding. *International Peacekeeping, 7* (1), 8–96.

Last, D., & K. C. Eyre (1995). *Combat and contact skills in peacekeeping: Surveying recent Canadian experience in UNPROFOR.* Occasional paper, The Lester B. Pearson Canadian International Peacekeeping Training Center, Nova Scotia, Canada

Leeds, C. (2001). Culture, conflict resolution, peacekeeper training and the mediator. *International Peacekeeping, 8* (4), 92–110.

Lewicki, R. J., McAllister, D. J., & Bies, R. J. (1998). Trust and distrust: New relationships and realities. *Academy of Management Review, 23,* 438–458.

Lewicki, R., & Stevenson, M. (1997, June). *Trust development in negotiation: Proposed action and the research agenda.* Paper presented at the Trust and Business: Barriers and Bridges conference, DePaul University.

McLaren, L. M. (2003). Anti-immigrant prejudice in Europe: Contact, threat perception, and preferences for the exclusion of migrants. *Social Forces, 81* (3), 909–936

Munduate, L., Ganaza, J., Peiro, J., & Euwema, M. (1999). Patterns of styles in conflict management and effectiveness. *International Journal of Conflict Management, 10*, 5–24.

Murnighan, J. K., Malhotra, D., & Weber, M. (2004). Paradoxes of trust: Empirical and theoretical departures from a traditional model. In R. M. Kramer & K. S. Cook (Eds.), *Trust and distrust across organizational contexts: Dilemmas and approaches* (pp. 293–327). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Natsios, A. (1997). An NGO perspective. In I. W. Zartman & J. L. Rasmussen (Eds.), *Peacemaking in international conflict: Methods and techniques* (pp. 337–361). Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace.

Nezlek, J. (2001). Multilevel random coefficient analyses of event- and interval-contingent data in social and personality psychology research. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 27,* 771–785.

O'Reilly C. A., & Chatman, J. A. (1996). Culture as social control: Corporations, cults, and commitment. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 18*, 157–200.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual Review of Psychology, 49*, 65–85.

Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. (2000). Does intergroup contact reduce prejudice: Recent meta-analytic findings. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Reducing prejudice and discrimination in social psychological perspectives* (pp. 93–114). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Pruitt, D. G., & Rubin J. C. (1986). *Social conflict: Escalation, stalemate and settlement.* New York: Random House.

Rahim, M. A., & Bonoma, T. V. (1979). Managing organizational conflict: A model for diagnosis and intervention. *Psychological Reports, 44,* 1323–1344.

Rahim, M. A. (1983). A measure of styles of handling interpersonal conflict. *Academy of Management Journal, 26,* 368–376.

Rahim, M. A. (2001). *Managing conflict in organizations* (3rd ed.). New York: Quorum Books.

Report of the panel on United Nations peacekeeping operations. (2000). *Document of the Secretary General.* Document No. A/55/305–S/2000/809.

Rieff, D. (2002). *A bed for the night: Humanitarianism in crisis.* New York: Simon & Schuster.

Roth, P. L., & BeVier, C. A. (1998). Response rates in HRM/OB survey research: Norms and correlates. *Journal of Management, 24,* 97–117.

Rupesinghe. K. (1995). *Conflict transformation.* New York: St. Martin's Press.

Schminke, M., Cropanzano, R. S., & Rupp, D. E. (2002). Organization structure and fairness perceptions: The moderating effects of organizational level. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 89,* 881–905.

Slim, H. (1996). The stretcher and the drum: Civil-military relations in peace support operations. *International Peacekeeping, 3* (2), 123–140.

Slim, H. (2001). Positioning humanitarianism in war: Principles of neutrality, impartiality and solidarity. In D. S. Gordon & F. H. Toase (Eds.), *Aspects of peacekeeping* (pp. 125–140). Portland, OR: Frank Cass.

Staw, B. M., Sanderlands, L. E., & Dutton, J. E. (1981). Threat-rigidity effects in organizational behavior: A multilevel analysis. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *26*, 501–524.

Stevens, C. K., Bavetta, A. G., & Gist, M. E. (1993). Gender differences in the acquisition of salary negotiation skills: The role of goals, self-efficacy and perceived control. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *78*, 723–735.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.) *Psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 7–24). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

Tripodi, P. (2001). Peacekeeping: Let the conscripts do the job. *Security Dialogue, 32* (2), 155–168.

United Nations Peacekeeping Operations. (2003a). *Background note*. Retrieved November 7, 2003, from http://www.un.org/peace/bnote010101.pdf

United Nations Peacekeeping Operations. (2003b). *TES training planned activities*. Retrieved November 7, 2003, from http://www.un.org/Depts/dpko/training/training_activities/tes_training_activities_2002_main.htm

Van de Vliert, E., Huismans, S. E., & Euwema M. C. (1995). Managing conflict with a subordinate or a superior: Effectiveness of conglomerated behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *80*, 271–281.

Wall, J., & Druckman, D. (2002, June). Mediation in peacekeeping missions. Paper presented at the International Association for Conflict Management conference, Park City, UT.

Watson, D., Clark L. A., McIntyre, C. W., & Hamaker, S. (1992). Affect, personality, and social activity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *63*, 1011–1025.

Weingart, L. R., Bennet, R. J., & Brett, J. M. (1993). The impact of consideration of issues and motivational orientation on group negotiation and process outcome. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *78*, 504–517.

Weiss, T. G. (1995). Military-civilian humanitarianism: The 'age of innocence' is over. *International Peacekeeping*, *2* (2), 157–174.

Weiss, T. G. (1999). *Military civil interactions: Intervening in humanitarian crises*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Williams, M. (2001). In whom we trust: Group membership as an affective context for trust development. *Academy of Management Review*, *26*, 377–396.

Received: December 3, 2002
Accepted after two revisions: June 1, 2004

♥

The International Journal of Conflict of Management
Vol. 15, No. 2, pp. 208–210

Biographic Sketches

Katerina Bezrukova is an Assistant Professor of Psychology at Rutgers University. Her research interests include workplace diversity, conflict, and performance. Most recently she has been interested in the new topic areas of demographic faultlines, ethnopolitical conflict, and peacekeeping. Her research has been published in the *Human Resource Management Journal* and *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. (bezrukov@camden.rutgers.edu)

Martin C. Euwema is an Associate Professor Organizational Psychology at Utrecht University, The Netherlands. His research interests are peacekeeping, organizational conflict behavior, stress, well being, and organization development and change. He has acted as a trainer in negotiation and conflict management for peacekeepers for over 7 years. Currently, he is involved in a project on global leadership and team performance. (m.euwema@fss.uu.nl)

Yoichiro Hayashi is a research fellow of the Japanese Society for Promotion of the Sciences. He received his Ph.D. from Tohoku University in Sendai, Japan. His research concern focuses on cognitive processes driving justice perceptions in organizations. He is currently conducting research on collective justice perceptions in Japanese contexts. (hayashi@sal.tohoku.ac.jp)

Karen A. Jehn is a Professor of Social and Organizational Psychology at Leiden University. She received her Ph.D. from Northwestern University. Her research interests include group processes, diversity, conflict, and political organizing behavior which have been published in *Administrative Science Quarterly, Academy of Management Journal, and Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, among others. (jehnka@fsw.leidenuniv.nl)

S. Zev Kalifon was born in the United States and immigrated to Israel in 1970. He did his undergraduate work at the Hebrew University in Psychology and Social Anthropology. He served five years in the Behavioral Science Department of the Israel Defense Forces before returning to the United States for graduate work. His Ph.D. is in applied anthropology from the Northwestern University Program in Ethnography and Public Policy. He returned to Israel in 1987 and is affiliated with the Interdisciplinary Department of Social Sciences at Bar-Ilan University. His research interests are in medical anthropology, urban studies and new ethnographic methods. (kalifz@mail.biu.ac.il)

Nicolien Kop earned her Ph.D. in psychology from Utrecht University, The Netherlands, where she studied the relationship between occupational stress and conflict behavior by Dutch police officers. She worked at the Clingendael Institute for International Relations, conducting a study on training needs and conflict management of military peacekeepers. She is currently a researcher at the Dutch National

Police Institute. Her research focuses on stress and conflict management in relation to criminal youth, intercultural interactions, and organized crime. (nicolien.kop@lsop.nl)

Winnifred R. Louis (Ph.D., McGill University) is a post-doctoral research fellow in the School of Psychology at the University of Queensland. Her research interests include decision-making in conflict, social influence and group norms, and collective action. (wlouis@psy.uq.edu.au)

M. Ben Mollov received his Ph.D. in Political Science from Bar-Ilan University, Israel, and earlier an M.A. from Columbia University in International Affairs. He is currently a lecturer in Political Science in the Interdisciplinary Department of Social Sciences at Bar-Ilan University, and teaches in the graduate program of the Program for Conflict Management at the University. His research interests include culture and conflict resolution and is the co-author of "Culture, Dialogue, and Perception Change in the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict" which appeared in *The International Journal of Conflict Management.* (mollob@mail.biu.ac.il)

Tyson Neil (B.A., L.L.B., B.C.L., McGill University) completed an honours arts degree in social psychology. He now applies this knowledge working in a law firm in Montréal, Canada. (tysonneil@hotmail.com)

Ken-ichi Ohbuchi is a professor of psychology at the Graduate School of Arts and Letters, Tohoku University in Sendai, Japan. He received his Ph.D. from Tohoku University. His research interests include cognitive, motivational, personality, and cultural factors of anger, aggression, and conflict management. He is currently engaged in research projects concerning justice and fairness in Japan. (ohbuchi@sal.tohoku.ac.jp)

Lakshmi Ramarajan is pursuing her Ph.D. in Management at the University of Pennsylvania. Her research interests include international conflict management, the role of international organizations in post-conflict reconstruction and turnover in human service organizations. She worked on conflict resolution programs for West Africa before joining the doctoral program. (ramaraja@wharton.upenn.edu)

Bas van Rossum studied organizational psychology at the University of Groningen, the Netherlands. His master thesis on conflict behavior in Japanese firms was prepared during a study visit to Tohoku University as part of a one-year stay in Japan. After holding a research position at the University of Groningen, he is presently employed with Asia House, guiding and preparing Dutch companies for doing business in Japan. (bas.vanrossum@asiahouse.nl)

Gerald M. Steinberg teaches Political Studies at Bar-Ilan University, and directs the Program on Conflict Management and Negotiation. His doctorate (Cornell University) examined the link between politics and technology in arms control verification, and current research includes Middle East diplomatic and security issues, CBMs, and critical analysis of models of dispute resolution. He is a consultant to the Israeli government, and participates in track-two processes. Recent articles include "Begin at Camp David: The Dynamics of Leadership Transformation", and "The Centrality of Confidence Building Measures: Lessons from the Middle East." (steing@mail.biu.ac.il)