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Abstract

The present research examined the influence of self- and other-affirmation on the perceptions of a counterparty in a value conflict through the potential mediating effect of ‘openness to experience’ and ‘shared identity’. Participants evaluated a theoretical individual who held opinions and values opposite of the participant concerning ‘Black Pete’. They were to rate their behaviour towards this person in a potential negotiation and they evaluated the counterparty on multiple constructs. It was found that individuals in the other-affirmation condition were more motivated to negotiate, less inclined to force their own values, yielded more and evaluated the counterparty to be more cooperative, than did individuals in the self-affirmation condition. However, these effects were not mediated by either openness to experience or shared identity.
Conflict issues arise whenever a perceiver encounters any person in a situation that is a threat to one’s needs, interests or concerns (e.g. multiple social groups with the same interest). Discrimination, prejudice and stereotyping all are the escalating result of the tendency people have to form judgments about groups. This tendency is created as humans form certain perceptions of a counterparty (such as a threat to one’s needs), which is an important phenomenon in social sensitive issues especially during a value conflict. A value conflict is a problem that involves norms and values where there is no single correct answer. Individuals or groups can hold non matching positions due to different ideas about this issue and due to perceived value-differences, interpersonal or intergroup conflicts can occur. The essential question underlying the present research concerns the following: ‘Would participant’s perception about a conflict party be affected by a manipulation of self-affirmation and other-affirmation, through ‘openness to experience’ and ‘shared identity’?’.

Affirmation has to do with either reflecting upon others’ or own values. Rexwinkel, Ellemers and Harinck (2011) suggested that conflicting values may lead to a threat for the shared identity, which is a probable cause for interpersonal conflicts. They showed that a technique called ‘other-affirmation’ can give a feeling of shared identity due to acknowledging the other party has positive qualities (Rexwinkel et al., 2011). Other-affirmation is the phenomenon when somebody gives a positive judgment about someone else. Reflecting upon personal values - called ‘self-affirmation’ - reduces susceptibility to threats (Sherman & Cohen, 2002) and leads to more openness to information disconfirming one’s initial attitudes and beliefs, which leads to more conflict-solving behaviour and compromises in negotiations (Cohen et al., 2007). Though it seems affirmation techniques may help reducing conflicts, the link between the different kinds of affirmation and the reduction of negative perceptions of the counterparty in a given conflict situation has never been studied. In our opinion the findings of this study are important, as they may have
practical implications for restoring relations and preventing individuals or groups (holding different values) from getting into conflicts with each other.

**Mediating effects**

During a value conflict, there are two or more parties holding different attitudes and values, which causes one party to have certain perceptions about the other conflict party and vice versa. The valence of these perceptions (being positive or negative) are important to determine whether parties are willing to reach an agreement or not. The mediating effect of two phenomena that have been showed to have an conflict-reducing effect, but are never linked to perceptions about the counterparty, will be investigated in the current study.

At first, the level of ‘openness to experience’, which is one of the Big Five personality traits of Goldberg (1993) describing a degree of curiosity versus cautiousness, is argued to be a potential mediator in the effect of affirmation techniques on the perception about the counterparty. Previous studies have shown a connection between openness to experience and interracial attitudes (Cokley et al., 2010; Flynn, 2005). College students scoring high in openness to experience held more positive attitudes towards racial diversity (Cokley et al., 2010). In the interracial study, Whites that scored relatively high on openness to experience were less rigid in their use of stereotypes about Blacks and are more open to information that disconfirms the existing stereotype than those who scored low on this personality trait (Flynn, 2005). In the current study it is argued that this pattern could also be found in the evaluation of the counterparty in the value conflict that will be implemented here. Based on the findings of Cokley and colleagues (2010) and Flynn (2005), the first hypothesis is that participants who score high in ‘openness to experience’ will held more positive attitudes and evaluations towards the counterparty than participants who score low in ‘openness to experience’ in a value conflict (*hypothesis 1a*).
Secondly, the experience of shared identity and perception of common ground is measured as this concept is proven to decrease self-involvement, which is favourable in searching for a solution in conflicts. Kouzakova, Ellemers, Harinck and Scheepers (2012) showed that framing a conflict issue in terms of opposing values versus opposing interests had different effects on self-involvement and perception of common ground. Framed in terms of different values, a conflict elicited more violation of similarity expectations, and raises less perceived attitude similarity with the interaction partner (Kouzakova et al., 2012). Moreover, the experience of a value conflict induced more self-involvement and decreased perceived common ground compared with a conflict of interest. As an influence, this perception of less common ground or ‘low shared identity’ may be a potential cause for the escalation of conflicts. Therefore I suggest that reaching for more common ground (high level of ‘shared identity’) could prevent conflicts from escalating and maybe even have the potential to solve conflicting issues during for instance a negotiation between parties holding different values.

In the current study a value conflict will be implemented where participants are introduced to a counterparty who takes the opposite stand in the issue, and the expectation is to see an effect in perceived shared identity and common ground when the participant takes either a positive or negative stand. Based on the findings of Kouzakova and colleagues (2012) that people perceive less shared identity and common ground when they learn their stand in the issue is opposite with the counterparty (who hold other values), I expect that high perceived shared identity is correlated with more problem-solving behaviour, while low perceived shared identity is related to a lower willingness to adjust one’s opinion and less cooperative behaviour, plus negative evaluations of the counterparty (hypothesis 1b).

With the explanation of involving ‘openness to experience’ and ‘shared identity’ into the solution of resolving conflicts, the variable I am most interested in will now be discussed: affirmation.
Self-affirmation

The self-affirmation theory (Steele, 1988) proposes that people have the basic need for self-integrity (concept of an integration of ideals and beliefs, where the self is seen as a good, moral person) and that this can be protected from threats by reflecting on other important values, to maintain the perceived self-integrity. This motivation to maintain self-integrity can be so powerful, that people resist information that threatens their personal beliefs, integrity and self-worth (Sherman & Cohen, 2002). According to Sherman and Cohen (2002), people have a self-regulatory system to maintain the perceived self-integrity and self-worth which can be regulated by self-affirmation directly (e.g. dismissing attitude-disconfirming evidence) or indirectly (e.g. draw upon alternative sources of self-integrity such as a valued trait that is not necessarily related to the current conflict context).

Cohen and colleagues (2007) proved that self-affirmation increased openness to information, ideas and courses of action when a particular unrelated characteristic of the person (part of identity) was made salient. Once self-affirmation was induced by reflecting on a specific trait or value important to the person, he or she was more critical about arguments that confirmed their views on the discussed issue (abortion) and felt less threatened by evidence that attacked their attitudes, than those who were in the non-affirmative condition (Cohen, Aronson, & Steele, 2000). This suggest that people are more open to information that they would otherwise resist because of the threat to self-integrity and their sense of identity, a phenomenon called ‘disconfirmation bias’. Disconfirmation bias refers to the tendency for people to be extremely critical towards information which contradicts their prior beliefs, while uncritically accept information that confirms their beliefs (Edwards & Smith, 1996). So, people seem relatively unbiased in assimilation of new information after self-affirmation.

Despite this increased open-mindedness and the decreased disconfirmation bias in the negotiation and compromise resulted by induced self-affirmation (Cohen et al., 2007), there is
no research that linked self-affirmation with perceptions about the counterparty. Therefore this will be addressed in the current study, by stating that negative perceptions about the counterparty during a value conflict can be decreased by self-affirmation through more openness to information and openness to experience. We expect that self-affirmation will result in a more positive evaluation about the counterparty through openness to experience (mediator), compared to the non-affirmation condition (*Hypothesis 2*).

**Other-affirmation**

When reflecting upon values of the other party and confirming that they have certain valued qualities, one uses other-affirmation (Rexwinkel et al., 2011). Other-affirmation can include emphasising positive behaviours of the other party, as well as confirming characteristics that are not directly related to the current conflict issue (Harinck & Druckman, *In Press*). It can lead to one perceiving the other is like him- or herself (‘shared identity’) and determine whether conflicts are seen as a common problem which needs to be solved by cooperation (Rexwinkel et al., 2011). It can also increase empathy or sympathy for the counterparty as this party might become less threatening by confirming certain qualities, which could be beneficial for conflict reduction (Harinck & Druckman, *In Press*).

Rexwinkel and colleagues (2011) suggested that value conflicts could be solved by confirming the shared identity through other-affirmation. Participants were instructed to describe a personally experienced value conflict that they had with someone. In the other-affirmation condition, participant had to describe a valued quality of the person they had the conflict with. Results showed that people in the other-affirmation condition experienced more shared identity and were more open to arguments of the other party than the two other conditions (Rexwinkel et al., 2011). They also had a higher intention to show cooperative behaviour, suggesting that other-affirmation leads to more openness and willingness to solve the conflict together (Rexwinkel et al., 2011; Harinck & Druckman, *In Press*).
Other-affirmation seems to benefit negotiations intended to solve value conflicts because other-affirmation negotiators not only indicated more cooperative problem solving behaviour (pro-social behaviour), but also show reduced defensiveness in their opinion in the value conflicts (Harinck & Druckman, In Press). This would also be a favourable effect for conflict reduction. Following this previous research, we expect that other-affirmation will results in more positive evaluations of the counterparty through the mediating effect of perceived shared identity, compared to the non-affirmation condition (Hypothesis 3).

**Self-affirmation versus other-affirmation**

In the study of Rexwinkel and colleagues (2011), participants were randomly assigned in either the other-affirmation condition (had to think about positive qualities of their counterpart in the conflict), self-affirmation condition (had to think about positive qualities of themselves) or in the control condition (had to think about a neutral topic). People in the other-affirmation condition showed higher open-mindedness and shared identity, higher intentions of problem solving and compromising compared to the self-affirmation and control condition. According to Rexwinkel and colleagues (2011), self-affirmation – in contrast to other-affirmation – gives a threat to shared identity, which leads to the use of a defensive strategy in the interaction with the counterparty.

Following from this, self-affirmation may lead to people being more rigid in their own beliefs (despite that it may increase openness), and less willing to cooperate and solve the conflict. This is undesirable in (value) conflicts, as cooperation is often the key to solving conflicts. Other-affirmation however, seemed to be more favourable as it led to being less rigid (Rexwinkel et al., 2011). Other-affirmation may also increase the liking of the other party due to the perceived shared identity and common ground, and increase the cooperative intentions towards that party. Despite of the fact that we hypothesize that self-affirmation leads to a higher openness to experience, we believe that this score may be even higher in the
other-affirmation condition as rigidity may be reduced here. So our last hypothesis in this study is: Other-affirmation leads to more positive evaluations of the counterparty due to higher openness to experience, less rigidness and higher perceived shared identity, than self-affirmation (Hypothesis 4).

**Current study**

In the current research, four hypotheses will be tested in the context of a value conflict. Value conflicts are difficult to solve, because people get rigid in their beliefs and a compromise may feel as a threat to self-worth (Harinck & Druckman, *In Press*; Harinck, De Dreu, & Van Vianen, 2000). I argue that positive or negative perceptions about the other party will be especially visible during value conflicts, as socially sensitive issues have proven to entail different attitudes and emotions towards the counterparty (Hewstone et al., 2002), for instance when race is involved (Fazio, 1997).

A conflict is introduced where people can differ about values (value conflict) and can discuss the issue with a counterparty, namely the “Zwarte Pieten Discussie”. For Dutch people this is a well-known issue that has often been in the media last year. We will measure the perceptions about the counterparty explicitly by self-reports and not implicitly (by for example the implicit association test), because we want to see if evaluations of the counterparty in the value conflict discussion change after the manipulation. Because there is no demonstrably correct answer of the brought up value problem, we argue that there is no pressure to conform to socially desirable or politically correct norms (which is relevant in implicit measures).

Before analyzing my hypotheses, a simple model was constructed that illustrates the relationships (arrows) that will be investigated in this study (see Figure 1).
Figure 1. Model of the relationship between affirmation conditions and the perception about the counterparty.

Method

Participants and design

There were 85 participants in this quasi-experimental study, mostly students from the Leiden University (23 males, 62 females, mean age 22.22). The majority of the participants were native Dutch people (74.1%) and 1.2% Moroccan, 2.4% Turkish, 5.9% Surinamese, and 16.5% filled in an alternative ethnic background. Except for one case (who finished Middelbaar algemeen voortgezet onderwijs), every participant (98.8%) had finished higher education (i.e. Hoger algemeen en voorbereidend wetenschappelijk onderwijs, Hoger beroepsonderwijs or Wetenschappelijk onderwijs). The sample was very homogeneous concerning education and age. One requirement in this study was that every participant was able to read and speak Dutch. This experiment was followed by another experiment, unrelated to this study, so that the total duration was approximately 45 minutes. As a reward, participants either earned 2 credits (required for a course for first grade students) or 4,50 Euros for these studies combined.

The study involved a value conflict issue (“Zwarte Pieten Discussie”) where participants chose to take a certain position (in favour of keeping Zwarte Piet vs. in favour of
eliminating Zwarte Piet) and were introduced to a counterparty who had the opposite stand of
the participant, followed by a manipulation of affirmation. The study was a between-persons
design with three conditions (self-affirmation vs. other-affirmation vs. non-affirmation) and
participants were randomly assigned to one of these three conditions (respectively 30, 28, and
27 participants in each cell). The main dependent variables were the perception about the
counterparty (measured by multiple evaluation scales), ‘openness to experience’ and ‘shared
identity’.

**Procedure**

The study took place in the laboratory (videolab) at the University of Leiden. Before
the study started, participants read information about what the research was globally about
(without jeopardizing data collection) and then filled out an informed consent form (see
Appendix I), which informed the reader that data collected through this study are confidential
and kept anonymous. Furthermore, participants were informed about the global procedure of
the research and told there were no risks of physical or psychological injury. The duration of
this study and the study that followed after this were also in this informed consent. Lastly,
participants were made aware of their right to stop participating in the study at all times. Once
the participant had signed the informed consent – thereby agreeing on the terms – the study
started. The participant was brought to a small room with a laptop, where the individual
would not be distracted. From now on, all instructions were given by the computer.

In the first phase of the current study, participants were asked to answer some general
questions that served as control measures, such as age and nationality (see Appendix A).
Next, a questionnaire with 37 statements concerning personality traits started, which served as
a measure of Openness to Experience (see Appendix B). Following this, the participant was
introduced with the value conflict “Zwarte Piet” in the form of a short questionnaire (see
Appendix C). In this questionnaire, the participant was asked if he or she is familiar with this
subject of conflict and had to decide whether he or she stands positive or negative towards
this issue. By checking the box that was in line with their stand, participants were now automatically linked with either a counterparty in favour of eliminating Zwarte Piet or a counterparty in favour of keeping Zwarte Piet in the Sinterklaas festivities, in the phase that followed.

After this short questionnaire, participants were informed that in earlier research opinions and arguments had been collected concerning the Zwarte Pieten Discussie, and that in the next few minutes they were going to read the response of ‘Kees’ – a participant from this earlier research¹. With Kees his own stand and attitudes towards the concerning issue, a value conflict was created as participants read a response with opinions and arguments opposite of their own stand: depending on whether the participant selected to be in favour of keeping Zwarte Piet or in favour of eliminating Zwarte Piet, Kees had the opposite stand in the discussion (both responses of Kees can be found in appendix D).

In the next part of the study participants went through the affirmation manipulation. When the participant read the response of Kees and clicked further, the participant now at random got instructions belonging to either the self-affirmation, other-affirmation or non-affirmation condition. In the self-affirmation condition, participants were asked to write down an experience where they did something good or felt good about oneself. This condition makes certain qualities of oneself cognitively available and increases the feeling of self-worth, according to Sherman and Cohen (2002). In the other-affirmation condition, participants were asked to write down a positive quality of Kees (the counterparty in the “Zwarte Pieten Discussie”). In the non-affirmation condition, participants were asked to describe their favourite holiday (see Appendix E).

¹ In reality there was no earlier inventory research where one of these responses was that one from Kees. This response was entirely fictional. One response was created for the condition where the participant selected to be in favour of keeping Zwarte Piet: Kees was in favour of eliminating Zwarte Piet from the Sinterklaas festivities. And one response was created for the condition where the participant selected to be in favour of eliminating Zwarte Piet: Kees was in favour of keeping Zwarte Piet in the Sinterklaas festivities.
After this manipulation, participants were instructed to think back at the response of Kees. A situation was sketched out where the participant and Kees together formed the directors at an elementary school and that a negotiation was planned where they needed to agree on whether Zwarte Piet must take part in the Sinterklaas festivities at this elementary school or not. With this in mind, participants filled in an evaluative questionnaire that reflected on their expectations in a future negotiation. This questionnaire consisted of three components: questions regarding their own behaviour and stand (part 1), opinion of the counterparty (part 2) and one open question where the participant had to write down his/her opinion about the group this counterparty represented (part 3) (see Appendix F). This questionnaire served as a measure of perceptions about the other conflict party after manipulation. Besides this measure, the degree of experienced ‘shared identity’ was also measured. This was done by the Inclusion of Other in the Self Scale (IOS) (Aron, Aron, & Smollan, 1992) where the participant was instructed to choose one of six pictures that best described the current relationship with their counterparty (see Appendix G). These measurements formed the last part of the research. When participants finished this, they were instructed to open the door of the cubicle.

Study 1 ended here and the second study that was combined but unrelated followed directly after the current study. In the ending phase (after the second study was also finished), participants were asked to answer the question “Waar denk jij dat het onderzoek over ging?” which was the check whether the participant had suspicions about the true intent of the study beforehand (suspicion check). Next, participants were debriefed about both studies (see Appendix J) and got the opportunity to leave their e-mail address to stay informed about the results of the research. Finally, they were thanked for their participation and rewarded with credits or money (participants were to choose).

**Affirmation**
Participants were randomly assigned to one of three conditions of the affirmation-manipulation: self-affirmation, other-affirmation, or non-affirmation. In the self-affirmation condition, the participant reflected upon him- or herself and described a positive quality. In the other-affirmation condition, the participant reflected upon the counterparty and acknowledged a positive characteristic of Kees. In the non-affirmation condition, participants described a non-relevant neutral subject in the research (their favourite holiday) which served as a control group.

**Dependent variables**

**Perceptions about the other conflict party**

The main dependent variable in this study was ‘perceptions about the other conflict party’. This was measured by assessing self-report measures including indications of participants’ own behaviour in a future negotiation (e.g. E5a: “In hoeverre zou je tijdens de onderhandeling met Kees bereid zijn om te proberen een gulden middenweg te vinden?”) and the evaluation of the counterparty (e.g. E11b: “Ik vind dat Kees bereidwillig is om zijn mening bij te stellen.”), where both aspects were measured on a seven-point Likert scales (1 ‘helemaal niet’, 7 ‘helemaal wel’). There was one open question that instructed the participant to give their opinion about the group this counterparty represented. The whole evaluation questionnaire was after the introduction of the counterparty and after the affirmation manipulation.

In the first part, the participant was asked to evaluate a potential negotiation with Kees where the 34 items were categorized into ten constructs: ‘motivation to negotiate’ (consisting of three variables, e.g.: “In hoeverre zou je tijdens de onderhandeling met Kees bereid zijn om ... door te gaan met de onderhandeling?”) with $\alpha = .79$, ‘desire to protect own values’ (consisting of three variables, e.g.: “... uw eigen waarden te verdedigen?”) with $\alpha = .82$, ‘open-mindedness’ (consisting of four variables, e.g.: “... open staan voor de ideeën/argumenten van de ander?”) with $\alpha = .79$, ‘yielding’ (consisting of four variables, e.g.: “...
“... de ander gelijk te geven?”) with $\alpha = .82$, ‘compromise’ (consisting of three variables, e.g.: “... te proberen een gulden middenweg te vinden?”) with $\alpha = .88$, ‘forcing’ (consisting of four variables, e.g.: “...alles doen om te winnen?”) with $\alpha = .90$, ‘problem solving’ (consisting of four variables, e.g.: “... de ideeën van beide kanten onderzoeken om een voor jullie beide optimal oplossing te bedenken?”) with $\alpha = .91$, ‘avoiding’ (consisting of four variables, e.g.: “... de meningsverschillen zoveel mogelijk te vermijden?”) with $\alpha = .86$, ‘mutual face concern’ (consisting of four variables, e.g.: “... een vreedzame interactive met Kees te willen behouden?”) with $\alpha = .77$, and one last single variable ‘conflict intensity’ (“Als u een dergelijk conflict zou ervaren, hoe intens zou u dit conflict dan ervaren?”).

The second part of the evaluation questionnaire was a measure about the counterparty (‘Kees’). This consisted of eleven statements about Kees, either with a positive or negative valence. For two items with a negative valence a reversed variable was computed. Additionally, a factor analysis was done to look if these eleven statements could be brought to a few constructs (see Appendix M). Three constructs were created: ‘strong’ (consisting of five variables, e.g.: “Ik vind dat Kees ... sterke argumenten heeft.”) with $\alpha = .82$, ‘cooperative’ (consisting of four variables, e.g.: “... gericht is om een compromis te vinden waar beide partijen tevreden zouden zijn.”) with $\alpha = .69$ and ‘aggressive’ (consisting of three variables, e.g.: “... agressief overkomt.”) with $\alpha = .63$.

The third and last part of the evaluation questionnaire consisted of one open question measuring the overall opinion of the participant towards the group Kees represented:

“Kunt u in het kort aangeven wat uw mening is op de groep die uw tegenstander representeerde? (voorzitter van het verwijderen (behouden) van Zwarte Piet van (in) het Sinterklaasfeest)”. These open questions were later scored in the valence of their opinion towards that group, where 1 is ‘negative’, 2 is ‘neutral’ and 3 is ‘positive’. To score this open question, I made a coding book (see Appendix L). In this coding book I described certain
characteristics that – once I come this across – belong to either of these three categories. The key of this valence scoring is the way how one stand towards the values and opinion of the group Kees represented earlier. This way of study is called qualitative research and is meant to find underlying motives and opinions. One participant filled in ‘no idea’, so was not scored in either three scores. This case was not included in the chi-square statistic test.

**Openness to experience**

To determine if the perception about the counterparty (positive vs. negative perceptions) was mediated by open-mindedness, the personality trait ‘openness of experience’ was measured. This is one of the five dimensions of the Big Five Factors (dimensions) of personality (Goldberg, 1993) and can among other methods be assessed by valid questionnaires such as the The Five-Factor Personality Inventory (FFPI) (Hendriks, Hofstee, & De Raad, 1999) or The Big-Five Inventory (BFI) (John & Srivastava, 1999). The questionnaire in the current study is based on this last 44-item inventory and is translated in Dutch, with 10 items measuring openness to experience (see Appendix B). The participants were instructed to indicate to what extent he/she agreed that the statement applied to him/her by answering on a five-point Likert scales, where 1 represented ‘strongly disagree’ (in Dutch: “Zeer mee oneens”) and 5 ‘strongly agree’ (in Dutch “Zeer mee eens”) (e.g. item 4: “I see myself as someone who.. is original, comes up with new ideas”). These ten items were computed into one variable ‘Openness to Experience’ (α = .82).

**Shared identity**

‘Shared identity’ was expected to mediate the effect of affirmation on the perception of the other conflict party. The feeling of ‘shared identity’ with the counterparty was measured after the affirmation-manipulation with the “Inclusion of Other in the Self scale” (IOS) (see Appendix G). This measure method created by Aron, Aron and Smollan (1992) instructed the participant to circle the picture which best described the experienced
relationship with the counterparty, whereby six pictures consisting of two circles (one circle that represents ‘the self’ and one ‘the other’) were overlapping on different degrees for each picture. This measure gives a clear view of how close one feels to the other which can be formulated as the degree of ‘shared identity’.

Control measures

Once the participant was placed in the cubicle, the participants answered some general questions which served as control measures in the study (see Appendix A).

Gender

The first question was to which gender he/she belongs. I controlled for gender, as personality traits (openness in experience) or opinions about the topic may be already significantly different between women and men. To avoid that this affects the interpretation of the data, gender was taken as a control variable.

Age

Participants were also asked to fill in their age in a blank space. As I recruited Leiden students, I expected to create a homogeneous group in age and do not expect to see any effect of this variable, but to be sure I still used this as a control variable.

Nationality

The ethnic background (nationality) was also a relevant control measure as racism can be a linked issue to the current study topic “Zwarte Piet”. The participant was asked to select out of a list of nationalities that are mostly found in The Netherlands (with the option ‘other, namely...’). I expected to have a fairly homogeneous group regarding nationality/ethnicity, with a minority with a non- autochthonous ethnic background.

Highest followed education

Next, participants were asked to select the highest followed education. Because of the location of the recruitment for participants in this study (University of Leiden), I again expected a highly homogenous group with a (national) above average education level.
Importance, centrality and emotional involvement

There are three control variables that all measure some kind of involvement in the value conflict issue which may influence whether individuals take a strong stand in the “Zwarte Pieten Discussie” and may influence the impact of affirmation techniques on the evaluation of the counterparty. These three are ‘importance’ (‘Is this subject issue important for you as a person?’), ‘centrality’ (‘Do you identify with the position/stand you take?’) and ‘emotional involvement’ (‘Do you feel emotionally involved with this subject?’) which can be found in Appendix C. It can be argued that non-significant outcomes of affirmation techniques on evaluation scales are the cause of a low degree of involvement in the issue; therefore these items are included as control measures in this study.

Suspicion check

After the participant finished both the current study and the unrelated second study, participants filled in one last question where he or she was checked whether they had suspicions about the true intent of the study beforehand, which could damage the reliability and interpretation of the data. This so called ‘suspicition check’ was an open question: “What do you think this study you participated in was about?” (“Waar denkt u dat het onderzoek waar u aan deelgenomen heeft over gaat?”). It was a check whether the participant discovered any hypotheses and the research purposes of both studies.

Results

Preliminary analyses

The affirmation manipulation was done by instructing the participant to give a personal response in the form of an open question. There was a suspicion-check after study 1 and 2 were completed, and there was no one with suspicions about the true intent of this current study. I made an overall correlation table including all evaluation scales, as this - the
perception about the other conflict party in a value conflict - is the main dependent variable in this study. You can find this table in Appendix K.

In the preparation for analyzing my hypotheses, the input of the third part of the evaluation questionnaire was scored negative (1), neutral (2) or positive (3) using the codebook found in appendix L. A chi-squared test was conducted to investigate whether there were differences between the three conditions in this last open question. Using the crosstabs, with valence of evaluation in rows and affirmation condition in columns, and selecting the chi-square statistic, results show that there is no association between the affirmation condition and the valence of evaluation ($\chi^2 (4, N = 84) = 3.88, p = .42$). The amount of negative, neutral and positive evaluations in the three condition groups were similar. In other words, it does not matter whether one thought about qualities of oneself, the counterparty or did not went through an affirmation technique at all, in someone’s evaluation of the group the counterparty represented. Table 1 shows the expected and observed count of each cell.

**Table 1. Cross-table Valence evaluation * Affirmation condition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Affirmation condition</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>self</td>
<td>other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Count: 13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count: 11.4</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Count: 11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count: 11.8</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Count: 6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count: 6.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count: 30</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count: 30.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A regression analysis with the valence of opinion towards the group Kees represented (negative, neutral or positive) as the dependent variable and the affirmation conditions as the independent variable was computed. There was no significant difference in valence between any conditions, so it does not give support to hypothesis 2, 3 and 4 and will not be mentioned again in these hypothesis results.

Additionally, I analyzed the effect of the potential mediators in this study (openness to experience and shared identity). To determine if openness to experience could be a mediator in the relationship between affirmation conditions and evaluation scales (perception of the counterparty), a significant relation between affirmation condition and openness to experience is required. To test this, an ANOVA was conducted, with openness to experience as the dependent variable and affirmation condition as the independent variable. There was no significant difference in openness to experience between the conditions \(F(2, 82) = .24, p = .79\). So the non-significant relationship \(r^2 = .00\) suggests that openness to experience cannot be a mediator if a significant relationship would be found between affirmation condition and an evaluation scale. The same analysis procedure was done to test if IOS (the measure for shared identity) could be a mediator in the hypothesized relationships between affirmation techniques and evaluations of the counterparty in the value conflict. An ANOVA was conducted with IOS as the dependent variable and affirmation condition as the independent variable. There was no significant difference in shared identity between the affirmation conditions \(F(2, 82) = .99, p = .38\). This suggests that IOS cannot be a mediator in the relationship of affirmation and perception of the counterparty, as there is no significant relation between affirmation and IOS \(r^2 = .00\).

With this knowledge, I analyzed the following hypotheses without taking openness to experience or IOS as a mediator into account, but investigated the main relationship between affirmation techniques and evaluation scales (perception of the counterparty).
Main analyse

Hypothesis 1a: Participants who score high in ‘openness to experience’ will evaluate the counterparty more positively than participants who score low in ‘openness to experience’ in a value conflict.

Simple linear regressions were conducted for each construct (dependent variable) in relation with openness to experience (independent variable). There were no significant relation between openness to experience and any of the ten different constructs belonging to this first part of the evaluation questionnaire (see Table 2).

Table 2. Correlations between the ten constructs and openness to experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motivation to negotiate</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to protect own value</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-mindedness</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yielding</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compromise</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forcing</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem solving</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual face concern</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict intensity</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Simple linear regressions were used to investigate the potential relationship between the factors ‘strong’, ‘cooperative’ and ‘aggressive’ (the dependent variables), and openness to experience (independent variable). Openness to experience did not significantly predict how
the counterparty was evaluated on being ‘strong’ ($\beta = -.05, t (82) = -26, p = .79$). Openness to experience did not explain a significant proportion of variance in the scores of factor ‘strong’, $r^2 = .00, F(1, 84) = .07, p = .79$. Openness to experience did also not significantly predict how the counterparty was evaluated on being ‘cooperative’ ($\beta = .18, t (82) = .97, p = .33$). Openness to experience did not explain a significant proportion of variance in the score of factor ‘cooperative’, $r^2 = -.00, F(1, 84) = .95, p = .33$. The same was found for the factor ‘aggressive’: Openness to experience did not significantly predict how the counterparty was evaluated on being ‘aggressive’ ($\beta = .28, t (82) = 1.62, p = .11$) and did not explain a significant proportion of variance in the score of factor ‘aggressive’, $r^2 = .03, F(1, 84) = 2.64, p = .11$.

To test whether there was a relationship between openness to experience and the valence of one’s opinion (negative / neutral / positive) towards the group Kees represented, a chi-squared test was conducted. A median-split on openness to experience was done to divide the participants’ scores on this variable into either a ‘low in openness to experience’ group or a ‘high in openness to experience’ group. The chi-square statistic was used to test whether the number of individuals in each category of the dependent variable (valence of opinion) was significantly different from the number expected in each cell. Using crosstabs with the median split variable of openness to experience in rows and valence of evaluation in columns, and selecting Chi-square statistic, results show there was no significant relationship between openness to experience and the valence of evaluations ($\chi^2 (2, N = 84) = 1.42, p = .49$).

In my preliminary analysis, I found that openness to experience could not be a mediator in the relationship of affirmation and evaluation. Added to that, the results for the analysis of hypothesis 1 suggest there was no relation between the degree of openness to experience and the way someone evaluates a counterparty in a value conflict. Hypothesis 1

---

2 Scores lower than 3.7 on the Openness to Experience scale were categorized into the ‘low in Openness to Experience’ group and scores equal or higher than 3.7 categorized into the ‘high in Openness to Experience’ group. These groups were respectively coded with 1 (low) and 2 (high).
was not supported in this study and it seems openness to experience does not play any role in how participants evaluate a counterparty after exposed to affirmation techniques.

Hypothesis 1b: Higher perceived shared identity is correlated with more problem-solving behaviour, while lower perceived shared identity is related to negative evaluative behaviour (e.g. more ‘forcing’ behaviour) and negative evaluations of the counterparty.

Linear regressions were computed with the ten constructs as dependent variables and IOS as the independent variable. As shown in table 3, IOS had a significant relation with seven constructs (underlined) and a marginal significant relation with “problem solving”. The slope (B) provides information as to how shared identity is related with the evaluation scales: higher scores on IOS (high perceived shared identity) goes with a higher motivation to negotiate, more open-mindedness, yielding, compromise and problem solving. Simultaneously, an increase in perceived shared identity goes with lower desire to protect own values, less forcing of own opinion and less perceived conflict intensity. This is all in line with hypothesis 1b.

Table 3. Correlations between the ten constructs and shared identity (IOS).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motivation to negotiate</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>10.95</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to protect own value</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>9.91</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-mindedness</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>8.99</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yielding</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>16.38</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compromise</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forcing</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem solving</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Again, linear regressions were used to analyze the relationship between IOS (independent variable) and the factors ‘strong’, ‘cooperative’ and ‘aggressive’ (dependent variables). There was a highly significant relationship between IOS and ‘strong’ \((F(1, 83) = 13.77, p < .001)\), where higher perceived shared identity significantly predicted higher scored evaluations on how ‘strong’ the counterparty was perceived \((\beta = .36, t (82) = 3.71, p < .00)\). This supports the hypothesis. IOS was significantly related with the ‘cooperative’ construct \((F(1, 83) = 7.92, p = .01)\), where higher perceived shared identity significantly predicted higher scores on the evaluation of the cooperativeness of the counterparty \((\beta = .25, t (82) = 2.82, p = .01)\). This is in line with the expectations formulated in hypothesis 1b. Lastly, there was also a highly significant relationship between IOS and the ‘aggressive’ construct \((F(1, 83) = 13.05, p < .001)\), where higher perceived shared identity significantly predicted higher scores on the evaluation of the aggressiveness of the counterparty \((\beta = .31, t (82) = 3.61, p < .00)\). This last finding is against my expectations, as I hypothesized that this negative evaluation scale would be higher scored when shared identity was perceived on a lower level (negative slope).

A chi-square test was conducted for analyzing the relationship between IOS (independent variable) and the valence of opinions (negative/neutral/positive) towards the group Kees represented (dependent variable). This relationship was highly significant, as the expected frequencies and the observed frequencies of participants in each IOS category differed significantly between the negative, neutral, and positive valence category \((\chi^2 (10, N = 84) = .31.73, p < .001)\). This suggests that the degree of experienced shared identity is related to the participants’ evaluation on the group that Kees represented.
Overall, it can be confirmed that shared identity is positively related with the evaluations participants had about their stand and their counterparty as higher perceived shared identity was related with more problem-solving, compromising behaviour and more positive evaluations about the counterparty in the value conflict. From the preliminary analysis however, shared identity (IOS) was ruled out as a mediating variable in the relationship between affirmation and evaluation behaviour. It seems shared identity plays an important role as to how evaluations of a negotiation with a counterpart in a value conflict are made, but is not influenced by affirmation techniques.

**Hypothesis 2:** Self-affirmation will affect evaluations about the counterparty more positively through openness to experience (mediator), compared to non-affirmation.

**Hypothesis 3:** Other-affirmation will result in more positive evaluations of the counterparty through the mediating effect of perceived shared identity, compared to the non-affirmation condition.

**Hypothesis 4:** Other-affirmation leads to more positive evaluations of the counterparty due to higher openness to experience and higher perceived shared identity, than self-affirmation.

For hypothesis 2, 3 and 4, three conditions (self-affirmation, other-affirmation, non-affirmation) were compared with in each other in their evaluations of a potential negotiation with counterparty Kees in the created value conflict. In order to test the efficiency of affirmation-techniques during a value conflict, a multivariate ANOVA (or MANOVA) was conducted, with each of the ten evaluative constructs of part 1 as the dependent variables and the affirmation condition as independent variable (fixed factor). The same method (MANOVA) was used with the factors ‘strong’, ‘cooperative’ and ‘aggressive’ of the second part of the evaluation questionnaire, with these factors as dependent variables and affirmation
condition as the independent variable. Differences in conditions for the open question of part 3 was tested using the chi-square test with crosstabs.

A MANOVA with the ten evaluative constructs of part 1 as the dependent variables and the affirmation condition as independent variable, was conducted (see Table 4).

Table 4. Descriptive statistics of the ten evaluation constructs and the effect of affirmation condition on these constructs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>Motivation to negotiate</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Desire to protect own</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open-mindedness</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yielding</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compromise</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forcing</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avoiding</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mutual Face Concern</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conflict Intensity</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A significant effect of “motivation to negotiate” was found on affirmation condition ($F(2, 82) = 3.75, p = .03$). To specify in which conditions participants differed in their motivation to negotiate, Post Hoc Tukey HSD tests were used. Individuals significantly differed in their motivation to negotiate between the self-affirmation condition and other affirmation condition ($MD = -.78, SE = .29, p = .02$). The results indicate that individuals in the other-affirmation
condition \((M = 5.92, SD = .80)\) were more motivated to negotiate than did individuals in the self-affirmation condition \((M = 5.13, SD = 1.22)\). There was no significant difference between the self-affirmation and non-affirmation conditions \((MD = -.25, SE = .29, p = .67)\), and between other-affirmation and non-affirmation \((MD = .53, SE = .30, p = .18)\), in the individuals’ motivation to negotiate. Therefore, these findings only support hypothesis 4.

There was also a significant effect of “forcing” on affirmation condition \((F(2, 82) = 3.60, p = .03)\). Conducting the Post Hoc Tukey HSD on the ‘forcing’ construct resulted in the following: individuals in the self-affirmation and other-affirmation condition differed significantly in the ‘forcing’ construct \((MD = .89, SE = .35, p = .04)\). The results indicate that individuals in the self-affirmation condition \((M = 4.35, SD = 1.48)\) were more inclined to force their own stand and to do everything to win, than did individuals in the other-affirmation condition \((M = 3.46, SD = 1.26)\). There was no significant difference in ‘forcing’ between the conditions self-affirmation and non-affirmation \((MD = .74, SE = .36, p = .10)\) and between other affirmation and non-affirmation \((MD = -.15, SE = .36, p = .91)\) in the individuals’ inclination to force their position. This supports hypothesis 4, as less forcing of one’s own opinion in the other-affirmation condition in comparison with the self-affirmation condition shows that one is less concerned about fighting for their own outcome. It suggests that one gives more space for the opinion of the counterparty in negotiation terms, which is positive for conflict reduction.

A marginal significant difference was found in the “yielding” construct in the same MANOVA with ‘yielding’ as the dependent variable (and affirmation condition again as the fixed factor), namely between the self-affirmation and other-affirmation condition \((MD = -.60, SE = .27, p = .08)\). Individuals were more inclined to give in and to meet with the other in the other-affirmation condition \((M = 4.55, SD = .97)\) than did individuals in the self-affirmation condition \((M = 3.96, SD = 1.10)\). This is line with hypothesis 4.
A MANOVA was conducted to test for significant differences between the affirmation conditions (independent variable) in the factors ‘strong’, ‘cooperative’ and ‘aggressive’ (dependent variables). Results show that there were significant differences between the conditions for the construct that describes cooperative characteristics of counterpart Kees and for aggressive characteristics (see Table 5).

Table 5. Condition * Strong, Cooperative, Aggressive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Df, df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Factor 1 - Strong</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>2, 82</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Factor 2 -</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>2, 82</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Factor 3 -</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>2, 82</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Post Hoc Tukey HSD showed a marginal significant difference between self-affirmation and other-affirmation was found in “cooperative” ($MD = .50$, $SE = .26$, $p = .15$), where participants in the other-affirmation condition found Kees to be more cooperative ($M = 4.10$, $SD = .92$) than participants in the self-affirmation condition believed Kees to be ($M = 3.60$, $SD = .89$). This is in line with hypothesis 4. The same Post Hoc Tukey HSD showed a significant difference in the evaluation of cooperativeness of the counterpart between other-affirmation and non-affirmation ($MD = .74$, $SE = .27$, $p = .02$). Individuals in the other-affirmation condition evaluated Kees as being more cooperative ($M = 4.10$, $SD = .92$) than did individuals in the non-affirmation condition ($M = 3.36$, $SD = 1.17$), which supports hypothesis 3.
A Post Hoc Tukey HSD showed that there was a significant difference between self-affirmation and other-affirmation in “aggressiveness” ($MD = -.62, SE = .25, p = .04$).

Participants in the other-affirmation condition evaluated Kees significantly higher on this factor ($M = 5.48, SD = .85$) than did participants in the self-affirmation condition ($M = 4.86, SD = 1.07$). In other words, participants in the other-affirmation condition believed that Kees came across as more aggressive (evaluated more negatively) than did participants in the self-affirmation condition, which is in contrast with my expectations formulated in hypothesis 4.

In the same Post Hoc Tukey HSD a significant difference between other-affirmation and non-affirmation was found in the evaluation of “aggressiveness” ($MD = .62, SE = .26, p = .05$), where participants in the other-affirmation condition scored higher on this factor ($M = 5.48, SD = .85$) than did participants in the non-affirmation condition ($M = 4.85, SD = .95$). This is contrary to my expectations for hypothesis 3.

**Discussion**

In the current study I investigated whether affirmation techniques (other-affirmation and self-affirmation) could positively influence the perceptions of the counterparty in a value conflict, with the purpose to solve intergroup conflicts. I found that other-affirmation was more effective than self-affirmation in the motivation to negotiate, yielding, and the perception of the cooperativeness of the counterparty. However, between these affirmation conditions and the condition without an affirmation technique, the difference in evaluations was very limited as there were no significant differences in the evaluation scales between the affirmation conditions and the no-affirmation condition.

There was no explicit manipulation check, as I argue that the independent variable is not manipulated indirectly so it was not necessary to confirm that the independent variables was successfully manipulated. In my preliminary analysis, I investigated the relationship of
the potential mediators ‘openness to experience’ and ‘shared identity’ with affirmation. I concluded that there was no significant relation between affirmation techniques and openness to experience, and the same applied for shared identity, which already suggested those two variables could play no mediating role in the relationship between affirmation and the perception of the counterparty. The first hypotheses (1a and 1b) suggested a relationship between respectively openness to experience and shared identity with the perception of the counterparty (the evaluation scales). Here, there was no significant relationship between openness to experience and evaluation scales. However, shared identity – measured by IOS – was significantly related to almost every construct of the evaluation scales. Though IOS was not a mediator, it was an important predictor for the perception of the counterparty in a value conflict.

Hypothesis 2 suggested that self-affirmation would lead to more positive evaluations and perceptions of a potential negotiation with a counterparty in a value conflict. There was no support for this hypothesis, as there was never a significant difference in the evaluation scales between the self-affirmation and non-affirmation conditions. For this reason, hypothesis 2 is found to be invalid in the current study. A possible reason for this could be that self-affirmation is only effective when there is a second exposure of the counterparty after the affirmation manipulation where the participant now would be more open to for arguments that otherwise threatened their stand. It could also be due to the fact that there was no interaction with the counterparty, that self-affirmation did not have its expected effect. Future research could create a situation where there is an actual interaction (e.g. negotiation) between parties (where participants are faced with a real person) and test whether affirmation techniques are then more effective than the procedure of the present research.

There were results that supported hypothesis 3, where other-affirmation was expected to lead to more positive evaluations than non-affirmation. Individuals in the other-affirmation
condition evaluated counterparty Kees to be more cooperative than did individuals in the non-affirmation condition. In the perception of their own stand in a potential negotiation, individuals in the other-affirmation did not differ significantly with individuals in the non-affirmation condition. Interesting is the finding that individuals in the other-affirmation condition evaluated the counterparty to come off as more aggressive than individuals in the no-affirmation condition evaluated the counterparty to be. A possible explanation could be that other-affirmation does not only make positive characteristics salient, but also some strong negative traits like aggressiveness. Hypothesis 3 thus seems to be partly supported.

I expected that other-affirmation would be even more effective than self-affirmation in the reduction of conflict (hypothesis 4). This was supported in the motivation to negotiate, where individuals in the other-affirmation condition were more motivated to negotiate than did individuals in the self-affirmation condition. Individuals in the self-affirmation condition were more inclined to force their own stand than did individuals in the other-affirmation condition. Also, individuals in the other-affirmation condition yielded more than did individuals in the self-affirmation condition. Furthermore, the counterparty was perceived to be more cooperative in the other-affirmation condition than in the self-affirmation condition. However, these individuals also perceived Kees to be more aggressive than did individuals in the self-affirmation condition, which is against the expectations. A possible reason for this interesting finding is that other-affirmation makes the perceiver not only more aware of strong positive characteristics of the counterparty but also aware of some strong negative characteristics, as aggressiveness – in contrast with the self-affirmation condition where characteristics of the other party are less salient.

Overall, there were results that supported hypothesis 3 and 4 and some curious significant results that contradict those hypotheses. Note, that none of the hypotheses could be confirmed entirely, as I showed in the preliminary analysis that openness to experience and shared
identity were not found to play a significant mediating role in the relationship between affirmation conditions and perception of the counterparty.

Interestingly, in the evaluation of the group that counterparty Kees represented, individuals did not significantly differ in their valence of evaluation (negative / neutral / positive perception) between the three conditions (self-affirmation, other-affirmation, non-affirmation). It could be that affirmation conditions only reduce the negative perceptions of a counterparty in a value conflict, but it is limited to that specific counterparty you face. To reduce negative statements towards an entire population that holds other values, the specific affirmation methods used here might not be effective. It could also be that this evaluation measure was limited in the current study, as this was based on one open question with a qualitative way of research.

With the results of this current study, the answer on our research question ‘what is the effect of self-affirmation and other-affirmation on perceptions about the other conflict party?’ might be that other-affirmation is most effective in achieving a cooperative way of communicating and problem-solving in a value conflict, where the conflict party is perceived more positively. Self-affirmation works positively in reducing intergroup conflict to a smaller extent, as there were no significant differences in evaluation between implementing this technique or no affirmation at all. It seems that recognizing positive characteristics of someone who holds other values, decreases the chance that negative perceptions rise and instead ensures a more cooperative mindset in a potential negotiation of a value conflict. With this knowledge, I suggest that for instance managers in companies who are aware of a potential conflict of parties holding different values (e.g. two colleagues with a different cultural background) that need to work together, give the assignment for the parties to write down positive characteristics of one another.
However, there were some limitations to this study that I would like to address for future research in this subject to take into account. At first, I would think that expanding the third part of the evaluation questionnaire - that reflects on the perceptions of the group that is represented by the conflicting party - would be functional. Creating a general questionnaire that consists of multiple items that can be answered on Likert-scales, which can be implemented for all kinds of value conflict, seems like an effective measure. Secondly, it is interesting to investigate how ‘shared identity’ is connected with the perception of the counterparty in a value conflict. Are there more steps between affirmation and shared identity that explain that a significant direct relationship was not found? Theoretically one could think that other-affirmation could also highlight similarities between the conflict parties, therefore increasing the feeling of shared identity (or reducing shared identity threat). More research needs to be done to investigate the potential of the ‘shared identity’ phenomenon as a tool to reduce intergroup conflicts. Lastly, now that is shown that affirmation does influence the perception of a counterparty in a value conflict, it is interesting to investigate whether biases that play a role in this process are reduced too. Could other-affirmation and self-affirmation influence, for instance, intergroup bias? Next studies may create a situation where such a bias is induced and see if affirmation techniques can reduce the effect of such a bias in the perception and formation of evaluations of a conflict party.

The current research have shown that other-affirmation creates an important helpful ingredient in working out negotiations in value conflicts. So give your ‘enemy’ a compliment now and then, and you will see that this works best for a long-lasting peaceful, cooperative relationship!
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Appendix A. Background questions
Welkom in dit onderzoek!

Het doel van dit onderzoek is om een beter beeld te krijgen over gevoelens en meningen rondom Zwarte Piet.

We beginnen het onderzoek met wat achtergrondvragen.

1. Wat is je geslacht?
   - Man
   - Vrouw

2. Wat is je leeftijd?
   Mijn leeftijd is:

3. Wat is je etnische achtergrond?
   - Autochtone Nederlander (Gewoonlijk worden onder "Autochtone Nederlander" mensen gerekend met een Nederlandse nationaliteit, waarvan ook al de ouders in Nederland zijn geboren)
   - Marokkaans
   - Turks
   - Surinaams
   - Anders, namelijk ...

4. Wat is je hoogst voltooide opleiding?
   - Lager onderwijs (basisschool, speciaal onderwijs)
   - Lager of voorbereiden beroepsonderwijs (zoals LTS, LEAO, LHNO, VMBO)
   - Hoger algemeen en voorbereiden wetenschappelijk onderwijs (zoals HAVO, VWO, VWO TTO, Atheneum, Gymnasium, HBS, MMS)
   - Middelaar algemeen voortgezet onderwijs (zoals MBO, (M)ULO, MBOkort, VMBOt)
   - Hoger beroepsonderwijs (zoals HBO, HTS, HEAO, HBOV)
   - Wetenschappelijk Onderwijs (WO), Bachelor
   - Wetenschappelijk Onderwijs (WO), Master
   - Anders, namelijk ...
Bedankt voor het beantwoorden van de achtergrond vragen.
Het onderzoek zal bestaan uit zes onderdelen.
Klik op de pijl aan de rechterkant om te beginnen met onderdeel 1.
Appendix B. Openness to Experience Questionnaire

Note: This questionnaire is the Dutch version of the Big Five Test. It consists items that measures the ‘Openness to Experience’ dimension, but also the other four dimensions. We are not interested in these other dimensions, but they function as ‘filler items’, so the focus on ‘Openness to Experience’ is not that obvious. The green coloured items below are measurements of the ‘Openness to Experience’ construct.

The Big Five Inventory (BFI) – De ‘big five’ persoonlijkheidstest

In het eerste onderdeel vragen wij u een vragenlijst in te vullen die gaat over karaktereigenschappen. Aan de hand van stellingen kunt u antwoorden in welke mate deze voor u van toepassing zijn.

Hieronder volgen 37 stellingen over karakteristieken die mogelijk wel of niet voor jou van toepassing zijn. Bijvoorbeeld, ben je het mee eens dat je iemand bent die graag tijd verdrijft met anderen? Het gaat hierbij om jouw perceptie over jezelf in een variëteit aan situaties. Jouw taak is om aan te geven wat de mate is waarin jij het eens bent met de stelling, door middel van een vijf-puntsschaal waarbij 1 betekent ‘zeer mee oneens’, 2 ‘mee oneens’, 3 ‘niet mee oneens of eens’, 4 ‘mee eens’, en 5 ‘zeer mee eens’.

Er is zijn geen ‘goede’ of ‘foute’ antwoorden, dus selecteer dat nummer dat jou het meest reflecteert op elke stelling. Neem je tijd en overweeg elke stelling zorgvuldig.

Ik zie mijzelf als iemand die…

1. …sprakzaam is

Zeer mee oneens 1 2 3 4 5 Zeer mee eens

2. …de neiging heeft schuld bij anderen te vinden

Zeer mee oneens 1 2 3 4 5 Zeer mee eens

3. …grondig werk doet

Zeer mee oneens 1 2 3 4 5 Zeer mee eens

4. …origineel is, met nieuwe ideeën komt

Zeer mee oneens 1 2 3 4 5 Zeer mee eens

5. …gereserveerd is
Zeer mee oneens 1 2 3 4 5 Zeer mee eens
6. …behulpzaam en onzelfzuchtig is met anderen
Zeer mee oneens 1 2 3 4 5 Zeer mee eens
7. …ontspannen en stressbestendig is
Zeer mee oneens 1 2 3 4 5 Zeer mee eens
8. …nieuwsgierig is naar veel verschillende dingen
Zeer mee oneens 1 2 3 4 5 Zeer mee eens
9. …vol zit met energie
Zeer mee oneens 1 2 3 4 5 Zeer mee eens
10. …ruzies begint met anderen
Zeer mee oneens 1 2 3 4 5 Zeer mee eens
11. …gespannen kan zijn
Zeer mee oneens 1 2 3 4 5 Zeer mee eens
12. …ingenieus is, een diepe denker
Zeer mee oneens 1 2 3 4 5 Zeer mee eens
13. …een vergevingsgezind karakter heeft
Zeer mee oneens 1 2 3 4 5 Zeer mee eens
14. …de neiging heeft om ongeorganiseerd te zijn
Zeer mee oneens 1 2 3 4 5 Zeer mee eens
15. …veel piekert (zorgen maakt)
Zeer mee oneens 1 2 3 4 5 Zeer mee eens
16. …e~een levendige fantasie heeft
Zeer mee oneens 1 2 3 4 5 Zeer mee eens
17. …de neiging heeft om stil te zijn
Zeer mee oneens 1 2 3 4 5 Zeer mee eens
18. …over het algemeen anderen snel vertrouwt

Zeer mee oneens   1   2   3   4   5   Zeer mee eens

19. …emotioneel stabiel is, niet gemakkelijk overstuur

Zeer mee oneens   1   2   3   4   5   Zeer mee eens

20. …inventief is

Zeer mee oneens   1   2   3   4   5   Zeer mee eens

21. …een assertieve persoonlijkheid heeft

Zeer mee oneens   1   2   3   4   5   Zeer mee eens

22. …koud en afstandelijk kan zijn

Zeer mee oneens   1   2   3   4   5   Zeer mee eens

23. …doorzet tot de taak klaar is

Zeer mee oneens   1   2   3   4   5   Zeer mee eens

24. …humeurig kan zijn

Zeer mee oneens   1   2   3   4   5   Zeer mee eens

25. …waarde hecht aan artistieke, esthetische ervaringen

Zeer mee oneens   1   2   3   4   5   Zeer mee eens

26. …een beetje verlegen, geremd kan zijn

Zeer mee oneens   1   2   3   4   5   Zeer mee eens

27. …attent en vriendelijk is voor bijna iedereen

Zeer mee oneens   1   2   3   4   5   Zeer mee eens

28. …in gespannen situaties kalm blijft

Zeer mee oneens   1   2   3   4   5   Zeer mee eens

29. …voorkeur heeft voor routinewerk

Zeer mee oneens   1   2   3   4   5   Zeer mee eens

30. …extravert, sociaal is
31. …soms onbeleefd is naar anderen

32. …gemakkelijk nerveus wordt

33. …het leuk vindt om te reflecteren, te spelen met ideeën

34. …weinig artistieke interesses heeft

35. …het leuk vindt om samen te werken met anderen

36. …gemakkelijk afgeleid is

37. …verfijnd is in kunst, muziek of literatuur
Appendix C. Questionnaire topic “Zwarte Pieten Discussie”

Note: This questionnaire is based on the questionnaire used in a study of Rosabelle (2013). In the current study only Dutch speaking students will participate, so this questionnaire is entirely in Dutch.

Het volgende onderdeel zal bestaan uit een vragenlijst waarbij we meningen over het personage “Zwarte Piet” onderzoeken. U zult een aantal vragen gesteld worden over uw gedachten en gevoelens rondom deze kwestie. Om een zo nauwkeurig mogelijke meting te krijgen vragen wij u om zo eerlijk mogelijk te antwoorden op de vragen.

Klik op de pijl aan de rechterkant om te beginnen.

A1.
Bent u bekend met het Nederlandse Sinterklaasfeest?
□ Ja
□ Nee

A2.
Er is recent een discussie gaande omtrent Zwarte Piet. Bent u zich bewust van deze discussie?
□ Ja
□ Nee

A3.
In hoeverre bent u een voorstander van het behouden van Zwarte Piet in het Sinterklaasfeest?
Helemaal niet  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Helemaal wel

A4.
In hoeverre bent u een voorstander van het verwijderen van Zwarte Piet van het Sinterklaasfeest?
Helemaal niet  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Helemaal wel

A5.
Als u zou moeten kiezen, zou u een voorstander zijn van het behouden van Zwarte Piet in het Sinterklaasfeest of van het verwijderen van Zwarte Piet van het Sinterklaasfeest?
□ Behouden van Zwarte Piet
□ Verwijderen van Zwarte Piet

[als gekozen voor behouden:]
A6a.
Kunt u uw argumenten voor het behouden van Zwarte Piet in het Sinterklaasfeest geven?

[als gekozen voor verwijderen:]
A6b.
Kunt u uw argumenten voor het verwijderen van Zwarte Piet van het Sinterklaasfeest geven?

Control: importance (1)
B1.
In hoeverre is dit onderwerp belangrijk voor u persoonlijk?
Helemaal niet 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Helemaal wel

Control: centrality (1)
B2.
In hoeverre identificeert u met het standpunt dat u inneemt?
Helemaal niet 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Helemaal wel

Control: emotional involvement (1)
B3.
In hoeverre voelt u emotioneel betrokken bij dit onderwerp?
Helemaal niet 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Helemaal wel
Appendix D. Response van “Kees” op de Zwarte Pieten Discussie

If A5 “Behouden van Zwarte Piet” is selected:

Eerder in dit onderzoek heb je een open vraag beantwoordt om argumenten te beschrijven voor je standpunt (behouden of verwijderen van Zwarte Piet).

In voorgaand onderzoek is hier diepgaand naar onderzocht. Toen is o.a. geïnventariseerd welke argumenten veelal voorkomen bij mensen die voorstander zijn voor het verwijderen van Zwarte Piet uit het Sinterklaasfeest. In dat onderzoek hebben mensen vrij hun argumenten mogen beschrijven die hun standpunt ondersteunen.

Zodadelijk wordt een respons getoond die gegeven is door één van de participanten die deelnam aan dat onderzoek. Deze persoon geeft een aantal argumenten weer voor zijn/haar standpunt. Wegens het behouden van anonimiteit hebben wij een andere naam gegeven. Lees deze respons goed door.

Respons “Kees”:

Ik ben van mening dat Zwarte Piet een beledigend en racistisch deel is van de traditie. Zwarte Piet staat symbool voor slavernij. Ze geven een stereotype van zwarte slaven en door deze traditie voort te zetten worden met name donkere mensen herinnerd aan slavernij. Daar wil je kinderen toch niet aan blootstellen? Kinderen moeten goed ontwikkeld worden op scholen, en opgroeien tot mensen die niet meedoen aan racistisch gedrag. Juist omdat het gericht is op kinderen moet je heel terughoudend zijn. Indirect maak je namelijk aan kinderen reeds duidelijk dat er een bepaald onderscheid is.


Ik ben ook van mening dat een traditie makkelijk is aan te passen. Verandering in tradities heeft bovendien met morele groei te maken en verandert met de tijden – het is niet slecht om tradities te veranderen. Om te voorkomen dat mensen het beledigend en racistisch vinden, vermijd dan stereotypering en kies allerlei gekleurde Pieten. En Sinterklaas mag blank zijn maar ook gekleurd. Het zou geen probleem moeten zijn om de pieten een andere kleur te geven. Bovendien, als het zwart van roet van de schoorsteen komt, waarom dan niet enkel wat vegen?

If A5 “Verwijderen van Zwarte Piet” is selected:

Eerder in dit onderzoek heb je een open vraag beantwoordt om argumenten te beschrijven voor je standpunt (behouden of verwijderen van Zwarte Piet).

In voorgaand onderzoek is hier diepgaand naar onderzocht. Toen is o.a. geïnventariseerd welke argumenten veelal voorkomen bij mensen die voorstander zijn voor het behouden van Zwarte Piet van het Sinterklaasfeest. In dat onderzoek hebben mensen vrij hun argumenten mogen beschrijven die hun standpunt ondersteunen.
Zodadelijk wordt een respons getoond die gegeven is door één van de participanten die deelnam aan dat onderzoek. Deze persoon geeft een aantal argumenten weer voor zijn/haar standpunt. Wegens het behouden van anonimiteit hebben wij een andere naam gegeven. Lees deze respons goed door.

Respons "Kees":

Ik ben van mening dat Zwarte Piet een vrolijk en geliefd deel is van de traditie. Niemand wordt kwaad gedaan en iedereen is welkom! Ook donkere mensen kunnen en mogen Sinterklaas spelen, net als dat blanke mensen Zwarte Piet kunnen en mogen spelen. Er is daarom geen reden dat iemand zich uitgesloten hoeft te voelen. Dat niet iedereen het Sinterklaasfeest viert, staat los van Zwarte Piet. Dat anderen het feest niet vieren kun je niet verwijten aan de blanke Nederlander.

Tradities zijn niet per definitie goede tradities. Maar ze bestaan al jarenlang zonder enig probleem. Het volksfeest maakt Nederland vrij uniek, dat moet je juist koesteren. In plaats van onderscheid, is het iets dat ons bindt! Wat blijft er over van de traditie als van alles gewijzigd wordt? Zo kun je wel doorgaan met deze politieke correctheid.

Als laatste wil ik ook duidelijk zijn met het volgende: dit is een kinderfeest, gericht op kinderen. Het is geen feest waar racistische mensen bijeen komen om ideeën uit te wisselen. Laten we kinderen toch blijven verblijden met cadeautjes en gezelligheid.
Appendix E. *Affirmation techniques*

❖ **Self affirmation manipulation**

Voordat we verder in zullen gaan op Kees, willen we je vragen om terug te denken aan een ervaring waarin je iets goed deed of waarover je goed voelde over jezelf. Hierin ben je vrij te schrijven over welke ervaring dan ook.

Een voorbeeld kan zijn dat je tijdens sporten in de laatste minuten de wedstrijd besliste, of dat je na jaren eindelijk besloten hebt die goede vriend(in) op te zoeken in Frankrijk.

Alles mag, zolang het maar te maken heeft met een kwaliteit van jezelf die in een situatie naar boven kwam, iets wat jij deed of er iets gebeurd is waardoor jij je goed voelde.

Omschrijf hieronder de situatie waarin jij iets positiefs deed, of waarover je goed voelde over jezelf.

❖ **Other affirmation manipulation**

Nu willen we je vragen om terug te denken aan de "Zwarte Pieten Discussie" van net en een positieve kwaliteit of kenmerk te omschrijven van de respons van "Kees".

Een voorbeeld kan zijn dat "Kees" alles deed in het belang van de ontwikkeling van de kinderen, en daarbij zijn eigenwaarde op een tweede plek zette.

Neem rustig je tijd en klik op de pijl rechts om het kader te openen om hierin zo goed mogelijk te beschrijven wat een positieve kwaliteit / sterk punt was van de andere directeur.

Omschrijf hieronder een positief kenmerk van directeur Kees dat je is opgevallen tijdens de discussie omtrent "Zwarte Piet".
Voordat we verder in zullen gaan op Kees, willen we je vragen na te denken over hoe jouw favoriete feestdag eruit zou zien. Dit hoeft niet gerelateerd te zijn aan het Sinterklaasfeest. Een voorbeeld is dagje carnaval met je beste vriend(in).

Alles mag, zolang het maar te maken heeft met een feestelijke dag. We zijn geïnteresseerd in uw smaak en ideeën waarbij geen goede of foute antwoorden mogelijk zijn.

Omschrijf hieronder hoe jouw favoriete feestdag eruit zou zien.
Appendix F. Evaluation questionnaire

This questionnaire is composed of three sections. The first section contains questions of ten general constructs in a negotiation (e.g. compromise). The second section contains statements about counterparty Kees. The third section is one open question where the participant can write down what he/she thinks about the group that Kees represents.

Denk terug aan Kees (de persoon waarvan jij het respons hebt gelezen op de vraag argumenten te beschrijven voor zijn/haar standpunt rondom de kwestie "Zwarte Pieten Discussie")

Stel je voor dat je samen met Kees deel uit maakt van de leiding op een basisschool. Onlangs is er een kwestie naar boven gekomen waarvoor jullie beiden tot een overeenkomst dienen te komen. De kwestie gaat over of Zwarte Piet wel of niet deel moet nemen in het Sinterklaasfeest op deze basisschool.

Er staat nu een onderhandeling gepland, waarin jullie het eens moeten worden of Zwarte Piet moet blijven in het Sinterklaasfeest of verwijderd moet worden van het Sinterklaasfeest.

Beantwoord de volgende vragen over verschillende aspecten in een onderhandeling met Kees.

Onderdeel 1 (34 vragen)
Als eerst volgen er vragen waarop u de onderhandeling kunt evalueren op een zeven-puntsschaal (1 = helemaal niet, 7 = helemaal wel) met de volgende opstelling:
"In hoeverre zou je tijdens de onderhandeling met Kees bereid zijn om ..."

E1. Motivation to mediate (or litigate) (3)
In hoeverre zou je tijdens de onderhandeling met Kees bereid zijn om ... E1a.

door te gaan met de onderhandeling?

Helemaal niet 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Helemaal wel

E1b.
een oplossing te vinden in deze onderhandeling?

Helemaal niet 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Helemaal wel

E1c. (R)
de onderhandeling te beëindigen

Helemaal niet 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Helemaal wel

E2. Desire to protect own values (3)
In hoeverre zou je tijdens de onderhandeling met Kees bereid zijn om ...

E2a.
uw eigen waarden te verdedigen?
**Helemaal niet** | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | **Helemaal wel**

**E2b.**
uw eigen standpunten te vertegenwoordigen?
**Helemaal niet** | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | **Helemaal wel**

**E2c.**
bij uw eigen mening/opinie te blijven?
**Helemaal niet** | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | **Helemaal wel**

**E3. Open-mindedness (4)**
In hoeverre zou je tijdens de onderhandeling met Kees bereid zijn om ...

**E3a.**
open staan voor de ideeën/argumenten van de ander?
**Helemaal niet** | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | **Helemaal wel**

**E3b.**
de argumenten van de ander objectief af te wegen?
**Helemaal niet** | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | **Helemaal wel**

**E3c.**
bereid zijn om het standpunt van de ander in overweging te nemen?
**Helemaal niet** | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | **Helemaal wel**

**E3d.**
bereid zijn om van je eigen standpunt af te wijken?
**Helemaal niet** | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | **Helemaal wel**

**E4. Yielding (4)**
In hoeverre zou je tijdens de onderhandeling met Kees bereid zijn om ...

**E4a.**
toe te geven aan de wensen van de andere partij?
**Helemaal niet** | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | **Helemaal wel**

**E4b.**
de ander gelijk te geven?
**Helemaal niet** | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | **Helemaal wel**

**E4c.**
proberen de ander tegemoet te komen?
**Helemaal niet** | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | **Helemaal wel**
E4d.
aan te passen aan de doelen en belangen van de ander?

Helemaal niet  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Helemaal wel

E5. Compromise (3)
In hoeverre zou je tijdens de onderhandeling met Kees bereid zijn om ...

E5a.
te proberen een gulden middenweg te vinden?

Helemaal niet  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Helemaal wel

E5b.
te benadrukken dat jullie een compromis moeten vinden?

Helemaal niet  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Helemaal wel

E5c.
aan te dringen dat jullie allebei wat toe moeten geven?

Helemaal niet  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Helemaal wel

E6. Forcing (4)
In hoeverre zou je tijdens de onderhandeling met Kees bereid zijn om ...

E6a.
jouw eigen standpunt erdoor duwen?

Helemaal niet  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Helemaal wel

E6b.
proberen winst te boeken?

Helemaal niet  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Helemaal wel

E6c.
vechten voor een goede uitkomst voor jezelf?

Helemaal niet  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Helemaal wel

E6d.
alles doen om te winnen?

Helemaal niet  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Helemaal wel

E7. Problem solving (4)
In hoeverre zou je tijdens de onderhandeling met Kees bereid zijn om ...

E7a.
jouw eigen waarden en de waarden van de andere onderzoeken om een oplossing te vinden waar jij en de ander beide echt tevreden mee zijn?

**Helemaal niet** 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 **Helemaal wel**

E7b.
op te komen voor jouw eigenbelang en voor de doelen en belangen van de ander?

**Helemaal niet** 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 **Helemaal wel**

E7c.
de ideeën van beide kanten onderzoeken om een voor jullie beide optimale oplossing te bedenken?

**Helemaal niet** 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 **Helemaal wel**

E7d.
een oplossing uit zult werken die zowel jouw eigen belangen, als de belangen van de ander zo goed mogelijk dient?

**Helemaal niet** 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 **Helemaal wel**

E8. Avoiding (4)
In hoeverre zou je tijdens de onderhandeling met Kees bereid zijn om ...

E8a.
een confrontatie over jullie tegenstellingen te vermijden?

**Helemaal niet** 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 **Helemaal wel**

E8b.
de meningsverschillen zoveel mogelijk te vermijden?

**Helemaal niet** 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 **Helemaal wel**

E8c.
de meningsverschillen minder scherp doen lijken?

**Helemaal niet** 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 **Helemaal wel**

E8d.
een confrontatie met de ander proberen te voorkomen?

**Helemaal niet** 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 **Helemaal wel**

E9. Mutual-face concern (4)
In hoeverre zou je tijdens de onderhandeling met Kees bereid zijn om ...

E9a.
bezorgd te zijn om een respectvolle behandeling van zowel u als Kees?

**Helemaal niet** 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 **Helemaal wel**

E9b.
een harmonieuze relatie tussen u en Kees belangrijk te vinden?
Helemaal niet  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Helemaal wel

E9c.
een vreedzame interactie met Kees te willen behouden?
Helemaal niet  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Helemaal wel

E9d.
een vreedzame oplossing voor het conflict te willen bereiken?
Helemaal niet  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Helemaal wel

E10. Conflict Intensity (1)
Als u een dergelijk conflict zou ervaren, hoe intens zou u dit conflict dan ervaren?
Helemaal niet  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Helemaal wel

Onderdeel 2
In het tweede onderdeel van de vragenlijst volgen stellingen waarop je Kees kunt beoordelen op een aantal aspecten op dezelfde zeven-puntsschaal als onderdeel 1 (1 = helemaal niet, 7 = helemaal wel), met de opstelling:

E11.
"Ik vind dat Kees ..."

E11a. Sterke argumenten heeft.
Helemaal niet  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Helemaal wel

E11b. Bereidwillig is om zijn mening bij te stellen.
Helemaal niet  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Helemaal wel

E11c. Gericht is om een compromis te vinden waar beide partijen tevreden zouden zijn.
Helemaal niet  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Helemaal wel

E11d. Agressief overkomt.
Helemaal niet  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Helemaal wel

E11e. Ongeïnteresseerd overkomt.
Helemaal niet  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Helemaal wel

E11f. Juiste belangen heeft.
Helemaal niet  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Helemaal wel

E11g. Overtuigend is met zijn argumenten.
Helemaal niet  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Helemaal wel

E11h. Begripvol is.
Helemaal niet  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Helemaal wel

E11i. Het probleem serieus neemt.
Helemaal niet  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Helemaal wel

E11j. Met reëlle voorstellen komt omtrent deze discussie.
Helemaal niet  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Helemaal wel

E11k. Mij doet twijfelen over mijn standpunt.
Helemaal niet  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Helemaal wel

Onderdeel 3

If A5 "Behouden van Zwarte Piet" is selected:

Kunt u in het kort aangeven wat uw mening is op de groep die uw tegenstander representeerde? (voorstander van het verwijderen van Zwarte Piet van het Sinterklaasfeest)

If A5 "Verwijderen van Zwarte Piet" is selected:

Kunt u in het kort aangeven wat uw mening is op de groep die uw tegenstander representeerde? (voorstander van het behouden van Zwarte Piet in het Sinterklaasfeest)
Hieronder ziet u zes plaatjes. Deze beschrijven ieder de relatie van jou ('ik') en Kees ('ander'), waarin de overlap van de cirkels de mate voorstelt waarin u de ander opneemt in identificatie van jezelf.

Dit gaat om een subjectieve ervaring. Er is dus geen goed of fout.

Bekijk de plaatjes goed en maak vervolgens de keuze welk plaatje het beste uw relatie met directeur Kees beschrijft.

**Appendix G. Shared Identity: The Inclusion of Other in the Self Scale (IOS)**

Plaatje 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ik</th>
<th>Ander</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plaatje 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ik</th>
<th>Ander</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plaatje 3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ik</th>
<th>Ander</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plaatje 4:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ik</th>
<th>Ander</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plaatje 5:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ik</th>
<th>Ander</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plaatje 6:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ik</th>
<th>Ander</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bedankt! Dit was het einde van onderzoek 1.

Open de deur en de onderzoeksleider zal naar je toekomen.
Appendix I. Informed consent

Instemmingsformulier voor deelname aan onderzoek

Welkom in ons onderzoekslaboratorium. Elke keer als je meedoet aan onderzoek, vragen we je dit formulier te lezen.

Het onderzoek waaraan je straks gaat meedoen bestaat uit twee losse onderdelen. Het eerste deel is een onderzoek dat gaat over vraagstukken rondom Zwarte Piet waarover men verschillende ideeën kan hebben. Het tweede deel gaat over samenwerking en besluitvorming. Tijdens beide onderzoeken zul je vragenlijsten invullen en participeren in een rollenspel. Specifieke instructies hierover volgen later.

Het gehele onderzoek neemt ongeveer 45 minuten in beslag. Alle gegevens worden anoniem behandeld, samengevoegd met de uitkomsten van andere proefpersonen, aan statistische analyse onderworpen en eventueel gebruikt in wetenschappelijke publicaties.

In dit laboratorium wordt nooit een koppeling gemaakt tussen je naam en je, tijdens onderzoek verkregen, antwoorden en gedragingen.

Je kunt op elk moment besluiten om te stoppen met het onderzoek, of je toestemming in te trekken voor het gebruik van je data. Wij behouden ons het recht voor om je dan alleen het bedrag uit te betalen voor de tijd die je hebt deelgenomen aan het onderzoek.

Als je meer wilt weten over onderzoek waaraan je hebt meegedaan, kun je dat bij de proefleider melden. Deze kan je dan direct inlichten, of een afspraak met je maken om op een later tijdstip meer te vertellen. Hierbij willen we je alvast vragen om de opzet van het experiment geheim te houden, zodat proefpersonen na jou niet met voorkennis kunnen deelnemen aan dit onderzoek.

Voor jouw deelname aan dit onderzoek ontvang je € 4,50 of 2 proefpersoon credits (indien van toepassing). Aan het einde van dit onderzoek kun je bij de onderzoeker aangeven welke beloning je wenst te ontvangen.

Als je het bovenstaande begrijpt en ermee instemt, kun je op de lijst je handtekening zetten en meedoen aan het onderzoek.

Voor vragen of klachten over dit onderzoek kun je contact opnemen met hoofdonderzoeker Dr. Fieke Harinck, 071-5275344, sharinck@fsw.leidenuniv.nl.
Ik heb bovenstaande informatie begrepen en stem in met deelname aan dit onderzoek:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Naam</th>
<th>Datum</th>
<th>Plaats</th>
<th>Handtekening</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix J. Debriefing

Bedankt voor je deelname aan ons onderzoek!

Aan het begin van het eerste onderzoek is je verteld dat het doel van dit onderzoek was om de gevoelens en meningen van mensen over Zwarte Piet te onderzoeken. Het hoofddoel van dit onderzoek was echter om meer inzicht te krijgen in de manier waarop mensen met waardeconflicten omgaan en hoe zogenaamde ‘affirmatie’-technieken invloed hebben op hoe mensen hun tegenstander in het conflict waarnemen. Waardeconflicten komen voor wanneer mensen het oneens zijn over wat goed of slecht is, gebaseerd op de waardes die hen dierbaar zijn. We hebben Zwarte Piet gebruikt om te onderzoeken hoe mensen met dergelijke geschillen omgaan. Mede dankzij jouw input kunnen we betere interventies ontwikkelen die door professionele bemiddelaars gebruikt kunnen worden bij het bemiddelen van dit soort conflicten.

Het werkelijke doel van ons tweede onderzoek was om te kijken wat voor een effecten het hebben van een machtspositie en de stabiliteit van deze machtspositie kunnen hebben op het aanbieden van verontschuldigingen door middel van verzoeningsgedrag. Met behulp van de in het begin gemaakte schrijftaak en het aannemen van de voorgeschreven lichaamshoudingen hebben we het gevoel van macht bij jou gemanipuleerd of we hebben je een neutrale schrijftaak gegeven en lichaamshoudingen voorgeschreven waarbij geen macht werd gemanipuleerd. Dit met als doel om te kijken of je anders zou reageren in een conflict situatie. We onderzoeken bijvoorbeeld hoeveel helpgedrag je vertoont. De proefpersoon met wie jij hebt samengewerkt en de bak met snoepjes liet vallen maakte deel uit van het experiment. We hebben gekeken naar hoe je je op dat moment gedroeg.

We konden bovenstaande informatie niet vooraf aan jou vertellen, omdat je dan misschien anders zou hebben gereageerd. De gemeten gegevens worden anoniem opgenomen in het onderzoek. Als je nog meer vragen hebt over ons onderzoek of als je meer informatie wil over het onderzoek dan kun je contact opnemen met hoofdonderzoeker Fieke Harinck, 071-5275344, sharinck@fsw.leidenuniv.nl.
### Appendix K. Overview correlations between the dependent variables

#### Table 1: Correlation matrix of all evaluation scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Motivation to negotiate</th>
<th>Desire to protect own value</th>
<th>Open-mindedness</th>
<th>Yielding</th>
<th>Compromise</th>
<th>Forcing</th>
<th>Problem Solving</th>
<th>Avoiding</th>
<th>Mutual Face Concern</th>
<th>Factor 1 Strong</th>
<th>Factor 2 Co-operative</th>
<th>Factor 3 Aggressive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivation to negotiate</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>-27**</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>.42*</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Desire to protect own value</strong></td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>-32**</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>57**</td>
<td>-08</td>
<td>-24*</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>-22*</td>
<td>-24*</td>
<td>-39**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open-mindedness</strong></td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>-32**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>-24*</td>
<td>27**</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.32**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yielding</strong></td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>-32**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>-30**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compromise</strong></td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-24*</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.27**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Forcing</strong></td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.57*</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>-24*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problem Solving</strong></td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.22**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Avoiding</strong></td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.24*</td>
<td>-.24*</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mutual Face Concern</strong></td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.23**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001. Positive and negative values indicate significant positive and negative correlations, respectively.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Strength</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>.00</th>
<th>.11</th>
<th>.01</th>
<th>.04</th>
<th>.00</th>
<th>.27</th>
<th>.00</th>
<th>.36</th>
<th>.20</th>
<th>.19</th>
<th>.03</th>
<th>.09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>-.42**</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.36**</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.38**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3</td>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verdeling negatief, neutral, positief ten aanzien van</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>-.39**</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>-.47**</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tegenpartij</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
### Appendix L. Coding book

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Ze stellen zich aan / wat een onzin! / belachelijke opmerkingen!” (geen begrip voor tegenargumenten)</td>
<td>“Ik heb begrip voor de tegenpartij / ik sta niet negatief tegenover de andere groep, maar ben het er niet mee eens” (blijft bij eigen standpunt, maar niet aanvallig tegenover de andere partij)</td>
<td>“Ik begrijp hen wel en vind dat er wat gedaan moet worden met hun argumenten” (compromis) / “Ik vind dat er bepaalde wijzigingen moeten komen in de huidige situatie om ook de tegenpartij tevreden te houden” (houdt rekening met tegenpartij)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Ik vind ze onjuiste / onterechte dingen denken over mijn groep” (voelt zich totaal niet verbonden met de andere groep of voelt zich onbegrepen)</td>
<td>“Ik ben het deels eens met partij X, en deels eens met partij Y”. Neemt beide zijden in overweging maar heeft geen voorkeur voor één zijde</td>
<td>“Ze hebben goede argumenten waar ik nog niet bij heb stilgestaan” (staat open voor de waardes van de tegenpartij)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix M. Factor-analysis on evaluation part 2

Assumptions

To test if the data is suitable for factor analysis, the sample size was checked. The criterion $N \geq 300$ or $N/p \geq 10$ was not reached ($N = 84$ and $N/p = 84/11 = 7.64$). Though the sample size was not adequate, one can look at more specific rules. The next step was to check the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin. The KMO in this dataset was .74. The criterion here is that KMO should be at least above .50 and preferably above .70 (which was the case) to be sufficient, so this assumption was reached. Sample size is not very important if KMO is large enough.

Additionally, the rule of communalities is that all are $> .60$ and then a $N$ below 100 is ok. In this dataset not all communalities were 60 or higher. In fact, six items were and five were not (had a communality below .60). The rule of factor loadings (at least four loadings on a factor are $> .60$ and/or $< -.60$) was almost reached in the Varimax rotated component matrix: there were three items loading on the first factor with a loading of $> .60$ and one item that with a loading of .58, which is almost .60. As this is close to the criterion, I believe this will not cause much of a problem. On the second component there were two items with a high loading. The Bartlett’s Test of sphericity – which tests the null hypothesis that all correlations between variables are zero – was significant ($p < .001$). As a conclusion, this dataset was found to be suitable enough for factor-analysis.

How many components?

According to the eigenvalues-criterion, three components (factors) can be used because they have an eigenvalue larger than 1 (see Table 1). According to the point-of-inlexion-criterion, there are 1, 2 or 3 components (see Figure 1).
Table 1. Eigenvalues larger than one criterion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Eigenvalues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Scree plot.

To determine the number of components to be most efficient in data reduction, I fixed the number of factors and calculated how much variance was explained by these fixed number of factors. With two factors 50.60% of variance was explained and with three factors 61.85% of variance was explained. Therefore I chose to reduce the data of evaluation part 2 into three components/factors (see Table 2). Loading with the value above the limit value of .40 are underlined and values that are even higher than .60 are also made bold for emphasize.
Table 2. Component loadings for the three-components solution (using the Varimax rotation method).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>... sterke argumenten heeft.</td>
<td><strong>.88</strong></td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... bereidwillig is om zijn mening bij te stellen.</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td><strong>.75</strong></td>
<td>-.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... gericht is om een compromis te vinden waar beide partijen tevreden zouden zijn.</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td><strong>.86</strong></td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... agressief overkomt.</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td><strong>.75</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... ongeïnteresseerd overkomt.</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td><strong>.79</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... juiste belangen heeft.</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... overtuigend is met zijn argumenten.</td>
<td><strong>.84</strong></td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... begripvol is.</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>-.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... het probleem serieus neemt.</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... met reële voorstellen komt omtrent deze discussie.</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... mij doet twijfelen over mijn standpunt.</td>
<td><strong>.74</strong></td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interpretation and naming of the components

Component 1 describes a counterpart who is strong and convincing, therefore I named this factor “strong”. A reliability check was and results show that this construct consisting of variables E11a, E11f, E11g, E11j and E11k is highly reliable (α = .82). Component 2 describes a counterpart who is cooperating and searching for a solution in this conflict, therefore I named this factor “cooperative”. A reliability check was done on the combination E11b, E11c, E11h and E11l and results show that this construct has an acceptable Cronbach’s
alpha ($\alpha = .69$). Component 3, on the other hand, describes negative characteristics like aggressiveness and coming off as uninterested. I labeled this factor as “aggressive”. This construct, consisting of $E11dR$, $E11eR$ and $E11f$ had a Cronbach’s alpha of .63. Next, the created factors were computed into scales with these labels (strong, cooperative, aggressive) and were used in further analysis.