

A

Aaron, Marjorie Corman, 46, 96, 157, 225

ABA Model Rules, 221

Adjournment

- impasse and, 194–196
- loss and, 149–150

Adjudication

- evaluation and, 171–172
- evaluation of, as option, 10–12
- realism about outcome of, 10

Adversarial comments, 90–91

Allocation, in environmental contamination disputes, 290–292

Alternatives

- adjudication option and, 10–12
- analysis, 11–12
- causes for distorted thinking, 11
- feedback evaluation, 12
- information exchange, 11
- outside decision maker

 - attitude, 12

- questions, 11
- reality test, 11
- testing of, 10–12

Apologies, 140–141

Arguments

- allowing, 6–8
- in opening session, 22

Attendance, as precondition, 58–59

Attribution bias, 42

Authority

- in environmental contamination disputes, 285
- inadequate, 54–57, 102–105
- recommendation, 104

Availability bias, 73

B

Backward steps, 59

Bargaining

- accrediting opponent in, 92–93, 124–125
- advance work in, 113
- adversarial comments in, 90–91
- advising in, 90–94
- backward movement in, 99–101
- in basic strategy, 13
- bracketed, 97–98
- breaks in, 98
- in caucus, 29–30, 31
- caucusing and, 27
- certainty in, 112
- changing the subject in, 93
- clashes in, 122–126
- coaching in, 90–94, 125
- confidence-building measures in, 111–112
- “confidential listening” in, 95–96, 186
- development of options in, 119–122

Bargaining (*continued*)

direct communication in, 119–120
early problems in, 58–59
esteem in, 92–93
explaining in, 123
extreme offers in, 82–84
first offers in, 82–90, 98–99
fixed-pie bias in, 115
format limitations in, 113–115
history, 50
impasses, 13
impatience in, 102
inconsistent interests in, 126–128
with insured claims, 271–272
interest identification in, 115–119
interest-based, 109–128
intervening in, 94
lack of authority in, 102–105
limits in, 103–104
loss and, 145–146
mistrust in, 110–113
modeling of good, 63–64
moderation, 9, 31, 94
multiple parties and, 105–107
next-to-last number in, 96
obstacles in, 110–115
parallel discussion tracks in, 114
persistence in, 118–119
positional, 81–107
preconditions and, 58–59
private conversations and, 50
range, 97–98
recommendation authority in, 104
reframing in, 91–92, 113, 123–125
refusal to make first offer in, 98–99
restarting, at impasse, 185–186
settlement terms and, 126–127
special problems in, addressing, 98–107

styles in, 122–126
supporting process of, 90–98
tact in, 118–119
tactics in, 122–126
terms, 121–122
time-limited discussion in, 114

Barriers, cognitive, 72–79

BATNA. *See* Best Alternative to a Negotiated Agreement (BATNA)*Bell Atlantic Corp. v. AT&T Corp.*, 295

Best Alternative to a Negotiated Agreement (BATNA), 262, 263, 268

Beverages, 49–50

Bias

attribution, 42
availability, 73
fixed-pie, 115
perception, 43
vividness, 73

Blind bracketing, 193

Body language, in evaluation, 178–179

Breaks, in bargaining, 98

Briefings, expert, 52

Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., 296

C

Case analysis, with insured claims, 276–277

Case value, 228–229

Caucus

advantages of, 27
advice in, 32
bargaining in, 29–30, 31
concluding, 33–34
confidentiality and, 206–208
decision to use, 27
early, 28–30
engagement of principals in, 29
evaluation in, 176
follow-up, 33–34

- interventions in, 32
 - issues and interests in, 30
 - later, 32–33
 - legal evaluation in, 32
 - listening in, 28–29
 - middle, 30–32
 - modeling of negotiation techniques in, 29
 - open-ended questions in, 29
 - other side's perspective in, 31
 - patterns in, 27–28
 - private, 26–34
 - settlement confirmation in, 33
 - starting point in, 28
 - sub-meetings and, 33
 - transition to, from opening session, 26
 - CERCLA. *See* Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA)
 - Certainty
 - attraction to, as cognitive force, 154–155
 - in bargaining, 112
 - Client, asking about, 54–55
 - Cognitive barriers, 72–79
 - Cognitive forces
 - attraction to certainty and familiarity, 154–155
 - reactive devaluation, 153
 - Co-mediation, in environmental contamination disputes, 291
 - Competence, ethics and, 219–220
 - Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), 287–288
 - Conditional participation, 57
 - Conference calls, 48
 - Confidence-building measures, 111–112
 - Confidentiality, 42
 - between caucuses, 206–208
 - employment issues and, 244
 - ethics and, 220
 - information exchange and, 66–68
 - in law of mediation, 206–209
 - in standards of conduct, 206
 - Confirmatory acts, 196–198
 - Conflicts of interest, first contact and, 46–47
 - Contacts
 - first, 17
 - pre-mediation, 17–18
 - private, 18
 - Context, for first offers, 89
 - Conversations
 - get-acquainted, 53
 - private, 18, 50–53
 - Copies, disallowance of, 66–67
 - Copyright, 258
 - Costs, litigation, information exchange and, 72
 - Covid-19 pandemic, 34
 - Creativity, in employment issues, 244–245
- D**
- Data exchange, 65
 - Decision analysis
 - calculation process and, 239–240
 - data in, 229
 - discounted case value in, 228–229
 - evaluation and, 237–239
 - information exchange and, 75
 - logistics choices and, 239–240
 - multiple verdicts and, 233–235
 - odds calculation in, 240–241
 - reasons to use, 226–227
 - risk and, 229–233
 - scratch pad format in, 227–228
 - sensitivity analysis in, 235–237
 - tree format in, 227–235
 - Decision trees, 75, 227–235
 - Defensiveness, 78–79, 148
 - Devaluation, reactive, 42, 153–154
 - Discounted case value, 228–229

- Discrimination, racial, 242–254
- Distance, in evaluation, 177–178
- Drinks, 49–50
- Duration of process, 51
- Dysfunctional participants,
feelings and, 143–144
- E**
- Early Case Assessment (ECA), 262
- Email, initial, 47–48
- “Emotional flooding,” 19
- Emotions. *See also* Feelings
cognitive forces and, 153–155
in employment disputes,
243–244
evaluation and, 163
goal emphasis and, 151
in intellectual property
disputes, 259, 262–263
loss and, 144–150
moral issues and, 150–152
precedent and, 152–153
reputation and, 152–153
strong, 132–150
symbolic issues and,
150–152
- Empathy, 136–138, 175–177
- Employment disputes
case example, 242–254
challenges with, 246–249
confidentiality and, 244
cost savings in, 245
creativity of outcomes in,
244–245
emotionality and, 243–244
fact finding in, 251–252
imbalances of power in, 247
mediator proposals in, 249
multi-plaintiff, 249
negotiation by numbers in, 248
other alternative dispute
resolutions in, 251–252
“outside” barriers in, 248–249
personal issues in, 248
preparation for mediation in,
249–250
racial discrimination in,
242–254
resource disparity and, 246
revenge in, 247–248
speed in, 245
timing in, 246–247
wrongful termination, 242–254
- End game management
blind bracketing in, 193
at impasse, 191–194
mediator proposal in, 191–193
- Enron/Andersen* case, 299–300
- Environmental contamination
disputes
allocation in, 290–292
characteristics of, 283–284
co-mediation in, 291
free rider problem and, 285–287
interest groups in, 290
obstacles in, 284, 285–292
process issues in, 285–287
psychological issues in, 287–288
scientific issues in,
disagreement over, 288–289
settlement authority in, 285
uncertainty in, 284
variety of, 283–284
- Escalation, 42
- Ethics
codes, 212–213
competence and, 219–220
confidentiality and, 220
connections to disputants and,
218–219
illegal deals and, 220–221
lack of experience and, 219–220
lawyer-mediators and, 221–222
pro se litigants and, 206, 213
semi-competent litigants and,
215–216
sleazy deals and, 220–221
sympathy for disputant and,
216–218
- Evaluation
of adjudication, as option,
10–12

- adjudication and, 171–172
 after, 180–181
 benefits of, 161–162
 body language in, 178–179
 in caucus, 176
 dangers of, 163–165
 as “day in court,” 161, 174
 decision analysis and, 237–239
 decision on, 165
 defined, 159
 delivery of, 173–180
 disagreement and, 170–171
 distance in, 177–178
 doubt and, 170
 emotions and, 163
 empathy in, 175–177
 as essential, 158
 expectation of, 163–164
 feedback, 12
 and feigned disagreement, 165
 format, 173–175
 gestures in, 178–179
 global, 163
 as good practice, 158–160
 implicit, 178–180
 issues, 169–170
 and lack of information, 165
 lawyers’ desire for, 159–160
 “leaky,” 178–180
 legal, in caucus, 32
 levels of, 170–171
 next steps, 180–181
 options, 168–169
 preparation for, 172–173
 questions in, 170
 reactions to, 180
 reality testing *vs.*, 160–161
 settlement and, 161, 172
 silent, 179–180
 standard application in,
 171–172
 strategic, 175–177
 structuring, 169–173
 tact in, 175–177
 timing of, 166–169
 tone in, 178–179
- Expectations
 evaluation and, 163–164
 loss and, 147
 Experience, lack of, ethics and,
 219–220
 Expert briefings, 52
 Extreme offers, 82–84
- F**
- Fact finding, in employment
 disputes, 251–252
 Familiarity, attraction to, as
 cognitive force, 154–155
 Feelings. *See also* Emotions
 acknowledgment of, 136–138
 apologies and, 140–141
 in caucus, 28
 challenge of, 6
 dysfunctional participants and,
 143–144
 empathy and, 136–138
 exploring, 132–134
 in first offers, 84
 hidden issues and, 10
 listening and, 136–138
 in opening session, expression
 of, 23–24
 opening session and, 19–20
 responding to, 134–144
 response for, 6
 retracing and, 142–143
 Feigned disagreement, 165
 First contacts, 17, 45–47
 Fixed-pie bias, 115
 Food and drink, 49–50
 Free rider problem, in
 environmental
 contamination disputes,
 285–287
- G**
- Gestures, in evaluation,
 178–179
 Get-acquainted conversations, 53
 Greetings, in opening session, 23
 Guarantee, at impasse, 189–190

I

- Illegal deals, 220–221
- Impartiality, as mediator
power, 42
- Impasse
adjournment and, 194–196
asking for help in, 184–185
blind bracketing at, 193
end game management in,
191–194
final, 201–202
guarantee at, offering,
189–190
interests and, 185
last and final offer at,
193–194
modification of mix or structure
at, 186–187
opinion at, offering, 189–190
perseverance in, 184
restarting bargaining at,
185–186
status calls and, 194–195
tactics at, 184–196
waiting and, 184–185
- Impatience
in bargaining, 102
as mediator vulnerability, 44
- Implementation, settlement, 201
- Inadequate authority, 54–57
- Inconsistent interests, in
bargaining, 126–128
- Information exchange, 8
and articulation of perspective,
71
availability bias and, 73
cognitive barriers and, 72–79
confidentiality and, 66–68
data exchange and, 65
decision analysis and, 75
differences and, 69
and discussion of case
outcomes, 77
information gaps and, 64–69
judgmental overconfidence
and, 76
litigation alternative analysis
and, 69–79
litigation costs and, 72
and modeling of good
bargaining, 63–64
neutral analysis in, 68–69
in opening session, 22
overoptimism and, 75–76
in private conversations, 51–52
questions in, 70–71
representations and, 66
selective perception and, 73
verification and, 66
visual aids and, 74–75
vividness bias and, 73
- Information gathering, 8
- Insured claims
bargaining with, 271–272
case analysis with, 276–277
features in mediation of,
272–274
information flow with, 274–276
mediation models for, 274–282
movement facilitation with,
277–281
- Insurers, asking about, 55
- Intellectual property disputes
business interests in, 263
business issues in, 259
combinations of claims in, 259
copyright in, 258
emotions in, 259, 262–263
information access in, 264
at mediation, 267–269
nature of, 256–259
participants in, 264–265
patents in, 256–257
preparation in, 265
session planning for, 266–267
settlement documentation in,
269–270
settlement structures in,
263–264
success in, 262–267
timing of mediation in, 260–262
trade secrets in, 257

- trademarks in, 258–259
 who should mediate, 260
- Interests
 alignment of, 126
 in caucus, 30
 identification of, 115–119
 impasse and, 185
 inconsistent, in bargaining,
 126–128
 satisfaction of, 126
- Internet mediation. *See* Online mediation
- Introductory comments, in
 opening session, 23
- Issue identification, 4–5, 54–55
- J**
- Judgmental overconfidence, 76
- L**
- Last and final offer, 193–194
- Law of mediation
 confidentiality in, 206–209
 enforcement of participation,
 209–210
 enforcement of settlement,
 210–211
 liability in, 211–212
- Lawyer-mediators, ethics and,
 221–222
- Liability, mediator, 211–212
- Limits, in bargaining, 103–104
- Listening
 in caucus, 28–29
 confidential, in bargaining,
 95–96, 186
 feelings and, 136–138
 in opening session, 24
- Location
 food and drink at, 49–50
 in mediation preparation, 49–50
 neutrality and, 49
 in online mediation, 49
 and rooms for conferring, 49
- Loss
 adjournment and, 149–150
 as common, 144–145
 defensiveness and, 148
 delayed reactions to, 146–147
 emotions and, 144–150
 expectations and, 147
 feelings triggered by, 145
 impact on opponents, 147
 mourning and, 148
 negotiations and, 145–146, 149
 responses to, 147
 timing and, 147
- M**
- Markman* hearing, 256, 260
- Mastercard/Visa* case, 301–302
- Mediation goals, 41–42
- Mediation stages
 caucusing in, 26–34
 online mediation in, 34–38
 opening session in, 18–26
 pre-mediation contacts in,
 17–18
- Mediator powers, 42–43
- Mediator proposal
 in employment disputes, 249
 in end game management,
 191–193
- Mediator vulnerabilities, 43–44
- Mega-cases
 challenges of, 294
 defined, 293–294
 judge in, 304–306
 judicial cooperation in, 301–302
 multiple parties in, 294–295
 role facilitation in, 296–299
 science in, 302–304
 timing in, 299–300
- Memorandum of understanding
 (MOU), 197, 198–199
- Missing players, 54–57, 104–105
- Moral issues, 150–152
- MOU. *See* Memorandum of understanding (MOU)
- Mourning, 148
- Multi-plaintiff employment
 disputes, 249

Multiple parties

- anonymous contributions with, 106–107
 - assessment of responsibility with, 105–106
 - bargaining and, 105–107
 - deferring allocation in, 105
 - lead donor with, 106
 - in mega-cases, 294–295
 - partial settlement and, 107
 - process separation with, 105
- Multiple verdicts, decision analysis and, 233–235**

N

- Neutrality, perception of, 42
- Next-to-last number, 96

O**Offers, first**

- advising to revise, 87
 - asking for private information on, 86
 - in bargaining, 82–90
 - context for, 89
 - decision to transmit, 88
 - delivering, 88–90
 - extreme, 82–84
 - feelings and, 84
 - obtaining, 82–87
 - offering prediction after, 86–87
 - perspective with, statement of, 88
 - plaintiff as starting, 82
 - presentation of, 89
 - refusal to make, 98–99
 - responding to, 84–85
 - suggestions of standards in, 87
 - timing of, 82
 - underlying message in, 85–86
- Offers, last and final, 193–194**
- Olam v. Congress Mortgage Co.*, 211
- Online mediation, 34–38**
- activeness of parties in, 35–36
 - convenience of, 35
 - costs of, 35
 - interruptions in, 35

location and, 49

- private discussions in, 37
 - relaxation in, 34
 - time differences and, 37
- Opening session**
- argumentation in, 22
 - avoidance of, 18–19
 - building of working relationship in, 21
 - disappearance of, 18
 - “emotional flooding” and, 19
 - encouraging principals to speak in, 24–25
 - explanation of process in, 22
 - expression of views and feelings in, 23–24
 - goals of, 21–22
 - greetings in, 23
 - information exchange in, 22
 - introductory comments in, 23
 - listening in, 22, 24
 - one-sided, 20
 - order in, 25–26
 - promotion of discussion in, 25–26
 - techniques, 22–26
 - transition from, to caucus, 26
- Optimism, 75–76**
- Oral agreements, in settlement, 210–211**
- Order, in opening session, 25–26**
- Overconfidence, judgmental, 76**
- Overoptimism, 75–76**

P

- Partial participation, 56–57**
- Participation**
- conditional, 57
 - enforcement of, 209–210
 - partial, 56–57
- Patents, in intellectual property disputes, 256–257**
- Perception, selective, 73**
- Perception bias, 43**
- Perseverance, in impasse, 184**
- Persistence, in bargaining, 118–119**

- Phrasing, in environmental contamination disputes, 290–291
- Positional bargaining, 81–107. *See also* Bargaining
- Power imbalances, in employment disputes, 247
- Precedent, 152–153
- Preconditions
 - attendance as, 58
 - bargaining and, 58–59
- Pre-mediation contacts, 17–18
- Preparation, for mediation
 - administrative steps in, 47–50
 - bargaining problems and, 58–59
 - conference calls in, 48
 - conflicts of interest and, 46–47
 - first contacts in, 45–47
 - get-acquainted conversations in, 53
 - inadequate authority and, 54–57
 - information exchange in, 51–52
 - initial email in, 47–48
 - issue identification in, 54–55
 - location in, 49–50
 - missing players and, 54–57
 - private conversations and, 50–53
- Private conversations, 18, 50–53
- Private meetings, 52–53
- Pro se litigants, ethics and, 213–215
- Process issues, 51
- Psychological issues,
 - in environmental contamination disputes, 287–288
- Q**
- Quality of process, 216
- Questions
 - in employment disputes, 246
 - in evaluation, 170
 - in first contact, 45–46
 - in information exchange, 70–71
 - open-ended, feelings and, 133
 - open-ended, in caucus, 29
 - prompting, 133
 - “what if,” in bargaining, 97–98
- R**
- Race discrimination, 242–254
- Ratification, settlement, 200–201
- Reactive devaluation, 42, 153–154
- Realism, 78
- Reality testing, 160–161, 170
- Reframing, 91–92, 113, 123–125, 150–151
- Representations, in information exchange, 66
- Reputation, 152–153
- Resource disparity, employment disputes and, 246
- Revenge, in employment disputes, 247–248
- Risk, decision analysis and, 229–233
- S**
- Scarcity principle, 153
- Scientific issues
 - in environmental contamination disputes, 288–289
 - in mega-cases, 302–304
- Scratch pad format, in decision analysis, 227–228
- Selective perception, 73
- Self-determination, 216
- Semi-competent litigants, ethics and, 215–216
- Sensitivity analysis, 235–237
- Settlement
 - confirmatory acts and, 196–198
 - documentation of, 269–270
 - drafting, 198–200
 - enforcement of, 210–211
 - in environmental contamination disputes, 285

- Settlement (*continued*)
 evaluation and, 161, 172
 formal documents, 199
 implementation, 201
 in intellectual property
 disputes, 263–264, 269–270
 invalidation of oral agreement
 on, 211
 management, 196–201
 mediator power and, 43
 mediator role in, 199–200
 memorandum of
 understanding for, 197,
 198–199
 oral agreements in, 210–211
 partial, multiple parties and,
 107
 private caucus and, 33
 ratification, 200–201
 symbolic affirmation in,
 197–198
 terms, bargaining and, 126–127
 value, 228–229
- Site visits, 52
- Sleazy deals, 220–221
- Snacks, 49–50
- Stages. *See* Mediation stages
- Standards of Conduct for
 Mediators, 206, 213
- Status calls, 194–195
- Strategy, basic
 adjudication option in,
 evaluation of, 10–12
 allowing arguments, 6–8
 alternative testing in, 10–12
 bargaining impasses and, 13
 expression of feelings in, 6–8
 hidden concerns in, 10
 information gathering and
 exchange in, 8
 success foundation in, 4–5
- Sub-meetings, in caucus, 33
- Success foundation
 bargain moderation in, 9
 challenge of, 4
 issue identification in, 4–5
 legal case in, 4
 response in, 4
 trust and, 4
- Symbolic issues, 150–152
- Sympathy, for disputant, 216–218
- T**
- Tact
 in bargaining, 118–119
 in evaluation, 175–177
- Termination, wrongful, 242–254
- Timing
 in employment disputes,
 246–247
 of evaluation, 166–169
 of first offers, 82
 in intellectual property
 disputes, 260–262
 loss and, 147
 in mega-cases, 299–300
Toms River case, 302–304
- Tone, in evaluation, 178–179
- Trade secrets, 257
- Trademarks, 258–259
- Tree format, in decision analysis,
 227–235
- Trust
 in bargaining, 110–113
 success foundation and, 4
- U**
- UMA. *See* Uniform Mediation Act
 (UMA)
- Uniform Mediation Act (UMA),
 210–211, 213
- United States v. Microsoft Corp.*,
 296–299
- V**
- Verification, in information
 exchange, 66
- Virtual mediation. *See* Online
 mediation
- Visual aids, 74–75
- Vividness bias, 73
- Vulnerabilities, mediator, 43–44

W

*Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. VISA
U.S.A. Inc.*, 296

WATNA. *See* Worst Alternative
to a Negotiated Agreement
(WATNA)

“What if” questions, in
bargaining, 97–98

Worst Alternative to a Negotiated
Agreement (WATNA), 262,
263, 268

Wrongful termination, 242–254