The Top Ten Barriers to Dispute Resolution

By Joe Epstein, Esq. with Susan Epstein, Esq.

Introduction

Years of legal experience and thousands of mediations have helped us to devise a list of the Top Ten Barriers to Dispute Resolution. When negotiators are determined to be effective and collaborative, recognition of these barriers will enable them to move the mediation process forward in a positive way. This knowledge will also help the thoughtful and determined negotiator break an impasse. The top ten barriers to dispute resolution that we see in mediation are:

1. Inadequate Planning and Preparation
2. False First Impressions and Perceptions
3. Grief
4. Systemic Distrust
5. Failure to Communicate and Listen
6. Insufficient Focus on Underlying Interests
7. Partisan Perception, Judgmental Overconfidence and Wrong Baselines
8. Reactive Devaluation
9. Misunderstanding the Loss/Risk Analysis
10. Failure to give Opponents Face, Respect and Dignity

I. Inadequate Planning and Preparation

When parties set a case for mediation, they should determine what discovery needs to be done in advance of the mediation. Insufficient discovery often means that the parties are not able to accurately evaluate the case. On the other hand, waiting too long to mediate can eliminate the transactional cost savings of the mediation process. We try to work with parties to prepare them and ourselves for mediation.

For example, in a multi-party burn case with clear liability, we learned from the defendants the damage information they required to evaluate the case and then arranged for the plaintiff’s counsel to provide that information. We helped arrange for pre-mediation independent medical evaluations. A pre-mediation caucus with the plaintiffs was also arranged. Finally, in this case as in other high value cases, we ascertained information on the various layers of insurance coverage and were able to facilitate having the necessary decision-makers at the table.

In another recent multi-party case, we met with every party separately in advance of the mediation. Plaintiffs were asked to make pre-mediation demands and defense counsel were asked to bring the appropriate in-house counsel, risk managers and/or adjusters.

We recommend Counsel work the mediator regarding timing, “stage” setting and designating the decision-makers who need to be present at a mediation. In short, counsel and the mediator must design the mediation.

Furthermore, counsel must prepare themselves, their client, the opposing party and the mediator for the mediation. Preparation includes getting a feeling about the client’s and the opponent’s underlying interests, motivation, expectations, fears and concerns. Counsel should, similarly, role play the mediation with their clients and establish realistic expectations.

In preparing, counsel should consider that some cases lend themselves to an exchange of mediation statements. The purpose of this approach is to enable parties to evaluate the same case before and during the mediation.
The failure to creatively design the mediation, obtain discovery necessary for an accurate case evaluation or have the necessary decision-makers informed, involved and adequately prepared can doom a mediation to failure.

II. False First Impressions and Perceptions

This may be the most crucial barrier to successful dispute resolution. First impressions are terribly difficult to change. Decision-makers make their decisions on the data available at the time and they are slow to recognize and appreciate later contradictory data. The battleship once set in motion is incredibly difficult to turn about. Thus, the key is to make every effort to establish a good first impression.

These “first impressions” are set by client depositions, the quality of experts brought into the case, the efficacy of discovery and the “style” of counsel. First impressions, which are generally lasting impressions, allow a person the luxury of not thinking or reasoning. The very best way for parties to deal with this unfortunate and stubborn shortcut is prevention. Thus, parties should make the most of pre-mediation opportunities to favorably impress the opposing party. Perceptions are the lenses through which parties see themselves and their positions and others and their positions. Selective perception or stereotyping are frequently part and parcel of inaccurate first impressions. If parties cannot prevent these negative first impressions, they must be uncovered and addressed during the mediation. Like film producers and film directors, counsel must establish his client’s “first impression” before the mediation and reinforce it during the mediation.

III. Grief

Handling wrongful death cases, we were naturally brought towards the study of grief. Our research led us to the development of an alliterative tool that we use to question victims, their attorneys and opposing counsel. Without addressing the issue of grief, negotiators face an emotional roadblock when dealing with the grieved party. Thus, we inquire into feelings of (1) rage, (2) revenge, (3) retribution, (4) remorse, (5) regret, (6) restitution, (7) relief, (8) respect and (9) resolution. We have concluded that many of these and similar feelings/emotions occur in sexual assault, employment, professional dissolution and business cases.

Counsel and mediators make a mistake if they do not address this potent barrier to dispute resolution. Simply put, one must avoid the temptation of “avoidance” of the grief issue and be willing to tap into those feelings. Actively and empathetic listening will help address this barrier to conflict resolution.

IV. Systemic Distrust

Zealous representation, winning at all costs, the hired gun, the adversarial mindset, etc. are all glorified in folklore, the litigators’ mystique and the culture of insurance carriers and corporations. This sort of mindset often sows the seeds of distrust.

Parties often begin a mediation distrustful of their opponent. This barrier needs to be torn down, not re-enforced. Candid opening statements, acknowledgment of weaknesses, acknowledgment of the opposing party’s position, apology, advance pay, listening and revelation of negative information are all examples of trust building. Mediators, working with collaborative negotiators, can skillfully develop the trust necessary for conflict resolution. Our goal of building trust between the parties frequently causes us to engage in pre-mediation caucuses.

V. Failure to Communicate and Listen

The failure to communicate begins with failing to remember the words of a Jewish sage:

Each person was given two ears and one tongue, so that we may listen more than speak.

Native Americans have a valuable tradition of using a “Talking Stick.” The purpose of a Talking Stick is to give the person holding the Talking Stick the honor of speaking while all the others have the duty to listen. A Native American proverb capitalizes this goal as follows:

Listen or your tongue will keep you deaf.

The corollary to this last proverb is that the speaker must speak straight so that your words may go as sunlight to our hearts.

During a mediation, some parties need to express rage, anger, disappointment, grief and other emotions. Some parties require an apology or acknowledgment. Others will find the key to resolution when they listen hard enough that they can walk in another’s shoes. Too often parties fail to communicate candidly, while others fail to listen or honestly share perspectives and feelings. Successful mediation requires that this barrier to conflict resolution be torn down as early in the mediation as possible.

VI. Insufficient Focus on Underlying Interests

Too often negotiators focus on the zero sum game involving the distribution of money. While this focus is appropriate, counsel, adjusters and risk managers often miss the opportunity to address core values that often impact the progress of a mediation and the ultimate level of satisfaction that can flow from mediation.

For example, in a wrongful death case involving the loss of an infant in a small community hospital, both the hospital and the parents had important underlying interests. The parents...
needed to have their grief addressed and
validated by a neutral and by the hospi-
tal administrator. The parents needed to
feel that lessons learned from their
devastating experience would be used to
help others. On the other hand, the
hospital administrator wanted his risk
management team to utilize the parents
input to develop a training program. He
also wanted to acknowledge the parents
pain and to provide support that would
help them and give his staff a feeling of
positive closure.

To this end, we fashioned a settle-
ment that included a meeting between
the relevant staff and the parents, coun-
seling for the parents and grieving
children and a risk management
program. During the mediation, there
were three face-to-face meetings
between the hospital administrator and
the parents that were important parts of
the healing aspects of the mediation.
Further, the mediator made sure that he
addressed grief issues with the parents
head on. We closed the day with the
parents thanking us for our understand-
ing and for making a rough day less
difficult.

VII. Partisan Perception, Judgmental
Over-Confidence and Wrong
Baselines

Partisan perception involves the
partisan filter that advocates bring to a
case. What we see depends on where
we stand, who we are and what we have
seen before. Thus, with the same set of
facts, advocates see a different reality.
Mediators should require that the parties
switch places. Maybe, if the parties
would exchange their places they would
not suffer from judgmental over-confi-
dence in the evaluation of their case.
Hopefully, with a balanced view, parties
will not insist on proceeding from an
inaccurate baseline evaluation.

If advocates and their clients will
come to mediation with a collaborative
perspective, and a willingness to listen
to and consider other perspectives, these
inter-related barriers to dispute resolu-
tion can be addressed.

VIII. Reactive Devaluation

It is well recognized that if an oppo-
nent offers a suggestion, it will be given
less consideration than if a mediator
offers it. Similarly, if a party offers an
opinion about the law or an interpreta-
tion of the evidence, it will be similarly
discounted. The same opinions offered
by a mediator will be given more
consideration. Thus, it is imperative
that parties prepare mediators for medi-
ation, dealing with the mediator openly,
honestly and persuasively so the medi-
ator can express informed opinions and
make helpful suggestions whenever
necessary. Anticipation is the key to
handling this barrier.

IX. Misunderstanding the Loss/Risk
Analysis

Too often parties create a barrier to
dispute resolution because their risk
assessments do not factor in the full
range of key decision points that the
jury and the court will be considering.
This problem often leads to unrealistic
client expectations. Parties tend to be
averse to risk regarding gain and would
rather have a certain gain than an uncer-
tain larger gain. On the other hand,
people are risk-seeking with regard to
loss. That is, they would rather avoid a
certain loss and take a risk of a greater
loss if there is some chance of avoiding
that greater loss. In other words, some
parties would rather postpone a certain
loss (settlement) for an uncertain result
in the future (trial).

In fact, parties with either perspective
should be encouraged to address the
realities that they will ultimately have to
address. Effective negotiators will assist
their clients and their opponent in
addressing these realities.

Effective mediators will provide a
reasoned reality check. Sensitive and
effective mediators are mindful that
“naked” truth is often rejected while
truth clothed in parable is more readily
received.

X. Failure to Give Opponents Face,
Respect and Dignity

“Treat others how you would like to be
treated” is an adage we all learned in
childhood, yet we frequently forget to heed it in the heat of battle. Pointedly,
in 500 BC, Sun Tzu, a Chinese consult-
ant to a variety of warlords and
emperors, wrote that the wise general
does not press a desperate foe too hard.
If you have the grace and good sense to
let your opponent leave the battlefield
with face, dignity and self-respect, he is
more likely to avoid an unnecessary
battle. Further, the opponent with no
place to go, like the cornered tiger, may
prove to be more tenacious and danger-
ous than expected. Collaborative
negotiators are nimble enough to avoid
this common barrier to dispute
resolution.

XI. Conclusion

When tearing down the barriers to
dispute resolution, collaborative media-
tors should be like “Bob the Builder”
and construct a bridge to the other side.
If parties and mediators address the
underlying needs, interests and concerns
while being mindful of giving others
face, dignity and respect, they will
resolve most disputes.
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