Between a rock and a hard place: challenges, strategies and resolution of value conflict mediation
Illes, R.M.

Citation
Illes, R. M. (2021, September 23). *Between a rock and a hard place: challenges, strategies and resolution of value conflict mediation*. *Dissertatiereeks Kurt Lewin Instituut*. Retrieved from https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3213609

Version:	Publisher's Version
License:	Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden
Downloaded from:	https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3213609

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

CHAPTER 4

The benefits of banging your fist on the table:

The impact of mediator-expressed anger on disputants in value conflicts

Mediators are professional third parties trained to intervene in conflicts by guiding the communication between disputants to reach mutually beneficial solutions. The two defining characteristics of independent mediators are impartiality and neutrality (Macfarlane, 2003). The latter suggests that mediators—despite their own ideas of righteousness—place their own emotions and opinions aside, while allowing parties to safely express their feelings and concerns in a judgment-free environment (Bowling & Hoffman, 2000). In practice, however, it is not always as easy for mediators to remain collected. Research discovered that when faced with difficult conflicts—where parties behave counterproductively while solutions or even progress seem to be impossible—mediators may succumb to frustration and express anger as a strategy to promote constructive conflict behavior (Illes et al., 2014). Although anger is a common negotiation tactic utilized by negotiators to elicit concessions from their counterparts (Sinaceur & Tiedens, 2006; Van Kleef et al., 2004a, Van Kleef et al., 2004b), exhibiting anger does not pertain to any mediation style or technique. In fact, considering mediators are instructed to remain calm and neutral, displays of anger by the mediator may even be considered a violation of the mediator's conduct.

The idea of a professional mediator displaying anger towards his or her clients may sound controversial. However, it is not difficult to imagine where the inspiration to use anger to gain obedience comes from. Think back to when you were a child. If you ever found yourself in a heated argument with your classmates at school, you probably remember the fight ending after you and your classmates got scolded by your teacher. Similarly, parents of quarrelling siblings may restore peace by raising their tone. At the workplace, leaders who display high-intensity anger may see the performance of their followers improve as they become motivated to reflect

on their own behavior and adjust it (Lindebaum et al., 2016). Much like when your parents told you to "go to your room and think about what you've done!" As displays of anger have been shown to positively impact recipients' behavior, it is not entirely ludicrous to imagine mediators using anger as a tactic to promote productive conflict handling behaviors among their headstrong clients in value conflicts.

However, displays of anger have also been found to have detrimental consequences. In the workplace for example, in addition to employee productivity, a leader displaying anger is also likely to provoke deviant reactions which can worsen workplace relationships (Geddes & Stickney, 2011; Gibson et al., 2009). Similarly, teachers and parents who—by displaying anger—got what they wanted (i.e., obedient children), may be providing a successful model for aggression, which the recipients may later imitate to get what they want (Ciccarelli & White, 2014). At the mediation table then, mediator-expressed anger that results in retaliatory behavior from disputants may jeopardize successful resolution.

Considering mediators are advised to not express anger while mediating a dispute, it is not surprising that our literature review on the topic only yielded one research on hostile mediators. Zhang et al. (2017)—the first to investigate the effects of negative emotions expressed by third parties—found that disputants were more willing and better able to reach an agreement when exposed to a hostile mediator. The research also showed that this effect was mediated by perceptions of a common enemy. However, these findings were found among disputants in a resource conflict with the possibility of mutually beneficial agreements. In their call for future research, Zhang et al. (2017) note that mediator-expressed anger should be investigated in other types of conflicts as it may not be beneficial in situations that are more personal and where possible agreements seem out of

sight. Indeed, expressing anger towards those defending their deeply held beliefs in value conflicts for example, may not be advisable. Nevertheless, mediators are currently employing this technique, particularly in these situations, while garnering successful results (Illes et al., 2014). To address this research-practice gap in conflict management, we explored the mechanisms involved when mediators utilize anger as an intervention in value conflicts. By means of two experiments, we investigated factors (i.e., direction of the anger and the power of the mediator) that may influence the efficacy of anger, in order to advise mediators to adopt or refrain from this controversial technique when mediating value conflicts.

Mediator-expressed anger

Conflicting parties who are unable to resolve their dispute can approach a mediator for assistance. Often, the reason parties fail to resolve the issue on their own is due to the strongly felt emotions, which are inherent to conflict (Van Kleef et al., 2004b). Whereas in deal making, emotions may surface during the session, in mediation, conflicting parties usually approach the session with preexisting strong emotions (Dunham, 2013). One of the most common and influential emotions expressed in dispute resolution is anger (Adler et al., 1998; Allred, 1999; Bollen & Euwema, 2015). It is the mediator's task to help parties neutralize their anger (Moore, 1996), to participate productively in order to reach optimal solutions.

However, not all conflicts allow mediators to transform parties' negative emotions as easily. Value conflicts for example, have been identified as difficult—if not impossible—to resolve (Prein, 2009). When disputants are in conflict about issues concerning their deeply held values and personal beliefs, they become particularly emotionally

involved (Harinck & Van Kleef, 2011), less willing to seek win-win opportunities (Harinck et al., 2000) and highly intolerant of their counterpart (Wright et al., 2008). Parties' headstrong attitudes in value conflicts may lead to stalemates or cause the mediation to end in no solution. When faced with such hopeless situations, mediators sometimes abandon their role of the patient, calm and rational third party and opt to employ more forceful tactics in an effort to salvage the case. One of the techniques sometimes utilized by mediators intervening in value conflicts is the expression of anger (Illes et al., 2014).

Although anger is often used by negotiators to pressure their opponents into conceding (Sinaceur & Tiedens, 2006; Van Kleef et al., 2004a, 2004b; Van Kleef et al., 2008), it is not found among legitimate mediation techniques. On the contrary, mediators are trained to remain neutral third parties who refrain from expressing their emotions. Granted, not all expressions of anger by mediators are premeditated. While some mediators may utilize this technique intentionally, others may reap the benefits as a result of uncharacteristic outbursts caused by a sense of hopelessness (Illes et al., 2014). Whether mediators purposefully expressed anger or were succumbed to it, the result was identical—specifically, more cooperative parties.

Despite the productive effects of mediator-expressed anger documented by anecdotal evidence (Illes et al., 2014), this strategy seems to conflict with the defining characteristic of mediators, namely, neutrality (Macfarlane, 2003). Neutrality suggests that mediators place their emotions and opinions aside while guiding parties to reach their own solution to the problem (Dunham, 2013). Anger, however, is expressed when individuals wish to communicate something that they personally feel is unacceptable (Averill, 1982; Chodron, 2003). Expressing anger then, violates the mediator's

characteristic of neutrality in that it shows emotion and communicates an opinion. A mediator expressing anger is explicitly or implicitly accusing parties of wrong-doing (Smith & Ellsworth, 1985). At the mediation table, disputants are meant to feel comfortable enough to share their concerns and express their emotions free of judgment from the mediator (Bowling & Hoffman, 2000). The mediator creates this environment by establishing a sense of trust with each party. If during heated discussions mediators opt to express anger, they risk losing the trust that is instrumental to the success of this method of dispute resolution. Such outbursts from the mediator may confine parties' sense of freedom of expression and inhibit them from actively participating in the mediation session. This, in turn, can hinder mutually beneficial solutions from manifesting.

Moreover, research has shown that angry individuals often lose perspective and become intolerant (Dunham, 2013). Conflicting parties who approach a mediator for assistance, may assume that the mediator possesses the skills to remain clear-headed and tolerate tension beyond the average individual. Outbursts of anger may convey incompetence and reduce the mediator's agency and efficacy.

Scholars claim the success of mediation is often the result of the positive relationship between the mediator and disputants, where the mediator shows understanding (Goldberg & Shaw, 2007), listens empathetically (Druckman & Olekalns, 2008) helps parties deal with their emotions (Giebels & Yang, 2009), satisfy their need of being heard (Thatcher & Greer, 2008) and acknowledged (Ufkes et al., 2012). These determinants of mediator success seem incompatible with the tactic of exhibiting anger.

Although mediator-expressed anger remains a novel development within conflict management literature, the role of anger expressed by disputants towards their counterparts

has been widely documented in negotiation literature. The consequences of disputant-expressed anger has been shown to be both productive and counterproductive. By first revisiting the circumstances under which disputant-expressed anger is beneficial and detrimental, we then utilize this insight to hypothesize on the impact anger may have when expressed by the mediator towards conflicting parties in value conflicts.

Anger as Counterproductive to Dispute Resolution

Scholars have found negative consequences of anger expressed by disputants on both intrapersonal and interpersonal levels. Indeed, anger can activate negative attitudes and behaviors among both the expresser and the recipient. In terms of the intrapersonal effects of anger, research has found that angry disputants are less considerate of their counterparts' interests and experience more difficulty in identifying these interests (Allred et al., 1997). Self-evidently, in order to successfully guide parties to resolution, one of the mediator's key roles is to identify parties' underlying interests. If mediators, upon getting angry, also fall prey to disregarding parties' interests, the mediation may fail. Studies have also shown that angry disputants feel less positively about the negotiation and their counterpart (Van Kleef et al., 2004a) leading to more impasses and less win-win solutions (Allred et al., 1997; Moore et al., 1999). If this effect also prevails among mediators expressing anger, the consequences can be detrimental as it can be expected that mediators' positive attitude towards the mediation sessions and the parties is likely to be fruitful for successful mediation.

Further, angry disputants tend to reflect less on the ramifications of their aggressive actions (Berkowitz 1988, 1989) and exhibit less constraint when faced with threats (Baron, 1973; Rogers, 1980). When deciding which mediation technique to employ in a conflict, mediators

evaluate the situation to carefully select the strategy with the highest probability of success. The feedback from the parties determines whether the chosen strategy should be altered or replaced. If mediators, upon getting angry, also neglect the consequences of expressing anger and are insensitive to the feedback from the parties, the case may lead to an impasse or end in no agreement.

In addition to the negative effects that anger may pose on the expresser, there are also interpersonal effects posed on the recipient. Social contagion theory (Levy & Nail, 1993) suggests that an emotion expressed by one person (the initiator) can unintentionally spread to the next person (the recipient). Drawing on social contagion theory, we can infer that disputants exposed to anger expressed by the mediator may themselves become angry and retaliate. As Dunham (2013) noted, in order for mediators to successfully approach anger among disputants, they must first identify the source of the anger in order to help parties effectively deal with it in the mediation process. Now a mediator who, by expressing anger, becomes the source of the anger among disputants, may not be in the best position to help parties deal with their anger.

Furthermore, research has shown that when exposed to anger expressed by their opponent, disputants tended to reach lower win-win solutions, develop worse interpersonal rapport and experience more impasses (Allred et al., 1997; Moore et al., 1999). Naturally, if mediator-expressed anger produces similar effects, mediators should steer away from utilizing this technique. However, mediators are currently employing this technique while generating positive results (Illes et al., 2014). Considering the above described detrimental effects of expressions of anger, the question is, under which circumstances would a mediator experience positive results by getting angry at conflicting parties? The literature on the

positive effects of disputant-expressed anger provides insight into possible factors accounting for the productive effects of mediator-expressed anger.

Anger as Productive to Dispute Resolution

Research has shown that counterparts on the receiving end of anger may concede to avoid negative consequences such as conflict escalation (Lelieveld et al., 2012; Van Kleef et al., 2004a). Indeed, anger has been identified as functional to one's self-interest (Feshbach, 1989). Specifically, disputants expressing anger are communicating, on the one hand, that their position on a conflict issue is important, and on the other hand, their unwillingness to yield (Frank, 1988; Fridlund, 1991, 1994; Keltner & Haidt, 2001; Morris & Keltner, 2000; Putnam, 1994). Research has also found that recipients of anger can become motivated to search for a solution to the problem (Brett et al., 1998; Gottman & Levenson, 1992). Taking the above findings into account, provided mediator-expressed anger leads to similar consequences as disputant-expressed anger, it may be advisable for mediators to indeed utilize this technique. A mediator expressing anger may evoke fear in disputants, who, in turn, will be motivated to come to a solution.

However, disputant-expressed anger does not result in compliant counterparts under all circumstances. Previous research has identified moderators of the efficacy of disputant-expressed anger. One moderator is the power position of the expresser. Specifically, studies have shown that anger expressed by high-power disputants indeed elicited concessions, however, when anger was expressed by low-power disputants, recipients tended to offer less to their counterpart (Lelieveld et al., 2012). The findings are explained by the social function of power. Individuals in a high-power position are —by definition—capable of influencing the

outcomes of less powerful individuals (Fiske, 1993; Keltner et al., 2008). Therefore, when anger is expressed by high-power disputants, recipients experience a threat (Van Dijk et al., 2008) which evokes fear of receiving a negative outcome (Sinaceur & Tiedens, 2006; Van Kleef et al., 2006). Anger expressed by low-power disputants on the other hand does not evoke fear of negative consequences. On the contrary, recipients of anger expressed by low-power disputants are likely to respond with reciprocal anger (Barsade, 2002; Friedman et al., 2004; Kopelman et al., 2006; Van Dijk et al., 2008; Van Kleef & Côté, 2007), which in turn may lead to competitiveness (Forgas, 1998; Pillutla & Murnighan, 1996) and retaliation (Van Kleef & Côté, 2007). Researchers therefore conclude that when anger is expressed by a high-power disputant, anger may be productive, but when anger is expressed by a low-power disputant, anger may backfire (Lelieveld et al., 2012; Van Dijk et al., 2008).

Further, research has also found that the target of disputant-expressed anger also impacts its efficacy. Specifically, upon receiving angry messages, opponents made larger concessions to their counterparts but only when the anger was specifically directed at their behavior (e.g., the offer) and not at them personally (Steinel et al., 2008). Steinel et al. (2008) attributed this finding to the strategic value of the emotional expression. When disputants express anger, it communicates strategic information about their negotiation position. In terms of the target of the anger, behavior-oriented anger communicates the expresser's limits and may evoke concessions. Person-directed anger on the other hand, does not communicate the expresser's negotiation position and may elicit competitive reactions. Inspired by the classic advice to separate the people from the problem (Fisher & Ury, 1981), Steinel and colleagues (2008) advise negotiators utilizing anger as a strategy, to direct the emotion towards

the behavior and not the people.

If these two factors of power and target—which influence the impact of disputant-expressed anger—also impact mediator-expressed anger, mediators may be advised to express anger only if they possess some form of power (e.g., arbitration if mediation fails) and the anger should only be directed at the parties' behavior and not at them personally.

In addition to the power of the expresser and the target of the anger, the conflict issue has also been shown to influence the impact of disputant-expressed anger. Harinck and Van Kleef (2011) discovered that disputant-expressed anger had productive effects in resource conflicts (i.e., disputes about tangible materials such as money) and detrimental effects in value conflicts (i.e., disputes about deeply held values such as justice and religion). Specifically, disputant-expressed anger in value conflicts, in comparison to resource conflicts, was deemed more unfair and sparked retaliatory and escalatory behaviors. In light of these findings, Harinck and Van Kleef (2011) concluded that disputants should be hard on the resources and soft on the values. If the efficacy of mediator-expressed anger also depends on the conflict issue in the same way, mediators may be advised to refrain from exhibiting anger when intervening in value conflicts. Yet it is these particularly difficult disputes like value conflicts that tend to induce mediators to employ more forceful tactics such as the expression of anger. To date, the success of mediator-expressed anger in value conflicts has only been documented by anecdotal evidence (Illes et al., 2014). By means of two experimental studies, this investigation aims to decrease the research-practice gap and test the efficacy of mediator-expressed anger in value conflicts.

As we have seen, considerable research has been conducted on the mechanisms involved in disputant-expressed anger. This literature points to a variety of factors that could also

play a role in mediator-expressed anger. As a first step, we narrowed down our investigation to one conflict type (i.e., value conflicts) and two possible factors (i.e., the power of the mediator and the target of the anger). Further, we adhere to two methods of investigation. The first study exposes participants to an angry mediator in a predetermined value conflict (i.e., a more controlled setting) while the second study allows participants to consider a previously self-experienced value conflict (i.e., a more naturalistic setting). The research design and results are discussed in turn.

Study 4.1

To assess whether the efficacy of mediator-expressed anger is influenced by the power of the mediator and the target of the anger, these factors were manipulated. The power of the mediator was distinguished by two models of third-party intervention, namely, straight mediation and mediation/arbitration (McGillicuddy, Welton & Pruitt, 1987). In straight mediation, parties are told that if the mediation ends in no agreement there will be no further steps taken. In mediation/arbitration, however, parties are told that if no agreement is made at the mediation table, the mediator will turn into the arbitrator and make a binding decision. It can be inferred that a mediator intervening in a conflict that holds the mediation/arbitration model possesses high power while a mediator in straight mediation has low power.

Furthermore, the target of mediator-expressed anger was manipulated by having the mediator direct the anger at either the parties or at the mediation process. If we are to take the findings of disputant-expressed anger influenced by the power of the expresser (Lelieveld et al., 2012) and the target of the anger (Steinel et al., 2008) as indication of the effects of mediator-expressed anger, we can hypothesize that high-power mediators directing their anger at the mediation process would be most successful.

Method 4.1

Participants and Design

Participants were 185 students from Leiden University (137 females, 48 males, *M*age = 21,12 *SD* = 2.69). The most dominant nationality in the sample was Dutch (*N* = 127), while other participants were western Europeans and from the Caribbean, among others. Participants were recruited on Leiden University's social sciences campus and by the university's online participation sign-up tool. Upon completion of the experiment, participants were compensated with €3 or 1 course credit. A 2 (mediator emotion: anger vs. neutral) x 2 (mediator power: high vs. low) x 2 (emotion target: people vs. process) between-participant design was used.

Procedure

Upon arrival participants were told that they would be taking part in an online mediation session that aims to test a newly developed digital way of conducting mediations. They were told that a local mediation organization has made professional mediators available online, to guide the participants and their counterpart to come to a solution to a predetermined conflict. After being assigned to their own private cubicle, participants received instructions via a computer. They read that their counterpart was sitting in another cubicle. Prior to introducing the conflict, participants were asked to exhibit their best effort in defending their given position on the issue.

Participants were asked to imagine that they—together with their counterpart—are organizing a school trip departing from the Netherlands to Poland, and must decide whether to travel by train or by plane. Participants were asked to defend traveling by train as it is the environmentally friendlier option. They were told that their counterpart was asked to

defend traveling by plane as it is faster and cheaper. This value conflict is an adapted version of a dispute used by Kouzakova et al. (2012) in their research on self-involvement and common ground in value conflicts.

Next, participants were explained that they would be discussing three aspects during the mediation session, namely, the environmental aspect, the financial costs and the issue of time. They were further given additional information about each of these aspects, which they could use to formulate and strengthen their arguments. The additional information for the environmental issue was as follows:

> Traveling by train is better for the environment than traveling by plane. Two other student union members will organize this student union trip next year. By traveling by train this year, you as leaders have the opportunity to set a good example of behaving in an environmentally conscious way. This behavior may be contagious and when other students organize the trip in following years they may choose to travel by train as well.

The additional information for the aspect of financial costs was:

> The train ticket costs €153 while the plane ticket costs €111. The student union budget is enough to cover the extra costs per student, so there is no reason to affect the environment for financial reasons. If the student union does not want to spend this money on the extra costs of traveling by train, the student union can raise the extra money to act in an environmentally conscious way.

Lastly, in terms of time, participants were told that:

> The train ride takes 12 hours while the plane ride takes three hours. The wait at the airport is not included in these three hours so traveling by plane takes longer than just the flight time. The time on the train can be used to bond and to do group activities, train rides can give a feeling of adventure.

Upon receiving this information, participants were given the time to write the arguments down on a sheet of paper next

to their computer. They were also encouraged to come up with their own additional arguments and were told that the better they defended their position, the better we could assess the new digital mediation model.

Subsequently, the mediation session began. Participants received a welcome message from the mediator who expressed a desire to resolve the dispute in three rounds. In the first round, the mediator gave the participant and the counterpart the opportunity to send their arguments on each of the three aspects in turn. Upon typing out and sending their arguments on one issue, participants received a message from the mediator communicating the argument of their counterpart on that same issue. Once this back and forth was accomplished for the environmental, financial and time issue, participants received a message from the mediator saying that the first round has come to an end and the second round will proceed shortly. In this message, the mediator was either angry or neutral, the anger or neutrality was either directed at the parties or the process and the mediator had either high power or low power. Participants exposed to a neutral high-power mediator directing the emotion towards the parties were told:

> Okay, that was the end of round 1. Before we go to round 2, I must say that the two of you are developing the disagreement in a standard way, the two of you are proceeding in a normal way. If we do not come to a solution, I will make the decision on whether the group will travel by train or by plane.

Those exposed to an angry high-power mediator directing the emotion towards the parties received the following message:

> Okay, that was the end of round 1. Before we go to round 2, I must say that the two of you are starting to irritate me, the two of you are not getting anywhere. If we do not come to a solution, I will make the decision on whether the group will travel by train or by plane.

Participants assigned a neutral high-power mediator directing the emotion towards the process were told:

> Okay, that was the end of round 1. Before we go to round 2, I must say that the way this is going is the standard way disagreements develop, this mediation session is proceeding in a normal way. If we do not come to a solution, I will make the decision on whether the group will travel by train or by plane.

Those assigned to an angry high-power mediator directing the emotion towards the process read:

> Okay, that was the end of round 1. Before we go to round 2, I must say that the way this is going is starting to irritate me, this mediation session is not getting anywhere. If we do not come to a solution, I will make the decision on whether the group will travel by train or by plane.

Participants exposed to a neutral low-power mediator directing the emotion towards the parties were told:

> Okay, that was the end of round 1. Before we go to round 2, I must say that the two of you are developing disagreement in a standard way, the two of you are proceeding in a normal way. If we do not come to a solution, no decision will be made on whether the group will travel by train or plane.

Those exposed to an angry low-power mediator directing the emotion towards the parties received the following message:

> Okay, that was the end of round 1. Before we go to round 2, I must say that the two of you are starting to irritate me, the two of you are not getting anywhere. If we do not come to a solution, no decision will be made on whether the group will travel by train or plane.

Participants exposed to a neutral low-power mediator directing the emotion towards the process read:

> Okay, that was the end of round 1. Before we go to round 2, I must say that the way this is going is the standard way disagreements develop, this mediation session is proceeding in a normal way. If we do not come to a solution, no decision will be made on whether the group will travel by train or plane.

Finally, those assigned an angry low-power mediator directing the emotion towards the process were told:

> Okay, that was the end of round 1. Before we go to round 2, I must say that the way this is going is starting to irritate me, this mediation session is not getting anywhere. If we do not come to a solution, no decision no decision will be made on whether the group will travel by train or plane.

After receiving this message participants were invited to the second round, where they were asked to react to their counterpart's arguments of the previous round and summarize all their main arguments in one message. Upon sending this message they received a summary from their counterpart. After they read their counterpart's summary, participants were told the mediator is determining how best to proceed. Then the mediator sent a similar message as outlined above, only with more emphasis on the emotion. For example, an angry high-power mediator directing the anger towards the people said:

> After reading both of your summaries I must say that the two of you are really making me angry, the two of you are really not getting anywhere. If we do not come to a solution after round three, I will decide on whether the group will travel by train or by plane.

Prior to moving on to round three, the mediator told the participants that he would like to ask them some questions about how they think the rest of the mediation session would go. Here, all the dependent variables were measured and round three was not held as participants were debriefed and rewarded for the participation.

Dependent Measures

To examine the effects of mediator-expressed anger we measured participants' open-mindedness, conflict handling behaviors, willingness to come to a type of outcome, perception of their counterpart, perception of the mediator, mediator rating and the mediation model rating. Unless otherwise stated, all dependent variables were measured on 7-point Likert scales, where higher values indicate higher intention.

Open-mindedness

The dependent variable of open-mindedness was measured by a 5-item scale (α = .81) validated in previous research (Rexwinkel et al., 2012). An example of an item assessing participants' open-mindedness is "I am open to the arguments of the other person" *(not at all)* to 7 *(very much)*.

Conflict Handling Behaviors

The conflict handling behaviors were measured by an adaptation of the Dutch Test for Conflict Handling (Janssen & Van de Vliert, 1996; for validation issues see De Dreu et al., 2001). This scale measures five distinct conflict handling behaviors by means of four items for each behavior. All items were measured on a 7-point likert scale ranging from 1 *(not at all)* to 7 *(very much)*. The conflict handling behaviors include yielding (e.g., "To what extent would you give in to the wishes of the other party?", α = .85); compromise (e.g., "To what extent would you try to realize a middle-of-the road solution?", α = .93); problem-solving (e.g., "To what extent would you stand for your own and the other's goals and interests?", α = .86); avoiding (e.g., "To what extent would you avoid a confrontation about your differences?", α = .91) and forcing (e.g., "To what extent would you push your own point of view?" α = .85).

Outcomes

The conflict issue of this study allowed us to measure participants' willingness to accept four possible solutions. The solutions included a win-lose outcome (i.e., "To what extent would you be willing to accept an agreement where the group travels by train? 1 *(not at all)* to 7 *(very much)*); a lose-win outcome (i.e., "To what extent would you be willing to accept an agreement where the group travels by plane? 1 *(not at all)* to 7 *(very much)*); and two compromises (i.e., "To what extent would you be willing to accept an agreement where half of the group travels by train and the other half travels by plane? and "To what extent would you be willing to accept an agreement where on the way to Poland the group travels by train and on the way back to Amsterdam the group travels by plane?" 1 *(not at all)* to 7 *(very much)*). In addition, we provided participants with the opportunity to come up with their own solution by means of one open ended question (i.e., "Can you think of another agreement that you would be willing to accept? If so, can you describe this agreement?").

Perception of the Counterpart

Participants' perception of their counterpart was measured by the sociability, morality and competency scales developed by Leach, Ellemers and Barreto (2007). Sociability ($\alpha = .91$) was assessed by a 3-item scale (e.g., "So far, I find my counterpart likeable" 1 *(not at all)* to 7 *(very much)*). Morality ($\alpha = .82$) was measured by a 3-item scale (e.g., "So far, I find my counterpart sincere" 1 *(not at all)* to 7 *(very much)*). And competency ($\alpha = .90$) was measured by a 3-item scale (e.g., "So far, I find my counterpart competent" 1 *(not at all)* to 7 *(very much)*).

Perception of the Mediator

Participants' perception of the mediator was also measured by the above described sociability ($\alpha = .96$), morality ($\alpha = .90$) and competency ($\alpha = .93$) scales by Leach et al. (2007).

Mediator Rating

Participants' rating of the mediator ($\alpha = .94$) was measured by a 3-item scale (e.g., "How effective would you rate this mediator?" *(very ineffective)* to 7 *(very effective)*).

Mediation Model Rating

Participants' rating of the mediation model ($\alpha = .95$) was measured by a 3-item scale (e.g., "How effective do you find this online mediation model so far?" *(very ineffective)* to 7 *(very effective)*).

Manipulation Checks

The manipulation checks for emotion and target of emotion were each assessed by two items and the power of the mediator was measured by one item. Specifically, the emotion, angry vs. neutral, was measured by asking participants "To what extent was the mediator a neutral third party?" and "To what extent did the mediator show signs of anger during the mediation?" 1 *(not at all)* to 7 *(very much)*). The target of the emotion, parties vs. process, was assessed by asking participants "To what extent is the mediator angry at both you and your counterpart?" and "To what extent is the mediator angry at the way the mediation session is going?" 1 *(not at all)* to 7 *(very much)*). Finally, the power of the mediator was measured by asking participants "To what extent does the mediator have power over the decision on whether to travel by train or plane?" 1 *(not at all)* to 7 *(very much)*).

Results 4.1

Manipulation Checks

A one-way ANOVA with the participants' rating of the mediator's neutrality as dependent variable and emotion (angry vs. neutral) as between-participant factor yielded a main effect of emotion $F(1,182) = 55.00$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .23$, indicating that participants in the neutral condition rated the

mediator as more neutral (*M* = 5.81, *SD* = 1.35) than those in the angry condition (*M* = 4.03, *SD* = 1.86). Similarly, a one-way ANOVA with the participant's rating of the mediator's anger as dependent variable and emotion (angry vs. neutral) as between-participant factor yielded a main effect of emotion $F(1,182) = 458.75$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .72$. Participants in the angry condition rated the mediator as angrier (*M* = 6.33, *SD* = 1.25) than those in the neutral condition (*M* = 2.04, *SD* = 1.46).

To test the manipulation of the mediator's power, a one-way ANOVA with the participants' rating of the mediator's power as dependent variable and the mediator's power (high vs. low) as between-participant factor was conducted. Results showed a main effect of power $F(1,182) = 46.79$, $p < .001$, η2 = .21, indicating that participants in the high-power mediator condition rated the mediator as having more power (*M* = 4.28, *SD* = 1.89) than those in the low-power mediator condition (*M* = 2.46, *SD* = 1.72).

The manipulation checks of the target of the mediator's emotion did not yield significant results. A one-way ANOVA with the participants' perception on the extent to which the mediator's emotion was directed at the parties as dependent variable and the target of the emotion (parties vs. process) as between-participant factor showed no difference between the conditions $F(1,182) = 2.42$, $p = .12$. Similarly, a one-way ANOVA with the participant's perception on the extent to which the mediator's emotion was directed at the process as dependent variable and the target of the emotion (parties vs. process) as between-participant factor revealed no difference between the conditions $F(1,182) = 1.35$, $p = .25$. Participants exposed to a mediator expressing the emotion towards the parties did not rate the target of the mediator's emotion significantly differently than those exposed to a mediator expressing the emotion towards the process.

It can be concluded that the manipulation of the target of the mediator's emotion was unsuccessful. Considering this result, the factor of target was excluded from the remaining analyses.

Dependent Measures

The results of the means of the dependent measures across conditions are shown in Table 4.1. The findings that yielded significant results are discussed in more detail below.

Conflict Handling Behaviors

A series of univariate analyses with the conflict handling strategies, emotion (angry vs. neutral) and mediator power (high vs. low) as between-participant factors revealed a significant interaction between power and emotion on the strategy of compromise $F(1,180) = 4.18$, $p < .05$, $\eta 2 = .02$. Independent samples t-test revealed that participants exposed to an angry mediator with low-power were more willing to compromise ($M = 5.60$, $SD = 1.01$) than participants exposed to an angry mediator with high-power ($M = 4.87$, $SD = 1.58$), t (74,8) = 2.62, $p < .05$. The results on compromise behavior of those exposed to a neutral mediator with high-power ($M = 5.24$, $SD = 1.38$) and low-power ($M = 5.15$, $SD = 1.44$) did not yield significant results. The ANOVA's on the other conflict handling strategies did not yield significant results.

Perception of the Counterpart

Univariate analyses with participants' rating of the sociability of the counterpart as dependent variable and emotion (angry vs. neutral) and mediator power (high vs. low) as between-participant factors revealed a significant interaction between emotion and power $F(1,176) = 10.15$, $p < .05$, $\eta 2 = .05$. Independent samples t-test showed that participants exposed to a high-power neutral mediator found

their counterpart to be more social (M = 4.14, SD = 1.26) than those exposed to a high-power angry mediator (M = 3.40, SD = 1.10). Further, independent samples t-test also revealed that participants exposed to a high-power neutral mediator rated their counterpart as more social (M = 4.14, SD = 1.26) than those exposed to a low-power neutral mediator (M = 3.49, SD = 1.07).

Perception of the Mediator

Univariate analyses with participants' perception of the mediator as dependent variable and emotion (angry vs. neutral) and mediator power (high vs. low) as between-participant factors revealed main effects of emotion across all variables. Specifically, participants exposed to an angry mediator evaluated the mediator as less social (M = 1.94, SD = 1.09) than those exposed to a neutral mediator (M = 4.27, SD = 1.43), $F(1,176) = 152.56$, $p < .001$, $\eta2 = .46$ Participants exposed to an angry mediator also evaluated the mediator as less moral (M = 3.43, SD = 1.55) than those exposed to a neutral mediator (M = 4.79, SD = 1.36), $F(1,176) = 39.32$, $p < .001$, $\eta2 = .18$. Similarly, those exposed to an angry mediator perceived the mediator as less competent (M = 2.68, SD = 1.43) than those exposed to a neutral mediator (M = 4.31, SD = 1.43), $F(1,176) = 58.54$, $p < .001$, $\eta2 = .25$.

Mediator Rating

Finally, a one-way ANOVA with participants' rating of the mediator as dependent variable and emotion (angry vs. neutral) and mediator power (high vs. low) as between-participant factors revealed a main effect of emotion $F(1,176) = 36.98$, $p < .001$, $\eta2 = .17$. Participants exposed to an angry mediator rated the mediator more negatively (M = 2.86, SD = 1.34) than those exposed to a neutral mediator (M = 1.78, SD = 1.01).

Table 4.1

Means and standard deviations of dependent variables across conditions.

	Neutral				Angry			
	Low power		High power		Low power		High power	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Open-mindedness	4.54	1.18	4.83	.97	4.56	1.16	4.33	1.25
Yield	4.15	1.23	4.47	.95	4.31	1.08	4.22	1.24
Compromise	5.15_{ab}	1.44	5.24_{ab}	1.38	5.60_{a}	1.01	4.87b	1.58
Problem-solving	5.20	.91	5.29	.90	5.29	.88	4.88	1.27
Avoidance	3.49	1.45	3.86	1.50	3.76	1.20	3.67	1.61
Forcing	3.80	1.30	4.14	1.26	4.14	1.29	3.97	1.27
Win-Lose outcome	6.33	.76	5.94	1.04	6.04	.99	6.09	1.16
Lose-Win outcome	3.93	1.58	4.35	1.28	4.18	1.35	4.04	1.52
Compromise outcome1	2.98	2.21	3.10	2.16	3.02	1.90	3.49	2.12
Compromise outcome2	5.30	1.80	4.88	2.04	5.11	1.68	5.49	1.69
Social counterpart	3.49_{a}	1.07	4.14b	1.26	3.79_{ab}	1.12	3.40_{a}	1.10
Moral counterpart	4.84	.96	4.85	1.03	4.79	1.09	4.54	1.11
Competent counterpart	3.75	1.16	4.31	1.29	4.06	1.27	4.03	1.57
Social mediator	4.10	1.43	4.44	1.43	2.07	1.26	1.80	.87
Moral mediator	4.79	1.47	4.79	1.26	3.24	1.54	3.63	1.55
Competent mediator	4.27	1.51	4.35	1.36	2.61	1.58	2.75	1.28
Mediator rating	2.73	1.32	2.99	1.36	1.73	1.09	1.83	.93

Note. *Means with different subscripts differ significantly at* $p < .05$

Discussion 4.1

As a first step to investigating the effects of mediator expressed-anger, we manipulated two factors, namely, the power of the mediator and the target of the anger. Based on the findings on disputant-expressed anger, it was hypothesized that an angry mediator with high power (as opposed to low) directing the anger at the mediation process (as opposed to the parties) would be most successful.

Contrary to the prediction however, the results show that parties exposed to a low-power angry mediator were more likely to compromise than those exposed to a high-power angry mediator. This finding is surprising, as previous research has shown that expressions of anger from low-power individuals are likely to lead to retaliatory anger and counterproductive behavior (Lelieveld et al., 2012) and not—as in this case—compromises. In previous research, it was expressions of anger from high-power individuals that tended to evoke fear among recipients who in turn conceded to avoid negative consequences. However, as previous findings are based on disputant behaviors in resource conflicts, Lelieveld et al. (2012) anticipated exceptions that may arise when the conflicts are particularly 'serious'. To that end, they hypothesized that during serious conflicts, disputants may not be sensitive to the negative consequences suggested by their counterpart's anger and power and may reciprocate regardless of their own and their counterpart's power position. Value conflicts—considering they typically are difficult to resolve—may also pose the effects of these 'serious conflicts'. If the conflict type justifies the finding however, a low-power mediator expressing anger should not evoke compromise behavior from disputants but, instead should experience similar counterproductive behaviors as a high-power angry mediator would, since the serious issue at hand would trump all customary reactions to anger and

power positions. The difference perhaps can be found when considering that disputants who display anger in 'serious conflicts', regardless of their power, do not make a decision on the outcome of the negotiation. High power mediators who display anger on the other hand, do have the ability to make a binding decision. As such, high power angry mediators might be perceived as doing 'too much' or 'crossing the line'. In that respect, parties may be more willing to compromise when exposed to a low power angry mediator who does not—in addition to being angry—also express power on- and control of the outcome.

Further results showed that angry mediators were rated as less social, less moral and less competent than neutral mediators. Angry mediators were also rated more negatively than neutral mediators. These findings suggest that mediators with low-power who are on the verge of exhibiting anger should decide whether it is more important to be liked by the parties or to reach a compromise agreeement.

In addition to parties' perception of the mediator, the results also showed mediator-expressed anger influenced parties' perception of each other. Specifically, those exposed to high-power neutral mediators rated their counterpart as more social than those exposed to high-power angry mediators. This finding contradicts research on the common enemy effect that emerges in resource conflicts when hostile mediators, through their expressed anger, promote a willingness to come to agreements by causing parties to feel more connected to each other and perceive one another more positively than do nice mediators (Zhang et al., 2017).

Limitations of this study include the failure of the target manipulation (i.e., anger directed towards the people or the mediation process). The failure of this manipulation could be due to the implicit meaning of anger when directed at the mediation process. Specifically, participants exposed to

anger directed at them personally were told that "the two of you are starting to irritate me" and "the two of you are not getting anywhere." Participants exposed to anger directed at the process were told that "the way this is going is starting to irritate me" and "this mediation session is not getting anywhere." It may be the case that participants exposed to a mediator expressing anger towards the process may have inferred that the reason the mediation session is proceeding in the manner in which it is, is precisely due to the way they are behaving. In this respect, participants exposed to a mediator expressing anger towards the process may have felt personally responsible for the manner in which the session was going and thus felt that the anger was directed at them personally. The distinction between the anger expressed specifically towards the people versus the process may not have been experienced.

Finally, by presenting our participants with a conflict scenario, a controlled setting was cultivated. All participants reacted to the same conflict issue. However, value conflicts are disputes concerning people's deeply held beliefs. People in conflict about their values truly identify with the issue at hand and are particularly self-involved. Placing participants in a predetermined conflict may not arouse the same emotions and behavioral intentions as conflicts that they have actually experienced or conflict issues that they truly identify with. In Study 4.2, we allow participants to recall a previously experienced value conflict and respond to the questionnaire with this dispute in mind.

Study 4.2

In Study 4.2, we investigated the impact of mediator-expressed anger by placing participants in a predetermined conflict. Although the use of fixed scenarios tends to minimize the presence of confounding variables, exposing

participants to value conflicts that they have not experienced firsthand may also decrease their sense of engagement. This may cause participants to respond with less intensity than if they were considering a self-experienced conflict. For this reason, in the present study, participants were asked to recall a previously experienced value conflict and consider this dispute when filling in the questionnaire.

Even though this approach may generate more authentic responses, it also results in a wide variety of conflicts, which may differ in numerous ways, such as conflict issues. As this study strictly investigates the impact of mediator-expressed anger on disputants in value conflicts, it is important that participants' self-experienced conflicts indeed contain a disagreement about values. To explore the extent to which the different conflicts may be characterized as value conflicts, we investigated two dimensions, specifically, the level of self-involvement and the content of the dispute.

Disputants in value conflicts tend to consider the issue non-negotiable (Tetlock et al., 2000). This headstrong attitude is often caused by the heightened emotional involvement experienced by disputants in value conflicts (Kouzakova et al., 2012), their specific self-identification with the issue and by the fact that disputants consider the topic personally important (Wade-Benzoni et al., 2002). In this research, self-involvement is considered to be composed of emotional involvement, self-identification and the importance of the topic. As disputants in value conflicts tend to be particularly self-involved, resolving the dispute may become considerably difficult. By measuring self-involvement, we can assess if its relationship with intended attitudes and conflict handling behaviors corresponds with those typically found in value conflicts.

Another way to explore the extent to which the different self-experienced conflicts pertain to the category of value

conflicts is by examining the content of the disputes. By categorizing the different conflicts according to the five foundations of morality (Haidt & Joseph, 2008), we assessed the values that were at stake in each dispute.

By means of the above-described approach, we investigated the extent to which the target of the mediator's anger and the power of the mediator influenced the impact of mediator-expressed anger on disputants in value conflicts.

Method 4.2

Participants and Design

Participants were 114[8] students from Leiden University (137 females, 48 males, *M*age = 20,15, *SD* = 2.28). The majority of participants were Dutch (*N* = 97), while other participants were western Europeans and from the Caribbean, among others. Participants were recruited on Leiden University's social sciences campus and by the university's online participation sign-up tool. Upon completion of the experiment, participants were compensated with €3 or 1 course credit.

A 2 (mediator emotion: anger vs. neutral) x 2 (emotion target: people vs. process) between-participant design was used. Despite the failed manipulation check of the target factor in Study 4.1, we repeated the same manipulation to test whether it would be successful in a different sample and different scenario (i.e., self-experienced value conflicts). Further, although we manipulated the mediator power in Study 4.1, we did not assess whether participants indeed perceived the mediator with high-power (i.e., the mediator who decided the outcome should the case fail) as indeed powerful. For this reason, in the present study, instead of manipulating the mediator's power, we measured their perceived power.

[8] The study originally included 122 participants. Eight participants have not experienced a value conflict and were instructed to consider a hypothetical scenario when responding to the questions. These participants were excluded from all analyses.

Procedure

Upon arriving in the laboratory participants were assigned to a private cubicle where they completed the questionnaire on a computer. They were told that the present study aimed to investigate how people deal with value conflicts. After they were given a definition of value conflicts, participants were asked to think of a general dispute about values that they have heard on the news or from family members and friends. Subsequently, participants read four examples of value conflicts that occur in society. These examples included conflicts where the president of a fraternity has ended the membership of a homosexual fraternity member because of his sexual orientation; where a teacher forbids a student from wearing a catholic necklace of Jesus on the cross while at school; where one neighbor feels that loud noise and visitors after 10 o'clock is unacceptable while the other neighbor is accustomed to loud noise and visitors late at night; and where a soccer coach refused to include a female soccer player to a (male) team because of her gender.

After reading these examples, participants were asked to think of an unresolved value conflict that they have experienced in the past. After describing this value conflict, they were asked to imagine that—together with their counterpart—they approached a mediator to assist them in resolving the dispute. Then, participants were given a similar message from the mediator as described in detail in Study 4.1, only the power factor was not included in the text (i.e., "I will make a decision" / "no decision will be made"). For example, an angry mediator directing the anger towards the people said: "Before we continue this mediation session, I must say that the two of you are starting to irritate me, the two of you are not getting anywhere." After reading this message, participants were asked a number of questions related to their attitudes and intended behaviors during such a mediation session.

Dependent Measures

The dependent measures included the following variables used and described in Study 4.1: open-mindedness (α = .83); conflict handling strategies (yield (α = .84), compromise (α = .96), problem-solving (α = .92), avoidance (α = .89), forcing (α = .88)); perception of the counterpart (social α = .91; moral α = .93; competent α = .93); perception of the mediator (social α = .96; moral α = .90; competent α = .94); and mediator rating (α = .89).

Outcomes

Further, we measured participants' willingness to reach four types of outcomes, specifically, compromise ("To what extent would you be willing to resolve this conflict with a compromise outcome, where both you and your counterpart give in a little?") 1 *(not at all)* to 7 *(very much)*); win-lose ("To what extent would you be willing to resolve this conflict with a win-lose outcome, where you receive your demands and your counterpart does not receive his or her demands? 1 *(not at all)* to 7 *(very much)*); lose-win ("To what extent would you be willing to resolve this conflict with a lose-win outcome, where your counterpart receives his or her demands and you do not receive your demands?" 1 *(not at all)* to 7 *(very much)*); and win-win ("To what extent would you be willing to resolve this conflict with a win-win agreement where you and your counterpart both receive your demands?" 1 *(not at all)* to 7 *(very much)*).

Mediator Power

Additionally, we measured the perceived power of the mediator by a 3-item scale (α = .91). An example of an item is "During the mediation session, to what extent would you feel the mediator has power over the outcome of the mediation?" 1 *(not at all)* to 7 *(very much)*).

Content Analysis

Participants' conflicts were analyzed and assigned to one of the five foundations of intuitive ethics (Haidt & Joseph, 2008). These foundations include the categories of harm/care, fairness/reciprocity, ingroup/loyalty, authority/respect, and purity/sanctity. Two researchers independently assigned the 114 different conflicts to one of the five categories. The result of this initial categorizing was compared and inconsistencies were discussed. In cases where no consensus was achieved, a third researcher was asked to make the final decision as to the category a given conflict pertained to.

Self-involvement

The self-involvement scale consisted of three items (α = .73), with each item measuring one of the abovementioned characteristics. Specifically, respondents' emotional involvement was assessed by one item: "I was emotionally involved in the conflict" 1 *(not at all)* to 7 *(very much)*. The extent to which respondents' identified with their views on the issue at hand (i.e., centrality) was verified by one item: "I identify myself with my standpoint on this topic" *(not at all)* to 7 *(very much)*. Lastly, the importance of the conflict topic was measured by one item: "I find the topic of the conflict personally important" *(not at all)* to 7 *(very much)*.

Manipulation Checks

The manipulation checks for emotion and target were each assessed by the same items used in Study 4.1. Specifically, the emotion, angry vs. neutral, was measured by asking participants "To what extent was the mediator a neutral third party?" and "To what extent did the mediator show signs of anger during the mediation?" 1 *(not at all)* to 7 *(very much)*). The target of the emotion, parties vs. process, was assessed by asking participants "To what extent is the mediator angry

at both you and your counterpart?” and “To what extent is the mediator angry at the way the mediation session is going?” 1 *(not at all)* to 7 *(very much)*).

Results 4.2

Content Analysis

Table 4.2 shows how the 114 conflicts were categorized among the five foundations of intuitive ethics. The majority of the disputes pertained to the foundation of fairness and reciprocity. The relevant virtues in this foundation are justice, fairness, honesty and trustworthiness (Haidt & Joseph, 2008). One participant described a conflict about fairness and reciprocity with the neighbors:

> A conflict with my father’s neighbors who are from Syria, they often invite family members over and play loud music until late in the night and they are also loud. This is frustrating especially for my father and stepmother who—due to their irregular schedules—retire to bed early to go to work the next day. A confrontation between my stepmother and the neighbors led to a fierce quarrel where the father of the neighbors reacted aggressively. My father and stepmother decided to no longer seek contact with them but the conflict is still ongoing.

Twenty-seven participants described a conflict about purity and sanctity. The virtues and vices pertaining to this foundation are temperance, chastity, piety, cleanliness and lust (Haidt & Joseph, 2008). One participant experienced such a conflict with a roommate:

> One of my roommates did not want to us to accept a girl to be our new roommate because she belonged to a religious sorority. My roommate believed the girl would therefore not be pleasant. I thought she would fit perfectly in our house and I did not believe her membership to the sorority described who she was as a person.

The third most described conflict pertained to the foundation of authority and respect. The vices and virtues of this foundation are obedience, deference and disobedience.

Haidt and Joseph (2008) give an example of a conflict pertaining to this category when two students disagree on if and to what extent immigrants should respect the traditions of the country they immigrate to. Indeed, one participant in our study encountered such a conflict with a potential employer: *"I was not hired at a clothing store because I wore a hijab, [the reason] was confessed to me."*

The foundation of ingroup loyalty encompasses disputes concerning loyalty, patriotism, self-sacrifice, treason and cowardice (Haidt & Joseph, 2008). One of our participants experienced a conflict about ingroup loyalty in a political setting: *"I always thought that as the leader of a political party it is more important to get things done than to keep the entire party satisfied. I suffered the consequences of this."*

Only four participants described conflicts pertaining to the foundation of harm and care. The virtues and vices of this foundation are caring, kindness and cruelty. One participant described a conflict about proper upbringing:

> A conflict between my mother and I. She was quizzing my smaller brother in a strict and stressed manner and she insisted on the importance of scoring high on the test. But is this the best way to teach someone something? I really don't think so. I thought my mother handled the situation completely incorrectly and I also told her this. I am worried that—because of my mother's strict methods—my brother will begin to despise homework/school and it is not a good way to learn something. I believe that assistance with homework should occur in a fun, trustworthy manner, otherwise you might as well not do it at all.

Table 4.2

Participants' previously experienced value conflicts categorized among the five foundations of intuitive ethics (N = 114)

Five foundations of intuitive ethic	*N*
Fairness/Reciprocity	56
Purity/Sanctity	27
Authority/Respect	18
Ingroup/Loyalty	9
Harm/Care	4

Exploratory Analysis

To analyze the extent to which participants' self-involvement is related to their attitudes and behavioral intentions, Pearson correlations between self-involvement and the dependent variables were conducted (Table 4.3). As mentioned previously, self-involvement includes participants' emotional involvement, identification with their views on the topic and how personally important they consider the topic. People in conflict about deeply held values tend to be particularly self-involved making them less willing to exhibit productive conflict handling behaviors. Indeed, Pearson correlations showed that the more self-involved participants were, the less open-minded they were (r = -.24, p < .01), the less they were willing to yield (r = -.31, p < .01), and the more they were willing to force their views on their counterpart (r = .23, p < .05). Such behavioural intentions are consistent with those typically found among people in value conflicts.

Table 4.3

Pearson correlations between dependent variables

Dependent variables	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.
1. Self-involvement	-	-.24**	-.31**	-.03	.06	-.09	23*
2. Open-mindedness			74**	.49**	50**	.10 .	-.32**
3. Yielding				58**	.48**	.24**	-.31**
4. Compromising					.67**	39**	-.41**
5. Problem solving						25**	-.25**
6. Avoiding							-.15
7 Forcing							

N = 101

**p* < .05, ***p* < .01

Manipulation Checks

A one-way ANOVA with the participants' rating of the mediator's neutrality and emotion (angry vs. neutral) as between-participants factors yielded a main effect of emotion $F(1,113) = 15.02$, $p < .001$, $\eta 2 = .12$. Participants in the neutral condition rated the mediator as more neutral ($M = 5.25$, $SD = 1.17$) than those in the angry condition ($M = 4.10$, $SD = 1.70$). Further, a one-way ANOVA on the participant's rating of the mediator's anger and emotion (angry vs. neutral) as between-participants factors yielded a main effect of emotion $F(1,113) = 121.54$, $p < .001$, $\eta 2 = .52$. Participants in the angry condition rated the mediator as angrier ($M = 5.36$, $SD = 1.24$) than those in the neutral condition ($M = 2.67$, $SD = 1.37$).

Similar to Study 4.1, the manipulation checks of the target of the mediator's emotion did not yield significant results. A one-way ANOVA with the participants' perception on the extent to which the mediator's emotion was directed at the parties as dependent variable and the target of the emotion (parties vs. process) as between-participant factor showed no difference between the conditions $F(1,113) = .03$, $p = .86$. Similarly, a one-way ANOVA with the participant's perception on the extent to which the mediator's emotion was directed at the process as dependent variable and the target of the emotion (parties vs. process) as between-participant factor revealed no difference between the conditions $F(1,113) = .34$, $p = .56$. The results show that participants exposed to a mediator expressing the emotion towards the parties did not rate the target of the mediator's emotion significantly differently than those exposed to a mediator expressing the emotion towards the process. As in Study 4.1, the manipulation of the target of the mediator's emotion was unsuccessful and this factor was therefore excluded from the remaining analyses.

Dependent Measures

Perceived Mediator Power

In contrast to Study 4.1, in the present study, the mediator's power was measured and not manipulated. The group was divided based on the median (4.0) of the perceived mediator power scale. Those who scored lower than the median (N = 55) were placed in one group (low-power mediator) and those who scored higher than the median (N = 60) were placed in another group (high-power mediator).

Open-mindedness

A one-way ANOVA with open-mindedness as dependent variable and emotion (angry vs. neutral) and perceived mediator power (high vs. low) as between-participant factors revealed a main effect of perceived mediator power $F(1,107) = 8.53$, $p < .01$, $\eta 2 = .07$. Participants who perceived the mediator as having high power were more open-minded (M = 4.68, SD = 1.04) than participants who perceived the mediator as having low power (M = 4.03, SD = 1.35).

Conflict Handling Strategies

Univariate analyses with the conflict handling strategies, emotion (angry vs. neutral) and perceived mediator power (high vs. low) as between-participant factors revealed a main effect of emotion on the strategy of forcing $F(1,107) = 9.09$, $p < .01$, $\eta 2 = .08$. Participants who were exposed to an angry mediator were more prepared to force their views on their counterpart (M = 4.51, SD = 1.11) than those who were exposed to a neutral mediator (M = 3.73, SD = 1.44).

The results also showed main effects of perceived mediator power on the strategies of yielding, compromise, problem-solving and avoidance. Specifically, participants who perceived the mediator as having high power were more willing to yield (M = 3.98, SD = 1.02) than participants who

perceived the mediator as having low power (*M* = 3.41, *SD* = 1.27), $F(1,107) = 7.60$, $p < .01$, η2 = .07. Similarly, participants who perceived the mediator as having high power were more willing to compromise (*M* = 5.16, *SD* = 1.22) than participants who perceived the mediator as having low power (*M* = 4.20, *SD* = 1.74), $F(1,107) = 11.18$, $p < .01$, η2 = .10. Further, participants who perceived the mediator as having high power were more willing to engage in problem-solving behavior (*M* = 5.30, *SD* = .88) than participants who perceived the mediator as having low power (*M* = 4.80, *SD* = 1.38), $F(1,107) = 4.77$, $p < .05$, η2 = .04. Moreover, participants who perceived the mediator as having high power were more willing to exhibit avoidance behavior (*M* = 4.00, *SD* = 1.40) than participants who perceived the mediator as having low power (*M* = 3.43, *SD* = 1.29), $F(1,107) = 5.09$, $p < .05$, η2 = .05.

Outcomes

Univariate analyses with the types of outcomes, emotion (angry vs. neutral) and perceived mediator power (high vs. low) as between-participant factors only revealed one main effect of perceived mediator power on the compromise outcome $F(1,107) = 7.72$, $p < .01$, η2 = .07. Participants who perceived the mediator as having high power were more willing to reach a compromise (*M* = 5.35, *SD* = 1.18) than participants who perceived the mediator as having low power (*M* = 4.55, *SD* = 1.91).

Perception of the mediator

Univariate analyses with the perception of the mediator, emotion (angry vs. neutral) and perceived mediator power (high vs. low) as between-participant factors revealed main effects of emotion across sociability, morality and competency. Specifically, participants exposed to an angry

mediator rated the mediator as less social (*M* = 2.73, *SD* = 1.28) than those exposed to a neutral mediator (M = 4.84, *SD* = .90), $F(1,107) = 107.62$, $p < .001$, η2 = .50. Similarly, participants exposed to an angry mediator rated the mediator as less moral (*M* = 4.53, *SD* = 1.36) than those exposed to a neutral mediator (*M* = 5.04, *SD* = .90), $F(1,107) = 5.19$, $p < .05$, η2 = .05. Further, participants exposed to an angry mediator rated the mediator as less competent (*M* = 3.49, *SD* = 1.51) than those exposed to a neutral mediator (*M* = 5.21, *SD* = .81), $F(1,107) = 60.90$, $p < .001$, η2 = .36.

The results also showed main effects of perceived mediator power across sociability, morality and competency. Specifically, participants who perceived the mediator as having high power rated the mediator as more social (*M* = 4.14, *SD* = 1.57) than those who perceived the mediator as having low power (*M* = 3.50, *SD* = 1.42), $F(1,107) = 6.48$, $p < .01$, η2 = .06. Further, participants who perceived the mediator as having high power rated the mediator as more moral (*M* = 5.02, *SD* = 1.10) than those who perceived the mediator as having low power (*M* = 4.56, *SD* = 1.21), $F(1,107) = 4.87$, $p < .05$, η2 = .04. Similarly, participants who perceived the mediator as having high power rated the mediator as more competent (*M* = 4.67, *SD* = 1.10) than those who perceived the mediator as having low power (*M* = 4.08, *SD* = 1.21), $F(1,107) = 4.79$, $p < .05$, η2 = .04.

Mediator rating

Univariate analyses with the overall rating of the mediator, emotion (angry vs. neutral) and perceived mediator power (high vs. low) as between-participant factors revealed a main effect of emotion $F(1,107) = 66.41$, $p < .001$, η2 = .38. Participants who were exposed to an angry mediator rated the mediator less positively (*M* = 2.76, *SD* = 1.33) than those exposed to a neutral mediator (*M* = 4.57, *SD* = 1.12).

A main effect of perceived mediator power was also found on mediator rating $F(1,107) = 66.41$, $p < .001$, $\eta 2 = .38$. Participants who perceived the mediator as having high power rated the mediator more positively ($M = 4.17$, $SD = 1.43$) than participants who perceived the mediator to have low power ($M = 3.19$, $SD = 1.46$).

The means and standard deviations of the dependent variables across conditions are shown in Table 4.4. Aside from the above discussed main effects, the remaining analyses did not yield any significant results.

Table 4.4

Means and standard deviations of dependent variables across conditions

	Neutral				Angry			
	Low power		High power		Low power		High power	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Open-mindedness	4.22	1.22	4.76	.94	3.69	1.52	4.57	1.09
Yield	3.59	1.21	4.01	1.10	3.00	1.31	4.02	.89
Compromise	4.26	1.87	5.18	1.27	4.00	1.66	5.05	1.28
Problem-solving	4.89	1.34	5.32	.95	4.67	1.53	5.18	.82
Avoidance	3.30	1.36	3.93	1.53	3.47	1.30	4.03	1.17
Forcing	4.01	1.63	3.56	1.30	4.83	1.24	4.24	.93
Win-Lose outcome	4.83	1.44	4.41	1.62	5.36	1.58	4.63	1.65
Lose-Win outcome	2.30	1.22	2.41	1.01	2.04	1.70	2.33	1.06
Compromise outcome	4.96	1.82	5.41	1.07	3.92	2.00	5.30	1.3
Win-Win outcome	5.61	1.31	6.24	.98	5.68	1.44	6.03	2 .96
Social counterpart	4.07	1.31	4.20	1.18	4.33	1.48	3.83	1.38
Moral counterpart	4.33	1.73	4.63	1.45	4.83	1.70	4.39	1.31
Competent counterpart	4.26	1.45	4.73	1.12	4.35	1.81	4.18	1.26
Social mediator	4.65	.93	4.96	.88	2.47	1.34	2.96	1.20
Moral mediator	4.96	.92	5.10	.90	4.21	1.45	4.80	1.25
Competent mediator	5.01	.80	5.32	.80	3.33	1.57	3.49	1.51
Mediator rating	4.10	1.19	4.86	.98	2.44	1.26	3.02	1.34

Discussion 4.2

By means of a similar model used in Study 4.1, in the present study the impact of mediator-expressed anger on participants' self-experienced value conflicts was investigated. It was hypothesized that mediators with high power expressing their anger towards the mediation process would be most successful. Much like in Study 4.1, the manipulation of the target of the anger was unsuccessful. This further suggests that in value conflicts, directing the anger towards the disputants or the issue is perceived as one and the same, possibly because values represent who we are. In line with our hypothesis, the results did show that mediators perceived to have high power tend to spark productive behaviours, more so than mediators perceived to have low power, regardless of their anger. Specifically, participants who perceived angry and neutral mediators to have high power were more open-minded, more willing to yield, compromise, behave in a problem-solving manner and avoid highlighting the differences between their views and the views of their counterparts than participants who perceived angry and neutral mediators to have low power.

In terms of the differences between angry and neutral mediators, the results show that participants exposed to an angry mediator were more willing to force their views on their counterparts than those exposed to neutral mediators. Considering high power mediators, regardless of their emotions, tend to foster productive behaviors from disputants, these findings seem to suggest they may enjoy a certain degree of liberty to express unconventional interventions such as the expression of anger. If disputants are open-minded, willing to compromise, yield, engage in problem solving and avoidance behavior and—by receiving anger from the mediator—tend to exhibit forcing behavior, a high-power mediator may still be able to resolve the dispute

considering the other productive behaviors at hand.

Another important factor mediators tempted to exhibit anger must consider is their own reputation. Replicating the findings in Study 4.1, the results showed that angry mediators were rated more negatively and were considered as less social, moral and competent than neutral mediators. However, regardless if they were angry or neutral, high power mediators were rated more positively and were considered more social, moral and competent than low power mediators. This suggests mediators with high power may again be able to afford exhibiting anger while overcoming the negative consequences of doing so.

Unlike Study 4.1, in Study 4.2 we made use of participants previously experienced value conflicts as opposed to a fixed value conflict. This method has its strengths as well as its weaknesses. On the upside, allowing participants to recall a previously experienced value conflict can increase their sense of self-involvement thereby generating more authentic responses. On the other hand, this method also brings possible confounding variables as the conflicts may differ in several ways, such as the degree of intensity and the nature of the counterparts. Moreover, the self-experienced conflicts described by our participants were also past conflicts, which may no longer be as relevant as an ongoing conflict. Nevertheless, the added results gained from utilizing previously experienced conflicts provide a more intricate picture of mediator-expressed anger. In the following discussion, we combine the results of Studies 4.1 and 4.2 to integrate them within the broader discussion of emotions expressed by third-parties in dispute resolution.

General Discussion

Distinguished mediators Daniel Bowling and David Hoffman noticed that a peaceful mindset enables them to

bring peace at the mediation table (Bowling & Hoffman, 2000). Similarly, Boulie (1996) identified 10 characteristics of successful mediators, the first three being empathy, patience and the ability to remain non-judgmental. Mediation handbooks instruct mediators to remain neutral (Susskind et al., 1999) and people intuitively believe that nice and neutral mediators are more likely to help disputants come to a resolution than hostile mediators (Zhang et al., 2017). Indeed, it may be counterintuitive to expect disputants—who are typically angry at their counterparts at worst or frustrated with the situation at best—to seek help from someone who will add fuel to fire with more anger. But what if displays of anger cause parties to behave more constructively in the mediation session, resulting in satisfactory settlements? Although not a conventional approach, research has discovered that mediators in value conflicts are currently exhibiting anger (Illes et al., 2014) while the impact of mediator-expressed anger has been investigated in resource conflicts (Zhang et al., 2017). With anger seemingly making its way to the mediator's toolbox, we conducted two studies exploring two factors related to mediator-expressed anger in value conflicts, namely, the power of the mediator and the target of the anger.

In Study 4.1, all participants considered the same value conflict, that is, a scenario that they have not personally experienced. In Study 4.2, participants considered a previously experienced value conflict. The resounding consistent finding across both studies indicates that if the mediator chooses to express anger, his or her reputation is likely to be at risk. Disputants in both studies rated angry mediators more negatively and perceived them to be less social, moral and competent than neutral mediators. This finding supports mediator instructions to remain neutral and empathetic (Susskind et al., 1999), and is consistent

with research showing hostile mediators were perceived as less competent than nice and neutral mediators (Zhang et al., 2017). Drawing on negotiation literature, this finding is also in line with research on the detrimental effects of anger on interpersonal liking—which has shown that, when faced with an angry counterpart, negotiators tended to develop a negative impression of the other compared to those faced with a happy or neutral opponent (Van Kleef et al., 2004a).

Although mediators who display anger may be building an unfavorable reputation, the results show that the mediator's power may have the ability to neutralize that effect. Specifically, high power mediators were rated more positively and considered more social, moral and competent than low power mediators, regardless if they were angry or not. The mediator's level of power also elicited different conflict handling behaviors among disputants. When a fixed value conflict was considered, angry mediators with low power led to more compromise behavior than angry mediators with high power (Study 4.1). When a previously experienced value conflict was considered however, high power mediators, regardless if they were angry or not, fostered a range of productive conflict handling behaviors (Study 4.2). Specifically, disputants facing high power mediators intended to be more open-minded, willing to yield, compromise and engage in problem solving and avoidance behavior than those faced with low power mediators. High power mediators also led participants to consider more compromising solutions than low power mediators. The negative consequence that both high and low power mediators were at risk of facing, specifically when they expressed anger, was forcing behavior. Taken together, these results suggest high (not low) power mediators may be in a better position to afford the costs of exhibiting anger in favor of the benefits elicited.

Theoretical Contributions

Most studies on the interpersonal effects of emotions in conflict and negotiation have primarily focused on how emotions, especially anger, expressed by negotiators shape the negotiation process (Van Kleef, 2008). Our study forms the second to show how displays of anger expressed by mediators impacts the mediation process. Whereas Zhang et al. (2017) investigated the impact of mediator-expressed anger in resource conflicts, the current research is the first to explore its effects in value conflicts. Although mediator-expressed anger was shown to positively influence negotiators' motivation and ability to resolve disputes about resources, our results point to a potential dark side of this controversial strategy when used in value conflicts. With disputants exposed to an angry mediator becoming more prepared to exhibit forcing behavior, we show that much like disputant-expressed anger in negotiation can lead to detrimental effects (Van Dijk et al., 2008), mediator-expressed anger can also backfire.

In line with the social-functional analysis of emotions (Keltner & Haidt, 1999), our findings show that mediator-expressed anger does impact the mediation process through the informational and behavioral effects of communicated emotions. In terms of the informational effects, negative emotions such as anger typically demand behavioral adjustment (Averill, 1982, Van Kleef et al., 2004a). In negotiation, disputants exposed to angry counterparts might make inferences about the other's position, such as high limits and dissatisfaction with the offer—which, under the right circumstances, should result in concessions out of fear (Van Dijk et al., 2008). Our findings contribute to this line of research by showing that in mediation, angry mediators who do not have control of the outcome can elicit behavioral adjustment in the form of compromise. This result mimics

findings in negotiation research showing that behavioral consequences brought about by displays of anger are dependent on the structural characteristics of the negotiation (Van Dijk et al., 2008), only in this case: the mediation.

Further, the present work extends perspectives on social roles as they relate to the functions of emotions (Frijda & Mesquita, 1994). Specifically, this theory posits that emotional expressions communicate whether or not the recipient deviated from social norms. Anger then, is used to ensure standard-confirming behavior (Averill, 1982). Although an angry mediator may be conveying to disputants that their behavior is unacceptable, disputants on the receiving end of anger in turn, may question the mediator's unexpected behavior. The perception that mediators may have violated standard-confirming behavior could be driving the negative ratings that disputants in both our studies awarded to angry mediators on all levels of measurement, including social and moral. By displaying anger in an effort to communicate deviation from the norm and fulfill social correction, a mediator may paradoxically be called on violating norms. Our findings flip the coin of social roles and the functions of emotions by illustrating how an entity in a position that requires a conduct free from emotional expression, may not be in a position to achieve social correction without being accused of the same infraction.

Our studies further build on the strategic value of emotional expression in dispute resolution by showing that in value conflicts, classic advice such as separating the people from the problem (Fisher & Ury, 1981) may not be feasible. Disputant-expressed anger in value conflicts has been found to be more successful when the anger is directed at the counterparts' behavior versus at them personally (Steinel et al., 2008). This has been attributed to the strategic information that behavior-oriented anger by disputants

communicate. Although this led us to infer that mediators who direct their anger towards counterparts' behavior, as opposed to towards them personally, would also be more successful, our findings show such separation might not be made when mediators are the ones expressing anger. Across both studies, participants did not perceive the mediators' anger directed at their behavior differently than the mediators' anger directed at them personally. As mediators are regarded to be patient and neutral third parties who are there to assist disputants as they come to a resolution, behavior-oriented anger may not have been perceived to be communicating any strategic information. Devoid of justification, anger directed towards disputants' behavior or towards them personally, may be perceived as committing the same act. In addition, as values represent who we are, an attack against our efforts to defend our values can be seen as an attack against us as people.

Moreover, previous research has demonstrated that hostile mediators in incentive-compatible resource conflicts were better able to support conflicting parties in making agreements than neutral or nice mediators, as disputants viewed each other more positively by turning the mediator into a common enemy (Zhang et al., 2017). Our findings suggest the common enemy effect may not develop once the issues no longer concern scarce resources but deeply held beliefs. In fact, disputants exposed to angry mediators perceived their counterparts to be less social than those exposed to neutral mediators. The underlying mechanisms specifically inherent to value conflicts may explain this development. In resource conflicts, disputants receiving anger from the mediator about their unwillingness to negotiate on their resources may bond over their identical behavior: fighting for the same thing (i.e., a bigger piece of the pie). Their sense of shared identity (Druckman & Olekalns, 2011) may become salient as they understand where they are both coming from. Disputants on

the receiving end of anger from a mediator in value conflicts on the other hand, may not conclude that the anger is directed at the same issue. Instead, disputants may question why they are receiving hostility for standing by what they believe is right. As their values are in stark contrast to those of their counterparts, disputants might feel that their counterparts are the ones who warrant hostility for not giving up on something that is, in their view, clearly wrong. As a result, anger in value conflicts may actually isolate disputants from their counterpart as opposed to bring them closer together against the mediator—which would have created the common enemy effect.

Practical Implications

On a practical level, mediators prepared to express outbursts of anger in an effort to promote flexibility among parties in value conflicts, may be best advised to do so only when they have high power. Although it should be noted that high power mediators may not need to express anger at all. Our findings showed high-power mediators fostered positive conflict handling behaviors as well as compromising outcomes, regardless if they were angry or not. Adding anger to the mix was found to incite forcing behavior from disputants. Granted, if a mediator feels the situation calls for a more forceful approach, given the benefits, a high-power mediator is more likely to afford the costs of mediator-expressed anger than a low-power mediator.

Another practical implication is related to the mediator's reputation. Angry mediators were rated more negatively and were considered less social, moral and competent than neutral mediators. In addition to low-power mediators, those who are in the beginning stages of their career and can benefit from positive word of mouth, may be better off refraining from using anger as a tactic in value conflicts.

Moreover, new perspectives in mediation literature are calling for the expansion of the present training and development of mediators, which currently focuses on two aspects of development: (1) enhancing the mediators' technical skills and (2) increasing their understanding of the theory behind the practice of mediation. A third aspect is proposed, namely, the mediators' personal characteristics (Bowling & Hoffman, 2000), which includes their presence of peace by *"being"* peace. Labels such as unsocial and immoral, awarded to mediators using anger as a tactic, may inhibit the development of their personal characteristics.

That being said, perhaps the most important theoretical and practical implication will present once (and if) mediator-expressed anger is formally adopted in mediation handbooks. As mentioned previously, mediators are trained to remain neutral when intervening in conflicts (Macfarlane, 2003). The only emotions they must manage are those expressed by the disputants. Our findings contribute to novel insights suggesting there is room for one more source of emotional expression at the mediation table, specifically, the mediator (Illes et al., 2014, Zhang et al., 2017).

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

One limitation of our experiments is found in the discrepancy between the manner in which we established the power of the mediator across the two studies. Specifically, in Study 4.1 (fixed value conflict), we manipulated the mediator's power by turning the mediator into an arbitrator (high-power) or by holding straight mediation (low-power). In Study 4.2 (previously experienced value conflict) however, we operationalized the mediator's power by measuring the extent to which participants perceived the mediator to have power, authority and control. This discrepancy should be factored in when digesting our findings on displays

of anger expressed by low and high-power mediators. To discern between bestowed power and perceived power, future research can combine these two approaches by manipulating the mediator's power through arbitration while simultaneously measuring the extent to which participants' feel the mediator has power, authority and control.

Furthermore, disputants' perception and rating of the mediator was measured right after the mediation session. In practice, clients may be asked to fill out an evaluation days or weeks after settlement. With an opportunity to reflect on their own behavior and the circumstances that prompted the mediator to become angry, people may deem the anger warranted. In addition, our experiments explored participants' intention to arrive at different types of outcomes. The nature of the final settlement, however, remained unknown. Yet, the outcome of the dispute may also impact how an angry mediator is evaluated. Specifically, coming to a mutually beneficial solution assisted by an angry mediator may be considered more favorably than making less desired agreements, such as a lose-lose outcome or no resolution, at the hands of a neutral mediator. In cases that were resolved, allowing participants to review the mediator at a later stage can also highlight the satisfactory resolution. Completing the evaluation with a full picture in mind might result in more positive ratings of the mediator. As we seek to better understand people's negative perception of angry mediators, it is important to explore the extent to which this disapproval lasts. Imagine parents getting angry while intervening between quarrelling siblings. After restoring peace, parents may find that their children are now angry at them. Those who have children might attest that the anger often declines with time. If the children are later asked whether they have good parents, it is likely the result of the exhibited anger (e.g., peaceful environment), the cause of the anger (e.g., bad behavior) and

their overall experience with their parents, will outweigh the anger experienced. Investigating factors such as time-lapse, the perceived merits of anger and the outcome of the dispute will further clarify the circumstances under which mediator-expressed anger can be effective.

In experimental studies, future research can investigate the role of time by sending participants the evaluation form 24 hours[9] after their participation. The perceived merits of anger can be established by first assessing disputants' understanding of what precisely made the mediator angry to begin with and whether they believe the anger is warranted. By including the final stage of mediation (i.e., the agreement) to the design, future research can determine the relationship between the type of outcome and satisfaction with angry mediators.

It should be noted here that we are assuming angry mediators are receiving negative ratings and have elicited forcing behavior by disputants because they have in turn also become angry, as social contagion suggests (Levy & Nail, 1993). However, being on the receiving end of what is perceived as unwarranted anger or an unexpected breach of professionalism can also spark other emotions such as fear, shock or disappointment. Research has shown that how people label their emotions can influence their evaluation of the situation which in turn impacts their behavioral reactions (Frijda & Mesquita, 1994). Moreover, studies have found differences in affective and behavioral reactions of disputants on the receiving end of disappointment versus anger from counterparts (Lelieveld et al., 2012). Considering disputants' emotional reactions to displays of anger by mediators can influence their intended conflict handling behavior, future research should aim to identify these in an effort to further assess the impact of mediator-expressed anger.

[9] Research has found anger typically lasts 24 hours (Verduyn & Lavrijsen, 2015).

Finally, one probable moderator of mediator-expressed anger that merits attention in future designs is that of gender. Our studies made no reference or indication that would suggest the mediator was male or female. However, previous research has consistently shown a gender bias when it comes to expressions of anger. For example, angry female leaders are considered less favorable than angry male leaders (Schaubroeck & Shao, 2012). Angry women are also considered less competent and are expected to receive less payment than angry males (Brescoll & Uhlmann, 2008). The fundamental attribution error has also been found in perceptions of anger among gender, with anger expressed by women typically being attributed to their personality, while anger expressed by males is attributed to external circumstances (Brescoll & Uhlmann, 2008). Disputants applying attribution error to angry female mediators will not perceive the emotional display as warranted but will instead conclude that that's just who the mediator is. These circumstances, which together are rooted in gender-role congruity theory (Tiedens, 2001), suggest that a female mediator may not be in the same position to overcome the possible negative consequences of expressing anger in the same way that their male colleagues would. In an experimental setting, by assigning a male mediator to half of the disputing parties and a female mediator to the other half, future studies can investigate the role of gender on mediator-expressed anger.

Conclusion

The present studies contribute to the limited work on anger expressed by mediators. Our results provide a first look at how this technique impacts disputants specifically in value conflicts. Although angry mediators are not considered favorable by disputants and can elicit forcing behavior, those

with high power were shown to also foster a range of positive conflict handling behaviors, regardless if they were angry or not. Despite its absence in mediation handbooks, as mediators currently utilize displays of anger, we in turn must continue to address this research practice-gap in conflict management literature. Drawing upon well-established insights on anger used as a strategic technique by conflicting parties, we can continue to explore the impact of anger coming from—not the other side—but the middle of the mediation table.